

Plenary Session

GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT: CHALLENGES OF PREDICTABILITY AND MANAGEABILITY

May 23, 2019.

A. P. Petrov Theatre and Concert Hall, SPbUHSS

CHAIRPERSONS:

- V. A. CHERESHNEV *Chief Researcher at the Institute for Immunology and Physiology (the Urals Branch of the RAS), member of the Presidium of the Urals Branch of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Medicine), Professor, Doctor honoris causa of SPbUHSS*
- M. Á. MORATINOS CUYAUBE *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*
- R. I. NIGMATULIN *Research Advisor of P. P. Shirshov Institute of Oceanology of the RAS, member of the Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor*
- S. V. VERSHININ *Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary*
- A. S. ZAPESOTSKY *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*

SPEAKERS:

- I. O. ABRAMOVA *Director of the Institute for African Studies of the RAS, member of the Presidium of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics)*
- E. AGAZZI *Professor of the University of Genoa (Italy), foreign member of the RAS, Ph. D.*
- A. A. AKAYEV *President of the Kyrgyz Republic (1990–2005), foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Engineering)*
- H. de CHAVAGNAC *Consul General of the Republic of France in St. Petersburg*
- B. DESGARDINS *General Manager of Banque “Eric Sturdza SA” (Geneva, Switzerland)*
- P. DUTKIEWICZ *Director of the Center for Governance and Public Policy at Carleton University in Ottawa (Canada), Ph. D., Professor of Political Science*
- J. K. GALBRAITH *Professor at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas (Austin, USA)*
- Al. A. GROMYKO *Director of the Institute of Europe of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Political Studies), Professor of the RAS*
- A. A. GUSEYNOV *Principal Adviser for Academic Affairs of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, full member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Doctor honoris causa of SPbUHSS*
- G. A. HAJIYEV *Judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, Dr. Sc. (Law), Professor; Honored Lawyer of the Russian Federation, Doctor honoris causa of SPbUHSS*
- V. V. KIRILLOV *Vice-Governor of St. Petersburg, Dr. Sc. (Sociology), full state counselor 1st class of the Russian Federation*
- G. W. KOLODKO *Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Poland (1994–1997, 2002–2003), Director of the Research Institute at the Kozminski University (Warsaw), foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor*
- H. KÖCHLER *President of the International Progress Organization (Vienna, Austria), professor emeritus at the University of Innsbruck, Ph. D.*
- A. M. KRAMARENKO *Director of Development of Russian International Affairs Council, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation*

- V. A. LEONTYEV *Deputy Plenipotentiary Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the North-West Federal District, full state counselor 2nd class of the Russian Federation*
- A. G. LISITSYN-SVETLANOV *Chief Researcher fellow of the Institute of State and Law of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Law), Professor*
- Ye. I. MAKAROV *Deputy Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, research supervisor of the Center for Monitoring and Analysis of Social and Labour Conflicts at SPbUHSS, Professor Emeritus of SPbUHSS*
- H. M. REZNIK *Vice-President of the Federal Chamber of Lawyers, Cand. Sc. (Law), Honoured Lawyer of Russia, Doctor honoris causa of SPbUHSS*
- M. SANAEI *Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Russian Federation, Cand. Sc. (Political Studies)*
- J. A. SCHOLTE *Professor of Peace and Development in the School of Global Studies at the University of Gothenburg (Sweden)*
- I. TALUKDAR *Research Fellow at the Indian Council of World Affairs (New Delhi)*
- P. P. TOLOCHKO *Member of the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Honorary Director of the Institute of Archeology of the NAS of Ukraine, academician of the NAS of Ukraine, foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Doctor honoris causa of SPbUHSS*
- Zh. T. TOSHCHENKO *Chief Researcher of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS, Chairman of the International Editorial Board of the RAS journal "Sociological Studies", corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor*
- V. T. TRETYAKOV *Dean of the Higher School (Department) of Television of Lomonosov Moscow State University*
- M. A. ZAMSHEV *Editor-in-chief of the Literaturnaya Gazeta (Literary Newspaper)*
- K. F. ZATULIN *First Deputy Chairman of the Committee on CIS Affairs, Eurasian Integration and Relations with Compatriots, deputy to the State Duma of the Russian Federation, Director of the Institute of CIS Countries*

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues! We are starting the work of the plenary session at the International Likhachov Scientific Conference. The Likhachov Scientific Conference (originally called the Days of Science) has been held at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences since 1993, initiated by academician D. S. Likhachov, who personally participated in several conferences. In 2001, writer D. A. Granin and I addressed the President of Russia V. V. Putin asking to take a number of measures to perpetuate the memory of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov who had passed away by that time. The President signed the Decree “On Perpetuating the Memory of D. S. Likhachov” within three days after the receipt of our letter (and that is unprecedented for the peaceful times). One of the paragraphs included holding the International Likhachov Scientific Conference employing the resources and potentialities of our University. Thus, our public initiative was granted the state status.

The Likhachov Scientific Conference is held under the auspices of the Russian Academy of Sciences, supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation and using the Presidential grant for civil society development. Thus, the International Likhachov Scientific Confer-

ence has the official state status fixed by the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation.

Over fifteen hundred people take part in the Conference every year. Today, about 800 people are present in this hall, and tomorrow over 750 schoolchildren from Russia and abroad will take part in the Likhachov Scientific Conference. During the school year, they took part in International Contest of Creative Works by schoolchildren “D. S. Likhachov’s Ideas and Modern Times”. This as well as participation of the SPbUHSS students in the forum is a very important part of the Likhachov Scientific Conference – and this is concentration on the future.

Over 200 reports written by the leading scholars, thinkers, public figures, journalists, representatives of various fields of practical activities and academic knowledge from 25 countries of the world are published on the University website. Reports were presented by advisor to the President of the Russian Federation S. Yu. Glazyev, over 25 members of the Russian Academy of Sciences, ambassadors Polad Bülbüloğlu (Azerbaijan) and Mehdi Sanaei (Iran), outstanding foreign scholars and statesmen from Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Hungary, Egypt, India, Italy, Iran, Iceland, Spain, Kazakhstan, Canada, Kirghizia, Paki-

stan, Poland, Puerto Rico, Slovenia, the United States, Turkey, the Ukraine, Switzerland, Sweden, etc. Over 200 Professors and Doctors of Sciences from various parts of our country take part in the Conference and surely there are scholars from Moscow and St. Petersburg higher educational establishments and institutes of the Academy of Sciences among them.

Each time, the most urgent issues of the modern times are included in the agenda of the Conference in accordance with the spiritual and moral legacy, Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov's behests. The topic of this Conference is "Global Development: Challenges of Predictability and Manageability". The title was not thought up by the Organizing Committee but worked out in the course of discussion with a big group of scholars traditionally taking part in the Conference. And it was supported by the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation.

We are living in a difficult period when the after-war world order is changing considerably and many principles of international law are challenged as well as the role of the United Nations, the World Trade Organization and a whole complex of social institutions that were set up after the war and operated for over 70 years. Until the recent decade, relations between many countries, notwithstanding their being tense sometimes and characterized as the Cold War during a certain period, were in any case built on international rules, norms and procedures for settling conflicts recognized by all. This provided for stability in global development. Notwithstanding that there were blocs (Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO), the threat of a nuclear war was real and there were crises (like the Cuban Missile Crises or the Berlin Crisis), the state of affairs was safer, more manageable and predictable than today: each country understood in what order it could uphold its interests if they had been infringed on. This system has been corroding, degrading and even breaking up in recent decades. Today, it is unclear for many countries how states and governments should behave in order to deal with conflicts. We run across a whole line of threats (terrorism, trade and tariff wars, etc.) to which the global community can't find adequate answers.

Extremely important issues are raised at the Likhachov Scientific Conference today: what should be done further and what should the after-war world order be like? It's absolutely clear to us, the participants of the Conference, that a new architecture is being created in the world. The matter is not if there will be or won't be a new architecture but if it is possible to transfer to a new global architecture, new rules of building international relations without a war (that in the present environment has all the chances to be a nuclear war). Currently, the feeling of military confrontations' danger is damped in case of many people, but the army men of several countries seriously engage in saber rattling and speak about a possibility of a nuclear war. This is the principal difference of the current situation from what we had ten or sixty years ago. The world has reached a dangerous line, and we should do everything possible to find the ways to exit the situation, first of all theoretical; practical ways will be looked for by other people and not us. The purpose of the Likhachov Scientific Conference is to work out productive ideas that will help to move forward and provide the stable future.

I invite Deputy Plenipotentiary Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the North-West Federal District Vadim Alexeyevich Leontyev to take the floor.

V. A. LEONTYEV¹: – Allow me to read the welcoming address by the President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin to participants, organizers and guests of the 19th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

"Dear friends! I'd like to welcome you on the occasion of the 19th International Likhachov Scientific Conference that opens today.

Academician Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov paid a lot of attention to St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, he was a Doctor honoris causa of this renowned higher educational establishment. And because of that it is symbolic that your meetings take place exactly here, in SPbUHSS, and they are rightly regarded as a significant event in the life of the Northern capital and the whole country.

I'll mention that well-known scholars and politicians, prominent figures in the fields of culture and arts, representatives of mass media traditionally take part in the forum. Their rich in content and sometimes fierce disputes invariably evoke a massive public response, serve to develop Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov's ideas, that have not stopped being urgent today.

I'm sure that the Likhachov Scientific Conference will carry out its lofty mission in future as well, aimed at expansion of humanitarian cooperation, strengthening friendship and mutual understanding by people.

I wish you success, interesting and useful communications. V. Putin."

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, the Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation D. A. Medvedev sent his welcoming address to our Conference. Dmitry Anatolyevich says in his welcoming address that over the two decades, our Conference has become a significant event in the academic and cultural life of the country and an impressive audience traditionally assembles for it. D. A. Medvedev mentions that the main topic of discussion, "Global Development: Challenges of Predictability and Manageability", is extremely urgent and touches upon practically all areas of our life. And that is very important in the time of global changes. In the opinion of Dmitry Anatolyevich, it is required to find new approaches to prevention and overcoming crises, and that is only possible by joint efforts, based on mutual respect and interested dialogue between states and nations, and with the help of science and culture that have no borders.

The Chairman of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation V. V. Volodin, who person-

¹ Deputy Plenipotentiary Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the North-West Federal District (from November, 2018), full state counselor 2nd class of the Russian Federation. He occupied various positions in the City Agency for Industrial Investments (2004 – 2007), served in the leading positions in the North-West Directorate for Construction, Reconstruction and Restoration (2007–2011), he worked in the Administration for Information and Document Provision of the President of the Russian Federation (2012). Chief adviser, head of the Home Policy Department in the Office of the Plenipotentiary Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the Central Federal District (2012 – September, 2018). Head of the Department for Working with Regions of the Central and North-West Federal Districts of the Presidential Office for Home Policy (September–November, 2018). He was awarded the second-class medal of Order of Merit for the Motherland.

ally familiarized himself with our University not long ago, also sent his welcoming address to the Likhachov Scientific Conference.

I invite Deputy Chairman of the Committee on CIS Affairs, Eurasian Integration and Relations with Compatriots of the State Duma, Russian scholar, well-known journalist, TV anchorman, director of one of the research institutions studying the Committee's issues, Konstantin Fyodorovich Zatulin to take the floor.

K. F. ZATULIN: – I was entrusted with the honorary mission to read the welcoming address from the Chairman of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation Vyacheslav Viktorovich Volodin.

Dear friends! This year, you again assembled in the city on the Neva river, in St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences to discuss urgent issues of global development.

Your scientific forum initiated by academician Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov has been making its contribution to arranging the dialogue between countries for many years, based on mutually advantageous, equal partnership. This confirms the great impact of D. S. Likhachov's humanistic ideas on the formation of modern scientific views and ideas.

Today, in the time of changes, when global development is subjected to new challenges and risks, it is especially important to promote a constructive agenda of international cooperation. I count on offers and recommendations worked out in the course of the Likhachov Scientific Conference being practical and significant, including in parliamentary dimensions.

I wish you successful and fruitful work. Respectfully yours, V. V. Volodin."

It's not my first visit to St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. I am proud of my warm relations with the President of this wonderful higher educational establishment but I participate in the Likhachov Scientific Conference for the first time.

A. S. Zapesotsky said that we lived during difficult times. Just recently, when I was lecturing at the SPbUHSS, I quoted the lines from one of the verses by Russian poet N. Nekrasov, "There were times worse, but never milder." Really, evident things are doubted today, in particular a possibility of international cooperation on equal terms, justice in international relations (though it is difficult to achieve), events testing international relations for stability and strength are multiplying, armed conflicts go on and new conflicts originate. It is important at this moment for us with our colleagues from abroad to continue looking for a new language that may be heard in other countries. It is important not to lose the ability to hear each other and convince.

I have been working in the State Duma for a fairly long period of time, but the first Duma is especially dear to me, because the authorities and the opposition were balanced then in the State Duma, the opinions were balanced, and that provided a possibility to make others change their mind.

Stability of the political system is important for residents of our country, they are not interested when people in power argue with one another – decisions taken by them are important. But those participating in this process think that a possibility to convince the opponent with arguments

that the speaker's point of view is right, seems important. And when everything is predetermined, and no matter what you say, a certain decision will be taken, this decision is not always the best.

Currently, the policy of the United States in relation to their allies in the West is dominating in international relations. They are trying to force their point of view on everyone: there are two opinions – American and wrong, i. e. the opinion of all the rest. This can't fail to bring indignation, regular bifurcations of the international life. In this environment, Russia is fighting on the international scene to have its independent position respected, in order for anyone not to be able to force their point of view on Russia, the way the country should live, who should rule it, how it should be represented in the world in general.

A vivid example is the Ukraine, where discussions go on all the time (and even more so now with the power passing over to the new President), including in talk shows and TV programs, as to the opinion of this or that American official about this or that appointment in the Ukraine. The Ukraine found itself in such a situation when it refuses itself the right to have its own opinion until it finds out what they think about the issue in the United States. And if in the past it was the opinion of the President, Vice-President, now minor officials from the U.S. Department of State, public figures and politicians from the United States tell the Ukraine who should be appointed the administration head.

I'm sure that Russia will never allow anyone to tell us whom to appoint and whom to dismiss. And to assert this right of ours is an important task for everyone and all of us, first of all people in power in Russia.

I'd like again to call all of you, especially the younger part of our audience to be interested in what is taking place and express your point of view, to listen to the opinion of people setting up the agenda of public discussions all over the world, thanks to such unique events as the Likhachov Scientific Conference. I wish participants of the Conference successful and fruitful work!

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation S. V. Lavrov sent his welcoming address to the Likhachov Scientific Conference. Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation Sergey Vasilyevich Vershinin is taking part in our Conference, and he is given the floor.

S. V. VERSHININ: – Dear friends, colleagues! I am happy to be present at this scientific forum for the first time. I'll start from the most important – reading the welcoming address by the Minister of Foreign Affairs S. V. Lavrov:

"I'd like to sincerely welcome organizers and participants of the 19th International Likhachov Scientific Conference as well as the Global Circle initiative.

St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences has been established as a sought-after discussion venue, where eminent and distinguished politicians, scholars, prominent figures in the field of culture from various states assemble every year to look for answers to numerous challenges of our times. Such interlinking of intellectual efforts acquires special significance in the current far from simple situation on the international scene, characterized by aggravation of old and origination of new challenges and threats.

The topic of this meeting is rather urgent. Currently, the world is undergoing tectonic changes related to formation of the polycentric architecture of the world order. This trend in particular reflects natural striving of nations for selecting the models of development answering their national, cultural, confessional identity by themselves.

It is in the interests of all to make this process manageable and predictable. It is only possible to achieve this aim jointly, on the solid foundation of international law, basing on the central coordinating UN role. It is difficult to overestimate the contribution of diplomacy called to assist achievement of balanced decisions in various fields – from economy to climate.

It is hardly possible to provide peaceful, safe and happy future of the whole mankind without establishing productive partnership between representatives of various confessions, cultures, civilizations. In this connection, I'd like to express my sincere gratitude to my colleague, high representative of the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations Miguel Angel Moratinos for his energetic efforts in this direction.

I am sure that your meetings will be held in a creative way, and their results will help to strengthen trust and mutual understanding between nations. I wish you fruitful discussions and all the best. S. V. Lavrov.”

Leading Russian and foreign scholars, politicians, diplomats and public figures are assembled today for the influential scientific forum held for the 19th time already to seriously and comprehensively discuss urgent global issues. The Global Circle group also has a big potential – it's a new format set up on the initiative of the high representative of the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations Miguel Moratinos and the President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences Alexander Sergeevich Zapesotsky. They met for the first time yesterday, and that meeting was useful. It seems that ideas helping to make our world more predictable and manageable will originate in the course of discussions of this new international intellectual club.

I'd also like to mention that the raised topic is much in demand – “Global Development: Challenges of Predictability and Manageability” as many challenges in politics and economy originate because of wrong forecasting, and that often takes the situation from under control and entails negative consequences. It is evident today that the system of international relations is being reorganized in the direction of multipolarity. And though, in our opinion, the general transformation vector is irreversible, there is still uncertainty as to what this multipolarity will be in the 21st century.

In this environment, the struggle for the rights to determine the rules of the game within the framework of the forming world order is aggravated. The collective West is trying to do it in its own way, to establish itself as the one united decision-taking center within the framework of the so-called liberal world order. And though there are disagreements between the United States and the European Union as to what this order should be based on (national sovereignty or multiculturalism), they act as one or with a common understanding. Today, the system of international law that was a guarantee of stability and predictability in global affairs, and was formed for decades, is in danger. Instead of it, the West forces some formula, the thought by it world order based on rules, on the other

participants of international relations. As a result, the established architecture of global governance is under a serious stress and just can't function efficiently in the environment when the same for all rules of the game are lacking. Decision taking in the format of narrow situation unions is practiced instead of multilateral diplomacy, most universally embodied in the United Nations. Then the rest of the states are offered to join the agreed upon decisions that are presented as the positions of the whole global community. Here are enough examples from the recent times, and I hope that we'll speak about that. We think that such an approach undermines the UN Charter and is not in conformity with the ideals of real multilaterality, shared by the overwhelming majority of member states of the global organization.

All these aspects can't fail to be reflected on the economy. On the one hand, we are seeing that after the long stagnation period, the world economy demonstrated signs of revival according to the results of 2018. There are positive trends witnessed in this field for the first time in several recent years. According to the World Bank, global GDP growth rates amounted to about 3.7% in 2018 (this is the best indicator since 2011). However, we can say at the same time that crisis phenomena development risks are still present, and now the growing tension in trade relations is singled out among the key, global challenges and threats. It has become evident that the debt model of economic growth has exhausted itself, and the existing global regulation mechanism is losing efficiency. Hence the trend's for protectionisms becoming more evident, one of its manifestations is politically motivated sanctions. Such limitation measures are unprofitable for neither of the sides, and the order founded on ill-considered use of such tools leads to new problems only. However, that does not help to solve the existing contradictions.

In our opinion there is another way for the world order evolution – formation of creative multipolarity, a more just and representative world order model, based on large-scale, non-confrontational and equal cooperation of states and their unions, with respect to cultural and civilization diversity of the today's world, observance of generally accepted principles and standards of international law by everyone as common rules of the game, and acknowledgement of the United Nations' role as the universal regulator for world politics.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, the Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation V. R. Medinsky sent his welcoming address to the Likhachov Scientific Conference. The Minister mentions that the Conference has become “a unique venue, where participants search for strategies and scenarios, providing joint dealing with global challenges”. Mr Medinsky says about Dmitry Likhachov's great role in culture of contemporary Russia, “His ideas of the basic importance of culture in the process of any nation's establishment stay urgent today as well.” He wishes us fruitful discussions and excellent results.

The Minister of Labour and Social Security of the Russian Federation M. A. Topilin also sent his welcoming address. He mentions in particular that “Social and labour relations are traditionally reviewed at the forum in the context of culture's development, and this approach allows to achieve scientific results important for practice”, he empha-

sizes the big role of the Conference for advancement of social and labour relations and wishes us all the best.

I invite a member of the Presidium of the RAS, academician Robert Iskandrovich Nigmatulin to take the floor.

R. I. NIGMATULIN: – The President of the RAS academician A. M. Sergeev greets participants of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference and says, “When there are tensions between countries, it is especially important for the voices of D. S. Likhachov’s comrades-in-arms to sound loudly and constructively, for their conclusions on culture as a sacred space forming individuals in the spirit of creation, co-creation, friendship and mutual respect, not to remain ‘a closed book’ but to be mastered by the global community. Slow and steady win the race, and you should keep putting one foot in front of the other.”

In contrast to the majority of people present here, I represent natural sciences. I should say that their role in the life of the society did not decrease in any way. This is related to development of new resources, environmental challenges, new technologies, population growth on the globe, etc. When I went to school in the 1950s, we were told at the geography lessons that the global population amounted to 2.5 billion people, and now it has reached 7.5 billion. More and more people want to drive cars, fly in planes, eat properly, these are normal needs. In that connection, problems originate, because it is necessary to harmonize the requirements, there should not be excessive resource spending. If an individual has a house, the area of which is 1,000 square meters, he spends resources excessively.

The role of social and humanitarian knowledge increased considerably, and that is brought about by various circumstances. When a country is strong, it can do whatever it likes, but besides strength, a nation should have compassion, striving for justice. Our government signed international agreements in the past, but some time passed after the Soviet Union disintegration, and now we understand and a lot was done unjustly, the world started infringing our interests and humanitarian ideas.

A few words about another challenge – global climate change. The average temperature on the planet increased by one degree over the recent one hundred years, it may be that in the nearest future it will increase by two degrees. This is a very small figure, but it is a strong blow on humans and our biological system, and it may have an impact on the bacterial and virus composition and bring about various problems. People study a possibility of pandemia that may eliminate the whole mankind. All that requires the most serious research. But I must say that currently the number of meteorological stations is decreasing, people and governments are saving money, and not only in Russia but in the United States as well. This is a global problem.

Currently, the solution of defense issues is more and more often reassigned to robots, automatic systems. And they have no humanitarian ideas because of that they can make mistakes – we view that as the most serious threat for our security. In that connection, it seems important for me to pay attention to significance of not as much education as enlightenment. I mean education not as preparation of an individual for labour activities, his qualifications and skills, but first of all humanitarian education: an individual should understand that we live in the world where we should be compassionate to each other.

One of the urgent problems of Russia is related to learning national languages in the republics. The State Duma adopted the law according to which it is supposed to learn them if there is a free will. This is a European norm: you learn if you want, you don’t learn if you don’t want. But in that connection there is a threat of national republics’ languages disappearance. It’s wrong to let matters drift in this situation. The role of education is not only in an individual learning what he/she wants but in the necessity to sometimes lead him/her to it. For example, there is the following principle in the United States: why should an individual be taught sines if he is going to be a taxi-driver? According to the Russian, Soviet philosophy, an individual should be made to study. In the Soviet times, when a schoolchild was a bad pupil, he had problems with parents, the Pioneer Organization, Komsomol (Young Communist League), etc. Education is extremely important, and here the role of the authorities should increase.

But the authorities are represented by officials, Party leaders, because of that people don’t trust them. Many research fellows think as follows: politics is a dirty business, they try to avoid politics. But in that case it will become even dirtier. Real scholars who dedicated their lives to science (and not those who got their doctor’s degrees from officials), who have been engaged in their studies from the time they were young, should go into power in certain circumstances, with certain talents and opportunities: global challenges are so important that dealing with them should not be entrusted to officials as well as settlement of military conflicts should not be entrusted to the military only.

It is possible to come to the conclusion from the above-said about the importance of education’s humanitarization, polylingualism and the idea that scholars should not avoid seeking official positions in the authorities, should not run away from this important and not very clean work.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, a welcoming address came from the St. Petersburg head Alexander Dmitrievich Beglov. Vice-Governor of St. Petersburg, well-known St. Petersburg scholar, Dr. Sc. (Sociology), Professor Vladimir Vladimirovich Kirillov is taking part in the Likhachov Scientific Conference.

V. V. KIRILLOV¹: – Dear participants of the plenary session, I’d like to welcome you in the most beautiful city of the world. I’d like to wish you to see the sights of our city, its culture and residents during the period of the Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Allow me to read the welcoming address from the acting Governor of St. Petersburg to participants, organizers

¹ Vice-Governor of St. Petersburg (since 2014), Dr. Sc. (Sociology), full state counselor 1st class of the Russian Federation. He served in the Soviet frontier guards under the State Security Committee of the USSR (KGB) from 1973 to 1991. Head of the administration and general services department, assistant to the Vyborg District administration head, Leningrad Region (1991–1993). First deputy administration head of the Vyborg District, Leningrad Region (1993–1994). Vyborg District administration head, Leningrad Region (1994–1996). Administration head of the Vyborg District municipal entity, Leningrad Region (1996–2000). First Vice-Governor of the Leningrad Region (2000–2007). Adviser to the Chairman of the Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Assembly of Member Nations of the Commonwealth of Independent States (2007–2008). Head of the Federal Service for Supervision of Natural Resources (2008–2014). He was awarded the Order of Honour, fourth-class Order of Merit for the Motherland, Order of Alexander Nevsky.

and guests of the 19th International Likhachov Scientific Conference:

“Dear friends! I’m happy to welcome participants, organizers and guests of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference!

Holding the large-scale humanitarian forum has become a good tradition in St. Petersburg where Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov – the outstanding scholar and educator – lived and worked. His brilliant ideas became a part of the global scientific heritage. They are still urgent today.

The topics of the Scientific Conference 2019 include the most important and pressing issues of our times that are exceptionally significant for the present and the future of Russia, the whole global community.

I’m sure that the forum will help to strengthen international humanitarian relations.

I wish all of you fruitful communications and most vivid impressions of our wonderful city! Acting Governor of St. Petersburg A. D. Beglov.”

There are many events taking place in the Northern capital during the period when the Likhachov Scientific Conference is held. On May 27, we’ll be celebrating the 316th anniversary of St. Petersburg. The gala concert of world opera stars *Classics in the Palace Square* was timed to coincide with this date and has become an acknowledged cultural event of Russian and global scales. Today, we are summing up the results of the contest for the best monument to writer Daniil Granin. I wish the Conference successful work. All the best to you!

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, a welcoming address came to us from the Director-General of UNESCO Mrs Azoulay. She assesses the role of the Likhachov Scientific Conference very highly and wishes us success. I should say that we have been getting welcoming addresses from UNESCO every year in the recent decade, that is the work of the Conference is noticeable from the perspective of this biggest UN organization in the field of culture.

And there is another welcoming address, which I’d like to mention especially. Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of our University and long-standing author of informative reports, reflecting the issues of relations between labour and capital in the global world, could not take part in the Conference for the first time in many years. Mikhail Viktorovich also presented his report for this Conference but he was a delegate to the Trade Unions Congress that took place these days, where he was triumphantly elected for the next term as the Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia.

I’ll quote some figures. There are 20 million people in the Russian trade unions, and they were represented at the Congress by 632 delegates. 610 of them, i. e. 96% of participants voted for the Chairman of our Board of Trustees. This is unbelievable rating, especially if we take into account that voting was by secret ballot. The Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia is not only the biggest non-governmental organization in the country but it is also very democratic, where they have fierce debates on all pressing matters.

And the trade union movement celebrates the anniversary of the fraternal for us higher educational establishment in Moscow – the Academy of Labour and Social Relations, and Mikhail Viktorovich was invited to participate in the

celebration. Because of that he could not take part in our work, so to say, in person but he sent his welcoming address that will be read by his deputy and the head of our University laboratory for analysis and forecasting social and labour conflicts of the respective Center attached to our University. Yevgeny Ivanovich, you are welcome.

Ye. I. MAKAROV¹: – Dear colleagues, welcome, all of you, to this 19th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. I’m sure that there will be fruitful discussions here, dedicated to urgent humanitarian issues and new ideas.

As Alexander Sergeyevich already said, another one, the 10th Congress of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia took place yesterday. No matter how amazing it may seem, but the main thoughts of the majority of speakers actually repeated the topic of the today’s Conference (and not only trade union activists from all over the country participated in the Congress, the President of the Russian Federation, Vice-Prime Minister, Chairman of the State Duma, ministers were also present there). They spoke about predictability and stability of Russian economy.

I’d like to start with the International Labour Organization. First, because it celebrates its 100th anniversary this year, second, because this is the only international organization among institutions, founded as a part of the United Nations, built on the principles of looking for compromises. No structures within the framework of the United Nations – neither the International Monetary Fund, nor UNESCO, nor any of all the rest 14 specialized global institutions – have a tripartite representation and a similar system of working out mutually acceptable solutions. This is very important because exactly the International Labour Organization, set up in 1919 because of the threat of a proletarian revolution in Europe, allowed to take humanity out of economic collapse and to the sustainable development road. However, it was interrupted during World War II but nevertheless exactly the economic policy worked out by looking for compromises allowed to soften to a large extent the consequences of both world wars. Predictability is possible exclusively when agreement is achieved by various parties fighting for their economic interests. Unfortunately, it’s impossible to otherwise build stable relations within the framework of the capitalist system today. Sure, each of the partners who assemble round the table for talks always has some “hidden stone”. That’s class struggle, strikes, revolutions (peaceful) in case of the working class. Employers always have an arsenal of means, with the help of which they can make employees do what the employer requires – lockouts, dismissals, employment of strikebreakers. The state has legislation and police with tear gas.

Disagreements requiring to compromise were not only the problem of 1919, it’s enough to see what takes place in Paris streets today in order to understand the urgency of

¹ Deputy Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia (since 2012), scientific advisor of the Center of Monitoring and Analysis of Social and Labor Disputes, SPbUHSS. Chairman of St. Petersburg and Leningrad Region Trade Union Federation (1991–2000). Deputy (2000–2004), Advisor (2004–2012) to the Plenipotentiary Envoy of the President of the Russian Federation in the Northwestern Federal District. Author of a number of publications on various trade union issues, topics of social and labor relations and conflicts, including: “Labor Relations and Labor Unions”, “Labor Conflicts: History, Theory and Methods of Monitoring”, and others. Full State Counselor, 2nd Class. Professor Emeritus of SPbUHSS.

the honest dialogue. Finding a mutually acceptable solution by real and not fictional participants of economic life is the only model that turned out viable and allowed to build the system of social partnership in Russia. We have social and labour conflicts like they do all over the world. There were over 980 large-scale conflicts fixed during nearly seven years I've been employed as the research supervisor of the Industrial Conflicts Monitoring Center (see the project's website industrialconflicts.ru). But this does not mean that they lead to economy's destruction – on the contrary, they are a way of dealing with difficulties in economic life, the indicator of searching and means to find mutually acceptable solutions. Sure, conflicts are inevitably related to losses, nevertheless they allow to solve difficult problems arising in various parts of our giant country and to solve in such a way as for enterprises and economy as a whole to move forward.

However, stability in economic life of any country depends not only on employees, employers and state authorities. Unfortunately, a lot of “garbage” is brought to “our shore” in the period of globalization, it comes from the so-called liberal brain centers, which all the time are trying to find out a way of dismantling the compromise search system, replacing these labour-consuming processes with simple forcing of the will of the strongest on others. This is done at various levels, sometimes by rather sophisticated methods. Today's global economic system turned into the field of dishonest rivalry and military and political pressure. This is not just my opinion – many delegates to the Congress of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia said that this fact worried them. We discussed that at the Congress, including with the President of our country, who understands the significance of social and labour relations and social partnership. He made several statements that are interesting to my mind. First, he said that persecution of trade union activists at enterprises, obstacles for setting up and activities of trade union organizations were the reasons for the prosecutor's office investigations. Yes, we have laws and regulations in our country, but unfortunately they are used rather selectively and are not always based on unconditional acknowledgement of the right to uniting in trade unions. The basis should be supported by the practice of exercising rights, and the President spoke about that. Second, the system of social partnership should be developed at all levels, in all subjects of the Russian Federation, independent of the administration head (governor) wishing it or not. We need the national system of looking for agreements and accord, at least in economic relations. And what is that but an attempt to make our economic world more predictable?

The Congress adopted the program “For Just Economy” that was presented at the meeting. In our opinion, it is the most important position today. We offer authorities in all sectors and at all levels, including the President of the country, to come back to the issue of correcting principles of natural persons' taxation. We think that the rich should pay for peace, and not 13%, like all the rest, but more depending on their incomes. Those whose incomes are below the subsistence level should be exempt from the income tax. Sure, V. V. Putin did not give the answer immediately but we know that when he returned to the Kremlin, he invited those on whom solution of these issues depends, to discuss the offers he heard at our Congress. I think that several the-

ses he presented at the Congress will be further developed in the form of assignments and orders from him.

Concluding my speech, I'd like to say the following. The Congress is not only an opportunity for delegates to tell about their concerns and claims born by their everyday activities in the regions, to colleagues. It is also a way and a necessity to count our numbers, to look in the eyes of trade union members and understand their main, deepest needs. So, it was said that there were just a little bit more than 20 mln members in the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia. There are 75 mln employable people in the Russian Federation, we represent about 30% of the employed. The surprising fact is that 30% of the 20 mln trade union members are young people below 35, and that is not the limit, young people are looking for ways to really participate in economic life. It was mentioned at the Congress that the demographic situation was unrestrainedly changing in Russia and trade unions are changing accordingly, as well as approaches to tasks and demands for activities.

I call upon everyone present in this hall to always carefully analyze their activities, weigh them from the perspective of adding stability to our society, making it more predictable. Pay more attention to young people, make way for them, share your experience with them. Only acting in such a way we'll be able to overcome all difficulties!

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, representatives of the highest juridical authority of Russia – the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation – have been taking part in the Likhachov Scientific Conference for a number of years. And this year several judges presented their reports. Now, I'd like to invite Gadis Abdullaevich Hajiyev, judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, Dr. Sc. (Law), Professor and Doctor honoris causa of our University, to take the floor.

G. A. HAJIYEV: – I am really speaking here on behalf of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, on behalf of the judges who presented their reports. Thus I am fulfilling the order given by the Chairman of the Constitutional Court Valery Dmitrievich Zorkin. I am sure that we'll hear new ideas today because synergy of various sciences, as they say, “hangs thick in the air”, and this is always very fruitful. I am sure that the colleagues present in this hall will pick up many new ideas while networking.

This week, a big international conference took place in the Constitutional Court as a part of the St. Petersburg International Legal Forum. 55 delegations took part in it, they represented the highest courts of various countries. The agenda was unusual and very interesting: constitutional identity, correlation of constitutions and universal approach to human rights. These issues were not discussed before though they have direct relation to the issues of world order, conflicts that take place today. It was surprising for me that the majority of speakers (with the Chairman of the Supreme Court of India, delegate from Pakistan and representatives of many other countries among them) adopted this agenda and spoke about inevitability of exactly this approach, when constitutional identity is taken into account.

Next day after this conference, Professor Zorkin delivered a public lecture. In my opinion, it was his best speech, in any case over the last 10 years. He presented a very interesting idea, in essence a new philosophical and legal com-

prehension of modern law – the idea of metamodernity. I think that his lecture can be viewed as a kind of contribution to the Likhachov Scientific Conference.

My recent visit to the Theatre of Europe in St. Petersburg to watch Lev Dodin's *Hamlet* served as the emotional impulse for my today's speech. The director staged Shakespeare but Saxo Grammaticus became one of the characters. This Danish historian and author of the 12–13th centuries as if takes part in writing the script for this performance. And we see on stage not only a reflecting young philosopher but first of all a murderer, who brought death to many people (and that really happened). And this individual says for some reason in the middle of the performance, "Violence ends in violence". Actually, this is the mystery: why does the individual, who committed the highest violence, speak about it as if comprehending the significance of his actions? That was the question I asked myself and it actually entailed some "non-theatrical" thoughts.

Why was the Monroe Doctrine of 1821, fairly progressive for that time, announcing the right of former colonies for self-protection, absolutely distorted by the end of the 19th century? Why did it turn into apotheosis of colonialism and colonial wars? These questions make one think: who is right in the eternal dispute that can be followed in the works by our well-known philosophers? Was Kant right with his eternal peace project, with idealism, hope for everything to turn out favourably and everyone starting to respect universal human rights? Or are the others right, more skeptical philosophers, who stick to a more realistic point of view that the universal approach to human rights is often used for destruction and can't be justified?

And the third approach is based on acknowledgement of cultural relativism, i. e. it is acknowledgement that it won't be possible to overcome cultural originality and uniqueness quickly, because of that it is required to be governed by the principle on which the Treaty of Westphalia was already based – the principle of restraining, keeping balance.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – On behalf of foreign diplomats working in Russia, the floor is given to the Ambassador of Iran to the Russian Federation Mr Mehdi Sanaei.

M. SANAËI: – Dear colleagues, it is a great honour for me to once again take part in the International Likhachov Scientific Conference. I'll try to present my theses in short. It has been possible to witness two main processes in the formation of the world order since the previous decade. The first is efforts directed to put an end of the Westphalian system of international relations. This system based on sovereign governments and official borders as well as the principle of noninterference by countries in internal affairs of each other, refusal from using force. The Post-Westphalian system is based on globalization, spreading the Western world ideas, including respect for human rights. The West is its main branch. The second process is formation of multilateralism and multipolarity, striving for partnership relations between all countries, continuation of the principles of the Westphalian system as well as respect to national sovereignty, inviolability of borders and regional security.

Taking these two processes into account, it has been possible to see the results of the said two processes mixing on regional and global scales since 2010 in the Middle East. Orientation to the West led to formation of the glob-

al environment, destruction of the state structures in Libya, Yemen and Syria and as a consequence to strengthening of non-governmental radical and terrorist organizations.

Such countries as Russia, Iran and Turkey took active part in the second process. The possibility to establish stability in Syria was provided with their help, terrorist groups were annihilated. This certifies that such serious problems can be solved.

Meanwhile, the role of the West in the world increases nowadays. This is certified by setting up the Eurasian Economic Union, Shanghai Cooperation Organization and other structures supporting this "Eastern flow". I am sure that the future of the world is multipolarity with the role of the East, especially Asia strengthening.

The relations of Iran and Russia and trilateral relations Russia–Iran–Turkey are very important. Iran is the state with a very long history and ancient culture. There was a time when it was the Persian civilization. Everyone knows such names as Omar Khayyam, Hafez, Saadi, Rumi, Ferdowsi. They were the symbols of inter-cultural relations. Modern Iran is also for cooperation. In 2001, we initiated the Dialogue of Civilizations forum, the United Nations adopted the resolution "World against Violence and Extremism" (WAVE), which was called for by the present President of Iran. However, there are countries that practice the sanction policy instead of dialogue. Everyday one can hear about sanctions imposed – either on China, or Turkey, or Russia. Sanctions have already become a popular tool and are already perceived nearly like a norm. We think that this is temporary, and dialogue will be a strategic line, this is multilateralism and the multipolar world. It just can't be otherwise.

Iran supports constructive cooperation but it, like any other country, protects its interests. Russian leaders said and not once that Iran played a big role in maintaining stability and peace in the Middle East, and it was impossible to ignore its interests. We'll continue cooperation with Russia, China, countries of the region in various focal areas.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, I give the floor to Mr Miguel Angel Moratinos to present his report. He is a permanent participant of our Conference, he was the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Spain for ten years, Doctor honoris causa of SPbUHSS. This year, he was appointed to one of the most important positions in the United Nations – the high representative of the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations, specially set up attached to the United Nations to strengthen the dialogue of civilizations. The United Nations is not just a diplomatic mechanism for cooperation of various countries but also a number of big institutions that are engaged in various focal areas: UNESCO deals with culture, the International Labour Organization deal with social and labour relations, etc.

M. Á. MORATINOS CUYAUBE: – It is my pleasure to be back again in St. Petersburg, at this 19th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, in this University, my University. As my dear friend, Rector Alexander Zapesotsky mentioned, I had the honour, the privilege to be awarded a *honoris causa* doctorate of our University.

I'm participating in this Conference for the eighth time. But this time my participation is special. This time I came in my new capacity as the High Representative of the Uni-

ted Nations Alliance of Civilization (UNAOC). For me this means a lot. It means that I can address my students, my dear students, with the message from the United Nations, I can address this multilateral forum. Had there been no such forum, we'd have to create it. And I came to you not only to thank Director Alexander Zapesotsky and the Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergey Lavrov, but to present my thinking, my thought to all of you.

We know that we are living in an era of transition with deep changes, profound mutation, and we are trying to shape the future. We know that we are abandoning the world of yesterday and we are constructing the world of tomorrow, but we still don't know what we are. There is a world full of opportunities and I normally try to qualify this world. Last year, I qualified it as a global complex uncertain world. We have to identify how we can move forward in order to achieve our main dreams for the future. Yes, my dear students, my dear friends, we are in the global world of connectivity, interdependence. What's more, the world is small: any event, any development happening in Latin America, in Asia, in Africa and Europe, affects all of us. Nobody can stop this globalisation process.

The world is complex. Now, remember the way President Clinton was elected and the phrase from his election campaign, "It's the economy, stupid". But we cannot say that economy is stupid. Is politics stupid, or is the technological revolution stupid, or is science stupid, or is climate change stupid? No, my dear friends. We need all these elements to understand the complexity of the world, and even more because it's not only the nation-states, not only the local municipalities in the civil sector, in the civil society, in the private sector. So, we all have this common responsibility. So, my dear friends, how are we going to address this challenge of today and tomorrow? There are only two ways. One way is some of us, people trying to maintain the traditional way to approach the global challenge. So, that is the so-called balance of power, generic ambitions. Or it is the way of the United Nations and others, and I think the majority of all of us here have to work with this concept that we call multilateralism.

As a true advocate of the value we call multilateralism, I believe that we need a new form of cooperation with other international and regional organizations. I will call it an inclusive multilateralism. We need the UN at its centre but with close links with the civil society, with religious leaders, with women, academia, and you! The youth, the young people, who are fresh with new ideas and want to form the mindset, where multilateralism is inclusive and will trickle down to the masses. With these complex global challenges our world is facing today, the particular threats are global terrorism and violent extremism. I cannot think of any other way to deal with the challenges other than global responses that have in their core an inclusive multilateralism. Let me just briefly touch upon the work of the United Nations Alliance of Civilization in this context.

The United Nations Alliance of Civilization remains an ardent defender of inclusiveness and efficient multilateralism through the promotion of intercultural and interfaith dialogue. Our mantra is very easy: "One humanity. Many cultures". We have to recognize that there is pluralism of civilizations. Each and every one of them has contributed to enriching our common and single humanity. There is unity and riches in our diversity. Allow me to refer here to the

founder of the United Nations; the late Dag Hammarskjöld, whose wisdom and vision still inspire all of us until today. He firmly believed in the riches that diversity brings to our world. When he was asked what his favourite book was, he said *Don Quixote* by Cervantes. If you ask me what my favourite is, I would say Tolstoy, *War and Peace*, so suddenly this spirit is missing today. Instead we are witnessing the rhetoric, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism and discrimination spreading like wildfire across the Dark Web.

There are different, often competing, conceptions of human fraternity in contemporary political philosophy. In short, human fraternity is about recognizing each other as equals, by appealing to our shared humanity. I must add that human fraternity is genuine with its emanation of respect of the others. Yet in all corners of the world we saw erosion of these universal values and growing social and cultural divides. And this is quite ironical because one would have expected today in this multiclade, multipolar, multicultural, multi-ethnic world that multilateralism will prevail and people will be more cosmopolitan.

Instead, my dear friends, what do we see? Terrorism, ethnic violence, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, hate speech and ultra-nationalism are in full swing. Atrocity crimes continue to show the conscience of humanity. New Zealand, Sri Lanka, Yazidi and the plight of Rohingya Muslims in Myanmar. Religious and ethnic minorities are still among the world's most vulnerable groups, particularly in conflict situations. And there is little doubt that women and girls throughout the world continue to suffer, simply because of their gender. That cannot continue like that.

Excellencies, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, the challenges represent a stark reality. They are testing the resilience of local communities that undermine the trust in our institutions. Today, however, we have an opportunity to demonstrate our shared responsibility and practical commitment to reclaim the notion of universal fraternity at the bedrock of international cooperation.

Allow me to touch on a few pragmatic approaches to the paradigm of moving forward. First, the United Nations Alliance of Civilization, the organization I have started to lead three months ago, remains an ardent defender of inclusiveness and efficient multilateralism. Second, global citizenship, inclusive citizenship, when individuals enjoy equal opportunities and rights, whatever their gender, religion or ethnic background, it is a key enabler of peaceful coexistence, but inclusive citizenship alone is not a panacea. Ethnic and religious minorities in all regions continue to face discrimination and threats, whether in the form of violent extremist attack or because of exclusionary policy promoted by ultra-nationalist groups. With our classical conception of citizenship, we should seek to establish a culture of peace from early age, when people of different identities, faith and culture are identified as global citizens. I truly believe that global citizenship education is the best vehicle to instil these values. My dear friends, who have come here to the International Academic Scientific Conference, I'm confident that our solidarity will help to facilitate a common understanding and social cohesion. We will offer this stimulus for some future generations to avoid barbarity and fear of terrorism.

Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, we are all united by common bonds, our culture is woven together in a shared heritage, but for universal fraternity to flourish, a basic level

of freedom, equality and political inclusion should exist in every society. Turning this vision into reality requires acting upon and accepting some responsibilities and principles, requires broader, deeper, stronger partnership and cooperation of all people and nations. Rest assured that the United Nation Alliance of Civilization remains committed to fostering the principles of our collective quest for justice, dignity and peace.

Let me propose the Alliance decalogue of human fraternity. Number one: Respect for all nations and peoples, regardless of their creed, culture and civilization. Number two: Dialogue as an essential tool for engaging in a better understanding of different cultures and perspectives. Number three: Tolerance as a basis of respect for every person's human dignity and fundamental rights with full appreciation of the rich diversity of our world's culture and civilization. Number four: Empathy as an ethical virtue to build bridges of mutual understanding and cooperation in our quest for universal acceptance and peaceful coexistence. Number five: Inclusion as a process that promotes the full and equal rights of individuals and groups to participate in their society regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation and gender identity, or disability status. Number six: Diversity as a positive and enriching concept; a just imperative, inseparable from respect for human dignity. Number seven: Solidarity as a commitment to help others in difficult situations in the spirit of mutual assistance and concern. Number eight: Dignity and equal rights of all members of the human family as interdependent and mutually reinforcing and forming the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world. Number nine: Multiculturalism as a process of expressing diversity in the age of globalization and not simply an attitude or view of others. Number ten: Convivencia – a Spanish word that means living together as a sacred duty and attitude to peaceful coexistence. That is the catalogue, decalogue that I want to share with you in order to create the atmosphere for commitment of all of us to creation of a better future. Thank you very much.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to our foreign participant. Professor Dutkiewicz, you are welcome.

P. DUTKIEWICZ: – Good afternoon, dear colleagues. The train has run off the track but the engine-drives goes on driving it. And the train continues its running though not along the track, and it is unclear in which direction. This metaphor reflects the state of affairs in our state, and it can be applied to many other states, regions, international institutions and corporations. Interesting processes began in this train. First, the public divided into first class and second class, and the minority moved to the engine, closer to the engine-driver. And the majority (those who did not have enough resources) found themselves in the last cars and they have no idea what will happen to them tomorrow. There is no contact between the first and the second.

However, though there are no rails, the wheels somehow adjust (and that's surprising), and the train goes on running. But the engine-drives asks himself the question: where to go if there is no road? Fear settles in his heart because he does not know in which direction the train will go, and how he, the engine-driver, will control it. And at that time people in the last cars start worrying, understanding that the engine-driver does not know where he goes. And

what is more, they stopped trusting his assistants as well. The situation becomes really dangerous. The engine-driver takes the train in the unknown direction, his assistants are saying that everything is fine, but the passengers know definitely that this is not true.

The engine-driver has two feeling. I have already told about the first one – it is fear, the second is the wish to do something for everyone to feel stability and assuredness in the future. How can he achieve this? Two ways come to his mind: material resources and immaterial measures. Material resources are money and other resources, but it's somewhat more difficult with immaterial measures. The task is to word the "right" agenda that would convince everyone that the way is right, and thus legitimize the engine-driver's actions. There is another solution as well: to strengthen institutions. These three strategies are the basis for creation of new hegemony. The aim is to direct the train along the right track without the risk to go off the rails and at the same time legitimize inequality between passengers.

It's not known how long it may go on. But no one thinks that it is required to be tolerant and respect each other. And this is right because the time of survival has come. And there are hundreds of such trains that have gone off the track. Different trains will go in different directions, and we have to survive in this turbulence. If passengers in the last cars are unhappy, they may be allowed to address with the offers where to go, but not very insistently because the engine-driver does not like revolutionary actions and will resist decisively, giving respective orders to his assistants. The period of instability, which we are entering, will last for some time. Sooner or later the situation should be relatively balanced, at the same time each "train" will create small and big hegemonies for itself, that in the end will agree on the new order, in which all of us will live. In any case, the young people are sure to enjoy a new world order in future but at first they will have to travel with crazy engine-drivers.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to one of the most outstanding philosophers in the world Abdusalam Abdulkirimovich Guseynov.

A. A. GUSEYNOV: – Dear colleagues, I'd like to draw your attention to the fact that the Likhachov Scientific Conference has been dedicated to one and the same topic for the third year in a row (with small modifications) – the future. What does it mean? One can certainly think that in this case we are speaking about the aspiration to dig into an exceptionally complex problem more deeply and comprehensively. However, I am afraid that the reason of our concentration, not to say fixation on the future is different: the future has become a soft spot of the modern public consciousness and humanitarian knowledge, the source of pain for the social organism, which we feel but the nature of which we can't understand. We are speaking about plans in this or that sector, develop various kinds of strategies, national projects, the idea of a roadmap has become habitual, even fashionable in the practice of governance, in short, we are trying to look into the future, orientating on our activities in time. The question arises: do we speak about the future in all such cases?

First of all, it is required to make the notion of the future as such more specific. Everything that will take place in an

hour, in a year, in 10 years and in indefinitely far-off time is referred to the future from the grammatical point of view. How far should we look forward in order to speak about the future as a special aspect of human cognition and practice? Does the problem come down to quantitative indicators? We should precisely separate the future as the aspect of physical time that includes everything, which will take place after a certain moment, indicated as the present by us, and the future in the information and content aspect, to wit, what the social system of the society will be, how it will change in comparison with what it is at the moment, from which we are counting. The idea of the social future is not just what will take place after, no matter what this “after” is, but it is always different. It is one thing how much time elapsed after some moment (for example, after 1991, and that means just physical activities that we can estimate and calculate precisely), and it’s another thing how the world changed, what events took place in it during that time (for example, I was young, I became old, there was one country, now we have another).

Special importance of the notion of the future in contemporary individuals’ worldview is determined by its being connected with the movement forward, ideas of progress, qualitative improvement of life. The future for us is the brighter and better space, non-existent happy country, utopia as it was called by Thomas More. The future exactly in this understanding has become one of the most important worldview ideas and social behavioral motives that determined historical consciousness, within the framework of which the new European civilization was formed. Transfer from the feudal and class society, monarchical system and half-educated state of the society to democratic way of life, nation-states, enlightenment of people took place under the banner of historical optimism. Belief in the mind, the power of science and technology moved people and nations forward. The modern capitalist civilization, no matter how we call it – the post industrial society, the knowledge society, information society, etc. – was formed exactly as the society that carried in itself new opportunities and values. And everything was wonderful while they spoke about creation, building capitalism as such, its inspiring slogans and advantages in comparison with the Middle Ages. But when they started speaking about the fate of capitalism itself, the situation changed. The question arose: is this the “final stop” or will there be some other life arrangement after capitalism, better than this one, requiring refusal from this civilization in its essential foundations? Two lines, two understandings of life originated then, which we know as socialism and capitalism. The argument between them was about preservation of development opportunities of the modern civilization based on capitalism, these opportunities being infinite, or their being historically exhausted at present and the communist system coming to replace it.

We know that capitalism won in this epochal opposition, and its main trophy as Alexander Alexandrovich Zinovyev was right to mention imaginatively, was the future. The bourgeois civilization as if became its owner, and now this civilization is no longer interested in the future – as improved, bright and qualitatively different. This civilization is fairly satisfied with itself, it looks calmly at its tomorrow as nothing threatens it there. Capitalism won in the Cold War and now it determines its future itself, and it seems guaranteed to it. Our colleague Professor Piotr Dut-

kiewicz used the metaphor: the train has run off the track. The problem may turn out worse than we think, and the matter is not that the train was torn off, or the engine-driver is taking it in the wrong direction, or there is no engine-driver at all in this train. It just runs along the track. Do you remember the song we had? Our train, fly forward, the stop is in the commune. Our civilization train has no stop where it plans to stop. Really, what do we want from the future, do we see something qualitatively different in it in comparison with what we are having today? Seriously, no; really we see the same present in the future, only a little improved. The public conscience both in Russia and other countries, both at the everyday level and the level of philosophical projects is characterized by its having no future, it has after but no other. In that championship, in which various countries, states, nations take part, not the social projects of the future are at stake but they have various cultural and civilization identities there at stake. We are speaking about geopolitics, that is about self-determination in space but not in time, and when we are speaking about the future, we mean it in the physical sense (what will happen after) and we think of it as some “cleaned” present. The future is reduced to prolongation of the present, only in more decent forms: the poor will be there (it’s impossible without them!) but there should not be homeless and starving; we’ll base on strength (what else?) but it would be nice to avoid a nuclear war, if it starts nevertheless, we should win it, etc.

The predominant public sentiments are characterized by the loss of historical optimism in what refers to the social future. The very idea of social progress is questioned. This surely does not mean that people refuse from hopes. They are just looking for other ways to satisfy their belief in the better and to the extent of social opportunities, they turn their eyes not so much to the future as the past. As Zygmunt Bauman writes, fixing the epochal change of the social sentiments vector, retrotopia comes to replace utopia (he titled his book *Retrotopia*, it was published in 2017 and recently translated into Russian).

Disillusionment in the social future, meaning impossibility to build the ideal society, refusal from social utopias, obligates to determine the future with more certainty as a subject of social cognition. In that connection I’d like to draw your attention to two important aspects. First. The future is impossible to cognize in the sense of our using the notions of “knowledge”, “cognition” – as something scientifically authoritative and true. It is impossible because the future is not a reality that exists in some far-off perspective. It is impossible to see like we can see things located at a long distance from us, if we are armed with various kinds of devices. The social future does not exist in the conceptual (empirical) meaning, it exists only like a dream, hopes, ideals. This is what should be built as a result of our activities that itself will enter the future as its essential element. The second aspect, generating and justifying disillusionment in the progressive view of the future is related to it as a rule being the converted form of ideology. The future was considered such a challenging task, ambitious goal, for which inadmissible things and unjustified sacrifices were allowed. Appealing to the future for happiness of the next generations was the most typical argument to justify violence and wars. It was considered a normal state of things when in the name of the future, that is for the sake of the future it was justified to do something which is unacceptable as such.

Both mentioned aspects certify that the social future is not only a philosophical and historical problem referring to epoch-making events and movements of big masses of people but at the same time it is a moral issue, included in the structure of individual responsibility of individuals.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, I present the chief editor of the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (Literary Newspaper) Maxim Zamshev to you.

M. A. ZAMSHEV¹: – Good afternoon, dear friends! It's wonderful that the Likhachov Scientific Conference is dedicated to such an urgent topic as global crisis of international institutions. It's clear that this crisis did not begin today, but now we are witnessing its perceptible and very serious consequences as we did not notice its beginning in due time. Probably, it was difficult to imagine hostilities and armed operations in the Donbass even five years ago, and an unruly terrorist civilization-state appearing in the center of Eurasia, and many other things. That is, we see the consequence but what are the reasons?

One of the key factors of this crisis is destruction of the system of international obligations undertaken after World War II. At that time, no matter how hostile politicians were to one another, it was still evident that peace was the main value. The system of restraining and not increasing threats became the priority of global politics. But after several decades, the Western politicians, who remembered the horrors of war, are no longer on the international scene. The world started disintegrating, computer technologies appeared, including various games. And alas, the generation of political amateurs is coming into power now, for whom war is no more than a computer shooting game, an entertainment. Probably, many people paid attention to others often watching military conflicts as if football matches and even supporting one of the parties. This is an awful moral catastrophe. At the same time, international institutions, in particular the United Nations, can have just a little impact on what is going on. And I am not even saying about the dictate of Anglo-Saxon countries evident everywhere. All that is very serious.

The second, no less important aspect (Alexander Sergeyevich spoke about that) is modern media. Why? The matter is that the news topic, which is the easiest to monetize, is enmity. For example, if some Western politician says, "Russia is our enemy", he will be momentarily quoted by all mass media. If there is an event related to cultural exchange, no media will respond. It is not interesting to them, such pieces of news are not so popular and they are of no use from the financial perspective. And the statistics of website visits, likes and other nonsense is important for them, and all that has no relation to the real state of affairs. And it may come up to someone making a careless political gesture – and nuclear weapons will get in terrorists' hands. And then our humanitarian conferences and fierce discussions will have no sense at all.

¹ Editor-in-chief of the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* (Moscow). Poet, novelist, literary critic. Author of 10 poetry books and 4 prose books, more than a thousand publications in different genres in Russia and abroad. Poems were published in "Literaturnaya Gazeta", "Nezavisimaya Gazeta", in magazines "Moscow", "Neva", "Ural" and other circulation editions. Translates from Romanian and Serbian. Member of the Presidential Council for Civil Society and Human Rights. Member of the Supervisory Board of the literary prize "Lyceum" for young writers and poets. Deputy Chairman of the Board of the Moscow City Organization of the Union of Writers of Russia.

In this environment, one naturally addresses the authority of academician Likhachov, who always repeated that culture was primary. It is so important that it can't be let at the mercy of any market. Meanwhile, market relations got into culture all over the world, hence all that media products for the mind-numbed public with low tastes. The Ministry of Culture has also become "marketable". Two billion rubles were invested into the Russian Seasons in Japan – this amount, for example, would be enough for two hundred years of work of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, which I head.

It's evident that one of the humanitarian problems of the today's world is states' assessing each other by nuclear power, the army strength and the like and not according to their cultural potential. I think that each of the countries should again learn how to perceive others not like enemies with cannons but like culture, in which there are wonderful writers, artists, scholars, musicians.

I think that this crisis will be quietly "dissipating". In any case, I'd like that very much and I hope that not only we want it.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I invite our guest from the United States. Professor Galbraith, you are welcome.

J. K. GALBRAITH: – Thank you very much, it's a great pleasure to be here. The last two or three speakers prefigured what I have to say very exactly. The comment about how the future is framed by ideology is an excellent introduction to a remark I make in my paper, which is that, for the West at least, the idea of economic development originated as an ideological response of the West to the conditions in the second half of the Twentieth Century, specifically to the decolonisation of what formerly were Western colonies, and the threat, or the promise of the alternative model presented by the Soviet Union.

This was explicitly the case in work in the United States – Walt Rostow, Simon Kuznets and more subtly in that of Albert Hirschman. The model that was aspired to was not free market capitalism at that time, but something that was better described as countervailing power, social democracy. The welfare state. A system of mutual benefit and organised progress allied to large private enterprise, small businesses as well, but dominated by great industrial firms. Thus the key, in some deep sense, to effective development, in both theory and in practice, was not education alone, valuable though that is, was certainly not just the progress of science and technology, but far more it was the system of regulation, it was the question of how you play the game. A shared order would come to govern just about everything, from public health and worker safety to the reliability of products and their increasing complexity, to the structure of wages, to the overall performance of the economy, and to the condition of the natural environment. How you play the game and how effectively you organise the rules and enforce them was the sum and substance of economic development.

About 40 years ago, this broke down in theory. It never broke down in practice. And those countries that continued to follow that model, articulated, I think, most effectively, I have to say, by my father, Germany, Japan, the Republic of Korea, and, most recently, on a gigantic scale, the People's Republic of China, are the ones that we regard as hav-

ing had the greatest sustained success. But in the area that I come from, sometimes called the Anglosphere, an alternative ideology came to dominate: self-regulation, dominance of finance and then, as a result of technical developments, technology came to permit and to foster cognitive silo-ing – what you might call stove-piping – or a system of separated cognitive zones with different communities holding different conceptions of what are the facts about different issues, situations and contexts.

My friend the ambassador from Iran, this morning, made, I think, a very valuable distinction between an interpenetrated world in which we all have access to each other's cognitive zones, whether we accept them or not, and a multilateral world in which communities are well organised with their own belief systems and value systems. And reference was also made to the superior stability of the Westphalian system which was epitomised in the Cold War by the separation of the world into two distinct, offsetting, if you like, countervailing blocs.

But there is a deeper issue which I just mentioned, I'll develop it just briefly, which is, what do we believe to be the facts? Which of the cognitive zones should we accept and how can we come to accept them? The contest cannot be resolved by a commitment to pluralism and mutual respect, valuable though those are. And so – and this is my concluding point – there is a role here, an important role, for independent thought and work. For scholarly scientific and forensic research. For the patient evaluation of evidence according to the standards that were set hundreds of years ago in the Age of Reason. A community dedicated to this goal exists. It lies in part in great universities such as this one, and it is to these institutions that we must look for assistance, perhaps ultimately for salvation in these extraordinarily difficult times. And that is very much, I think, the spirit that was bequeathed here by Dimitri Likhachev, and I must say I am very proud to be associated with it. Thank you very much.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to the Director of the Institute for African Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, member of the Presidium of the RAS Irina Olegovna Abramova.

I. O. ABRAMOVA: – Dear colleagues, I'll dwell in short on the issues that, to my mind, deserve discussing. First. The current situation reminds of the state of affairs in Europe before World War I. They struggled then for re-division of resources and markets, and the main contradictions were between the United Kingdom and Germany. Now, we have a different principal contradiction – between the basis and superstructure. Global economy shifts from the North to the South and from the West to the East more and more, but all political institutions are in the hands of the Western community. This generates those contradictions and conflicts, which we are witnessing now.

However, in contrast to the early 20th century, we have such important tools like nuclear weapons, which to a certain extent play the role of a restraining factor, and information technologies that allow us to transfer struggle from the material sphere to the ideological one. Today, there is struggle for new resources and markets, but absolutely new means are used. Direct military confrontation is not always required, it is often enough to manipulate with public con-

sciousness, brainwashing – and you'll achieve your aims, at the same time preserving your state and avoiding the threat of a nuclear war. In this connection, the attention, including of big players, is transferred to the so-called periphery or outlying regions, where interests clash as well. These regions are not only the objects of international relations – they turn into subjects more and more.

We should not forget about the African continent either – the only territory on the globe, except Russia, where resources have not been fully developed and divided. Currently, there is very fierce struggle going on for this continent, and it's very important for the Russian Federation not to miss its chance there. This October, the first full-scale Russian-African summit will take place, where over forty leaders of African states will meet with the President of our country.

Second. The norms and rules of the game that are still preserved by the West force on us certain stereotypes related to the consumer society. Our ideals are shifting to the material sphere to a considerable extent. Technological progress helps that as well. Meanwhile, the understanding of life meaning and ideas of happiness may be different. Do you know which nations think of themselves as the happiest according to the World Happiness Index? African. Those, whose material well-being is much lower than in economically developed countries. So, can it be that the meaning of our life is not reduced to consumption exclusively? Can it be that the main role is played by other purposes, ideas, ideals?

Finally, the third thesis. The humanitarian component of our development is very important in connection with what I said here. And the fact that we assembled in the humanitarian university today is rather symbolic. Culture may play a very big role in the future life, it has a potential for that.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I ask Consul General of the Republic of France in St. Petersburg Mr Hugo de Chavagnac to take the floor at the International Likhachev Scientific Conference.

H. de CHAVAGNAC¹: – Thank you very much for the very great honour of speaking in front of this assembly today on such an interesting subject for a diplomat. I have chosen to speak to you about something which is connected to what, in particular, Mr Amr Moussa said during the panel this morning which is on the role of international organisations and I have chosen to title my intervention “Are international organisations still useful?” because provocative questions are more likely to be listened to a bit.

So, I wish to reassure you immediately that there will not be much suspense. Yes, I believe very much that in-

¹ Consul General of France in St. Petersburg (since 2017). Worked in the Ministry of International Cooperation and Development of the French Republic (Paris, 1987–1992), European Commission (1992–1995), Direction of Economical and Financial Affairs of the Ministry of International Affairs (Paris, 1995–1998), as a Second Councilor in the Embassy of France in Russia (Moscow, 1998–2001), in the Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations (Brussels, 2001–2005), as a Counsellor to the President of Romania on European issues (Bucharest, 2005–2007), in the General Secretariat of “Livre Blanc” Commission on foreign and European policy of France (2007–2008), as a Director of international and European affairs in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France (Paris, 2009–2010), Councilor on cooperation and culture and Director of the Institute of France in Russia (Moscow, 2010–2013), in the Direction of enterprise and international economy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France (Paris, 2014–2016).

international organisations are still useful and actually there cannot be very much doubt about it. Why the question actually? The question because international organisations are quite young compared to nation states; the first ones have been born at the end of the 19th, early 20th century, and most of them appeared after the end of the Second World War; as a result for many of them of the Second World War, the New World Order which appeared at that period, and they have grown steadily. And in the nineties after the end of the Cold War there was a sort of hope that humankind could organise itself around a new sort of agreed order where things would be nice, and everybody would stick to a sort of international agenda and the international organisations would play a much, much greater role in particular for world security. And there is no doubt that since the year 2000 many of these hopes have, if not faded, they have suddenly diminished.

And that strong criticism has been addressed to international organisations and I would like to comment that there are two types of criticism against international organisations. One of them is certainly well intended. It's a criticism about efficiency. Are they efficient or not? It's a question of money but not that much actually, they are not very expensive especially compared to the budgets of big nation states. Actually, they are very cheap. You could consider that the main reason of criticism is not the money they cost, the main reason is that there are expectations from them and there is a feeling that they are not often fulfilled. I would say that this kind of criticism is absolutely legitimate and there is every reason to try to improve the efficiency of international organisations. But there is also a second type of criticism which comes, I would say, with much less "good intentions" and which is really dangerous. And this criticism is in the name of sovereignty, and of course sovereignty is supposed to be something wonderful, but sovereignty is quite often a pretext to refuse whatever is not pleasant for your own country or good for your interests and if everybody invokes sovereignty on every subject of course there will be no agreement, no agreement about anything. And so, it's a result of nationalism but it's a result of nationalism of which the consequence is unilateralism. And of course right now one country, I won't name the country because I am a diplomat but if I say the leading power in the world, perhaps I will be understood, – one country is showing such strong doubts about the usefulness of international organisations that you can worry very much considering it has had the foremost role in establishing these organisations and you can demonstrate that they have been quite advantageous to that country.

So, very briefly I'll go to the conclusion. I was going to say that there are a very big number of organisations, and you should not reduce to the Security council because maybe it's the one we speak about in the media, but actually there are many, many other organisations which are probably much more important and they are in particular all the organisations which deal with global problems: global health, global environment and so on. They are absolutely key for the future of mankind and these are areas where, without agreement between all countries in the world, without shared commitments, shared actions, there are absolutely no common solutions, which are critical for the future of mankind. Then there is the problem of security and crisis management. There is indeed a bigger difficulty in that area, the difficulty

is not a difficulty of the organisations themselves, it is a difficulty about the problem of countries around the world, and especially big powers, to be able to find grounds for agreement. This has certainly diminished over the last years. It is a very worrying tendency and it should be so for everyone. But nobody should consider that this is the responsibility of just one side or one country. If we want the situation to improve everybody has to take its share so that the situation can indeed improve. Thank you very much.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – And now I invite to speak the outstanding scholar and lawyer, academician Andrey Genadyevich Lisitsyn-Svetlanov.

A. G. LISITSYN-SVETLANOV: – Dear colleagues, some speeches referring to assessment of contemporary international relations, which we listened to here, brought to my mind some historical parallels related to the necessity for the leading states of the world to coordinate the new legal system.

Now, we are in the situation when it is necessary to think what our future can be. Let's remember Yalta of 1944 (the world-famous photo of the three leaders), where three very different leaders of three very different states, with very different future met during the going on war. One of them represented the renewed and very changed empire that was to become "the Great Power". The second represented "the empire on which the sun never sets". The third represented the country that not long before that had overcome enormous corruption and economic depression, besides had small experience in global politics but became not only "the Great Power" but also the only leading economy of the world for many years.

They had the task in front of them: to determine what to do next after fifty million people died. The construction of the after-war world order, creation of new international law began in Yalta.

It was not created at once. I'll give two examples to illustrate this historical process. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted only in 1948. It is the basic document of that period. But what was the political map of that time? Many colonies, territories under control. If we assess the realities of that time objectively, the Declaration refers only to those countries that worked it out, it seems that the rest of the global population was not taken into account. And the regime in the United States still had imprints of racial segregation.

In 1970, the main principles of international law were worded and acknowledged as imperative. Considerable time was required to work them out, already in the Cold War environment. And again this law was created mostly by the Soviet Union, Europe and the United States, i. e. the countries that are close civilizationally, at least in their legal systems dimension.

Currently, the world map, both political and legal, is absolutely different. It includes not just a wider set of countries but also the variety of their essential dimensions. I am speaking about states also representing ancient civilizations, different from the "Euro-American" civilization.

The today's crisis in international relations and international law is incomparable with a war tragedy. But what can new international law be, when it should be created by so different in their traditions states?

The task is not to just listen to one another but hear one another. Especially as the Western model does not work in the new leading countries. It is possible to see some successful elements of it but on the whole it is completely different, and that's the most serious problem for working out a new, sustainable legal system that won't be eternal but should give the world assuredness in the future for a certain historical period.

The second problem of the future legal system's formation is related to development of humanity as such and the new stage of its technical views and ideas development. Its new habitat is cyberspace. This space principally differs from the model existing now from the perspective of its legal regulation.

Until recently, any national legal system could be called "the right of the stretched arm" – the sovereign's arm acting within his borders. Originally law was territorial, and coordination of wills of sovereigns made creation of international law possible. But now we have cyberspace. It is not linked to state borders. There is not only information in it but there are also legally significant actions taking place in it, public opinion is formed there, finally, market is formed as the economic basis for existence of civilization space. And this space originated not on the basis of sovereignty but as an "extraterritorial phenomenon". The sovereign's arm has become short.

What will the philosophy of the new law be? How will it interact with the existing law acting in real space? Technical views and ideas are outrunning social views and ideas. Because of that I call upon everyone to think, put forward ideas – think how to build legal relation in the new world.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I invite our guest from New Delhi, research fellow at the Indian Council of World Affairs Mrs Talukdar to take the floor.

I. TALUKDAR: – The topic of the discussion has been on a New World Order and the problems related to it. When the Cold War ended, it was assumed that bipolarity ended, which was a positive news for the world. It brought in a so-called new atmosphere where the developing countries such as India and China also started to progress, creating a positive environment. A new kind of a world order i.e. multipolar world order was in the making. However, this concept of a multipolar world order is not new, because even in the imperial times there was a framework of multipolarity though there is difference between the imperial one and the 21st Century one. During the imperial times, the multipolarity was not based on mutual cooperation or coordination amongst each other nor was for mutual benefit. It was more of exceptionalism and expansion. It seems that there is more cooperation in this 21st century multipolar world order, however the direction to which it is heading doesn't seem like that because of the complexities. Question arises on the genesis behind these complexities that are evolving from this multipolar world order. The answer lies behind the remnants of the bipolarity which the world had witnessed during the Soviet Union time. The problems between Russia and the United States is still present in the current times. The ripple effect of this conflict of interest between these two ex-superpowers, whether directly or indirectly, can still be seen in the aspects of the international relations. For instance, the problems faced

in Latin America to an extent reflect the remnants of the problems of Russia and the United States (in an indirect manner). In the Middle East, there is either proxy or hybrid or asymmetry wars, where there is either direct (Syria or Iran) or indirect involvement of Russia and the United States, making things complicated in the region. Even in the Eastern European countries, there is the impact of this complexity of Russia and the United States.

There are other issues which might create another form of complexity in the world order. The rise of China to an extent. Most of the countries, including the United States, do not see Beijing's rise from a positive and constructive angle. India is concerned about its hegemonic tendencies which gets reflected in Beijing's policies be it at regional (South China Sea) or global (Belt and Road Initiative) level. The BRI initiative was projected in a positive manner and suggestions were made on the positive outcome from joining it. A Pakistani diplomat mentioned during the Likhachov Conference that those countries which are apprehensive (indirectly meant India as New Delhi has raised objections to it) about the BRI should not be and rather should join it. India has not signed up to the initiative as parts of one key project, the US\$ 57 billion China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC), runs through Pakistan-administered Kashmir, which comes under India's territorial sovereignty. The question which every country needs to ask itself before justifying projects like BRI and CPEC running through India is whether they will allow something similar to happen in their own territories if a particular country has territorial issue with the one who is initiating any mega projects like this. India-China and India-Pakistan has territorial issues which remains tensed and unresolved. Hence, multipolarity which promises positive outcomes have not been able to deliver them and in the near future the success rate remains doubtful because of the complexities shared between established powers, rising powers, middle and small powers. Apart from the complexities in the traditional realm of international relations, the non-traditional problems such as global climate change, terrorism, radicalisation, xenophobia and other manmade issues which are causing threat to humankind also create complexities in the multipolar world order. It does not seem that countries are serious in tackling these challenges. It is evident from the policies, both internal and external, that governments undertake. Though governments talk about these matters but their actions do not match. To take serious steps in handling these traditional and non-traditional issues, the countries will have to make major compromises in their policies which might be counter-effect to their respective national interests. Hence, there will be difficulty in making multipolarity work. With the "swing state" approach and rise in exceptionalism, multipolarity in truest sense becomes a far-fetched dream. The world is talking about US President Donald Trump's "America first" policy, however, this exceptionalism has been present in every country since a long time ago, including India. The only difference is that President Trump has been using the term "America first" openly. A strong global citizenship and the focus on humanity are the key drivers to make multipolarity work in a positive manner. Through a strong philosophy of humanity where countries can transcend differences amongst each other, when there is absolute and genuine tolerance, dignity and respect of each and every life, including culture, civilization, race, gender, reli-

gion and orientation etc., only then there can be a solution. Basing on the philosophy of humanity will be important. It is because culture and civilization though can bring countries together however at the same time has the seed of discontentment. The aspect of superiority that is present in every religion, culture and civilization sometimes can deter the harmonious growth amongst countries. The interlinkage between the traditional and non-traditional security aspects, including culture and civilization, makes the creation of a multipolar world order complicated. Through the focus on global citizenship and philosophy of humanity based on genuine dialogue and respecting every life can lead to a stable, prosperous and harmonious multipolar world order.

V. A. CHERESHNEV: – The floor is given to corresponding member of the RAS, Director of the Institute of Europe of the RAS Alexey Anatolyevich Gromyko.

AI. A. GROMYKO: – I'd like to mention that those speaking today in this hall are between the two fires, or between the devil and the deep sea: Areopagus is on the left, Veche (popular assembly in ancient Russia) is on the right. That is, all principles – both authoritarian and democratic – accelerate thinking processes and hearts beat quicker. I'd also like to have time to say something important.

This year, we are celebrating the 110th anniversary of the famous diplomat of the 20th century Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko. He had his favourite book in his childhood, it was titled *Pictorial Astronomy*. When already 65 years passed since the time he had read it – I think, some time in the middle of the 1920s – he addressed the Lenin Library asking to find this book. The librarians found out that it had been published several times and asked, “How is it possible to determine which edition you are looking for?” Andrey Andreevich had not seen this book for sixty-five years but he said, “The first caption under the star map of the sky is as follows, ‘Our Earth is striving for an unknown goal on the wings of time’.” It seems to me that this is a suitable epithet for our world – both in the early twentieth century and the early twenty-first century: the Earth is flying very quickly, time advances with gigantic strides. But for what purpose? Where are all of us flying?

They say that there are three periods in life: youth, middle age and the years when you look great. There is a feeling that everyone thinks conversely in our mature world: that he looks bad and there is no ray of hope. Really, there are reasons for that. Social inequality intensifies – both in the world as a whole and in certain countries, including all most developed countries. The number of trouble spots increases. Presumption of innocence in international relations has been practically forgotten and thrown away outside the ideas of justice. Arms race is accelerating and not only somewhere far from us – in Asia or Latin America – but in Europe as well. Strategic stability disappears gradually: the famous Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Short-Range Missiles terminates this year on August 2, the United States are withdrawing from it. And the President of Iran announced on May 8 that his country temporarily stopped fulfilling a part of obligations under the so-called Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action on Iran's Nuclear Program – and again as a result of the United States withdrawing from this most important international agreement.

But the situation is never only black or only white. What is not bad and inspiring in the current situation? First, it was already said today that global GDP is higher than ever in the ten recent years. Besides, the large-scale war in Syria abated, migration to Europe considerably diminished, the scenario for regime change in Venezuela was not brought into life, the Mueller's report in the United States struck a smashing blow on the “troll factory”, anti-American part of the establishment in this country, Poroshenko is no longer the President of the Ukraine, etc. That is the balance is maintained. The world will never be black and white.

In conclusion I'd like to say: how do you think, what will save the world? Common sense, rationality, some miracle? It seems to me that the world will be saved by the three words. They sound as follows in English: “yellow”, “blue” “bus”. And if a foreigner says these three world quickly, he can declare his love to a woman if she is Russian: “yellow-bluebus” sounds like “I love you” in Russian. The world will be saved by love.

V. A. CHERESHNEV: – I invite foreign member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Petr Petrovich Tolochko to the microphone.

P. P. TOLOCHKO: – Dear Alexander Sergeevich, the Presidium, dear colleagues, I'd like to present my three thoughts.

First. I liked the crazy engine-driver allegory, presented by Professor Dutkiewicz, very much. The following is important: the trouble of the crazy engine-driver is not only his not knowing where to go but also his trying to destroy everything that could show him the way. The world can't live without agreements and contracts. And today the system of such agreements is being destroyed by this crazy engine-driver. Piotr Dutkiewicz did not say who that engine-driver was though he lives not far from him. And I can say that this is the United States. The world should not acknowledge the United States exclusiveness and selectness – a crazy engine-driver should not rule the world. I think that this is the primary task of the global community.

Second. It seems to me that the West – I mean the collective West – has absolutely no moral right to demonize Russia, announce that it is an aggressor. Let's refer to history. Two world wars came to Russia from Europe. Enlightened countries preyed upon Russia in Vladivostok, in the Black Sea, in the North in the seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth years of the twentieth century. Napoleon and the Crimean War came to Russia in the nineteenth century. If we look in the earlier times, Swedish King Charles XII also entered the territory of Russia. Because of that the West has no right to force on the idea of confrontation. It will gain nothing from it, besides, it is simply unjust.

Third. It seems to me that the world should get used to the environment, in which a global cataclysm is possible soon. The United States announced their right to use nuclear weapons preventively. And other countries are silent – but they should not be silent. It seems to me that international organizations, about which our colleague from France spoke, are necessary for the world to become at least a little better – such as the World Peace Council. Great people, including Frédéric Joliot-Curie and Pablo Neruda, were its members. There were moral authorities in various countries, to whom the heads of states orientated. Besides,

there was the Non-Aligned Movement, its participants were a kind of counterweight, a moral arbiter between the power poles. All that is destroyed now.

Abdusalam Abdulkerimovich said that we did not know what the world of the future should be. I am not a philosopher, I am more pragmatic. It seems to me that the world of the future should be a little better than today's world. And if we make some world order institutions, which stopped their functioning and were forgotten, to start working again, it will be better.

V. A. CHERESHNEV: – The floor is given to foreign member of the RAS Askar Akayevich Akayev.

A. A. AKAYEV: – Dear colleagues, I want to draw your attention to the topic of our plenary session: “Global Development: Challenges of Predictability and Manageability”. The statement that the future of the society is unpredictable and consequently unmanageable has widely spread in the recent decade, starting from the world financial crisis of 2008–2009.

On the one hand, the reason for that is really deepening, widening chaotization of the today's world that is in civilization crisis. I am not speaking only about the economic crisis of 2009. The world is in the crucial, life-changing period when the fourth generation of local civilizations with the leading or even domineering Western civilizations changes. The fifth generation of local civilizations with the leading Eastern civilizations is also changing – first of all, Chinese, Indian, Eurasian with Russia at the head, etc. That is, we are in global civilization crisis.

On the other hand, the statement about development's unpredictability is spread to a large extent in order for international and national research institutions to somehow justify their helplessness. They turned out incapable of predicting either the financial and economic upheaval of 2009, or the global civilization crisis, in which the world is today. So, the development's unpredictability thesis is spread to justify billions of dollars spent on working out long-term forecasts, none of which came true. It is also necessary to camouflage strategic helplessness of authorities that did not manage to find ways to transfer to progressive future on national and global levels.

Because of that it should be said directly that the thesis about unpredictability, unmanageability of the society's future development is not only erroneous but also extremely harmful. It throws the progressive part of humanity off their guard, people who should fight for directing global development in the positive direction today because the world can start developing in the negative direction – and exactly that is taking place now.

Today, Alexander Sergeevich asked the outstanding scholars about the condition of the world. The question can be answered in short: the world is in the state of chaos. Yes, we lived in the environment of the Yalta world order for 70 years, and it provided considerable progress and flourishing of humanity. It was especially noticeable in the 1960s and the 1970s. The habitual for us world started breaking in the 1990s, after the USSR disintegration and disintegration of the socialist system. Today, it is in a chaotic state when there is already transfer to the new order going on.

At the same time, I'd like to mention the following. For some reason everyone says that the character of chaos is ex-

clusively degradational, they speak about chaos negatively. Really, chaos is very useful. The great Russian scholar, chemist, Noble Prize winner Ilya Prigogine developed the theory of chaos and demonstrated that any new order was born out of the old one or in place of the old one only via chaos. Exactly chaos brings the world to the bifurcation point when the direction is chosen. The unstable society is receptive for innovations, including managerial.

I come to the conclusion from the above-said. There are representatives of many branches of knowledge present here today: social sciences, natural sciences and others. Robert Iskandrovich was right to mention that we should all together, working on the inter-branch basis, develop the approach for political leaders, governments to learn governing the world in unstable environment. Then we will quietly transfer to the new world order that was foreseen by outstanding minds. It can be characterized as follows: integral humanistic noospheric social system.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I invite the Dean of the Higher School (Department) of Television of Lomonosov Moscow State University Vitaly Tovievich Tretyakov to take the floor.

V. T. TRETYAKOV: – Nevertheless, the future exists and it is predictable – I'll demonstrate it now. The buzzer will sound in five minutes, and I'll have to go down from the stand. And someone can make an effort and willfully press the buzzer earlier or just drive me away from the stand. That is, I can leave either in five minutes or earlier. So, the future is variable. This is important for what I want to say.

It turns out that myths and religion are more intelligent than science. The ancient people foretold everything, the Greeks had their Golden Age when the myth system was developed but it was quickly left behind. The Bronze Age followed it. And actually the time when mythology was fixed is already the Iron Age with its disgusting wars and other things. And the Paradise in Christianity is also left behind – and the one in heaven may not come. That is, not everything in our science and especially social science is right.

It's necessary to review the role of scholars in the life of the country. For example, in disintegration of the Soviet Union. Actually, all minds, from physicists to lyrists, were for restructuring and openness. Where was their insight, where was their far-sightedness? Now, they suffer that everything has been destroyed or disintegrated, including their dear Academy of Sciences. Though I'll mention that I am for setting up a new Scientific Party in the country instead of all existing now, but that is a separate topic.

We are lucky that Europe and the United States do not foresee now what is to happen in the world. It's clear that the United States as the dictator want to preserve the world we have now, and Europe has just gone crazy and does not understand that it is driving in exactly that train that is rushing into the abyss. European countries see danger in other things, and that is certified by the present struggle for the European Parliament, for fractions to win. Or take the Manifesto of thirty top intellectuals: the European house is on fire, etc. All that will not help European countries to keep the future in their hands.

By the way, there is no past in some sense either. Because if the state of affairs develops further as it devel-

ops now, our past will be annihilated, crossed off from our minds, the minds of our children, books, libraries. Everything will be confiscated, everything will be destroyed. There will be no victory in the Great Patriotic War and nothing at all of what you know. So, the time is an interesting category.

What exactly do European countries not take into account? Every 50–75 years the system of international relations changes radically. This is easy to follow if we look at the well-known to us events from the past. The recent 75-year period, from 1945, will end next year. It's evident that everything is changing. And the whole system of international institutions will be restructured, no matter how you stick to it. Consequently, in order to govern the future, it is required to create our own, advantageous for us new system. An international organization, in which you are not the leader is not required – otherwise someone else will be the leader, someone who will make you live according to his rules. Imagine what the Russia's position could be now had the Soviet Union not become a permanent member of the Security Council with the veto power. And there are two hundred countries there and as if democracy. Consequently it is required to take some actions already now. I am not saying that it is required to destroy the United Nations because this organization does not manage to perform its direct obligations. But it has just become outdated.

So, those who want to be in the future and govern it, lead and not be subordinate, have to prepare. It is required to build alternative international organizations – first of all, the new United Nations. How? I have a detailed plan. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs can contact me, I'll present everything to them if they do not know themselves how it is necessary to act.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I invite Grzegorz Kolodko to the microphone.

G. W. KOLODKO: – Our future belongs to us. But before we get there, we have to climb up the hill. It is hardly predictable; it is hardly manageable, so we have to look at the way of governing the global affairs and the globalisation. To govern, not to manage, not to control, but to shape to the extent driven by our culture and our interests. Because the world is being driven by ideas and interests. And it is surprising to many of us, definitely to me as the economist with some interdisciplinary inclinations, that so many decisions, including economic fields, are being taken because of ideas, not because of economic common sense. And that is causing a lot of irrationality in the contemporary world.

But first things first, when we are talking about the future, I think we have to revisit the question of globalisation. My train of thought tells me that globalisation, which I do define as the historical and spontaneous process of liberalisation and integration of, thus far to the extent, separately performing national economies into one interconnected, intertwined worldwide global economy, is an irreversible process.

But I'm here for the fifth time thanks to the generosity of Professor Zapesotsky and his great university. And I may say that each year that I come here the situation gets worse. Not here in St. Petersburg, I think it's better, not here

in Russia, slightly, but it is improving, but definitely, year after year the situation is worse in the world, including the lack of progress of globalisation. And I am contradicting myself not at all. I'm taking the longshot when I'm talking about the irreversibility of globalisation because of the ideas and interests which are shaping contemporary civilization or civilizations. And not only because of the supply chain, because of the power of transnational globalisation, but because, what we have heard already here, there is economic nonsense that makes any kind of wish for reverse globalisation.

But sometimes we do have nonsensical policies starting this time, another surprise, from the United States, which claims they were the leaders of the free world until recently, and now the biggest power behind the continuation of globalisation is China, a so-called communist country, they say win-win globalisation, so I'm warning ourselves that a win-win from a Chinese perspective may happen to be a two-zero for China, that it's not the future we are looking for. But globalisation is irreversible because of the power of economic gains from interconnected global affairs because of culture and also because of generational change. I'm taking a look for the future through the prism of values, institutions and policies. Upon how we measure depends where we are going. And I think that what we can contribute to, we cannot do that much. We can make another conference in St. Petersburg or in San Francisco, in Johannesburg or Rio de Janeiro saying what you are saying, and it won't change the world. But the intellectuals should change the definition of the aim of economic, of socio-economic activity, because how we measure depends where we are going, and definitely the future is not about more and faster, but much more about getting more balance – not only in economic, but also in social, on the one hand, and ecological, on the other hand, development as I am suggesting in new pragmatism. The nationalism, which is very much against globalisation, the new nationalism is the wrong answer for the failure of neoliberalism which was preying on globalisation which was not inclusive.

So now I have two enemies, I have the enemy of neoliberalism which is enriching the few at the cost of many and I have the enemy in the form of new nationalism, but the enemy of my enemy is not my friend. So, now the question is how to fight these two friends looking forward into the future. But this problem, we do have the solution, and for that reason I'm taking a look, with a kind of confidence, and one more time, as I said five minutes ago, the future belongs to us. The only difficult thing is to govern irreversible globalisation in a sensible, rational way. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I invite Hans Köchler, Ph. D., President of the International Progress Organization from Vienna to the microphone.

H. KÖCHLER: – Rector Zapesotsky, ladies and gentlemen! I have contributed a paper on the problems of world order and the issues of predictability. As time does not allow going into the details, I'll share with you the conclusions. In my assessment, the imperial project of the so-called liberal world order has failed. What we witness now are the rear-guard battles of the empire, so to speak. In the last 20 years, this has meant unilateral uses of force in an increasingly

multipolar framework. The problem is that the United Nations Organization – which has been referred to here repeatedly – is not well equipped to deal with these situations, and is not really able to maintain or restore international peace and security. In the available time, I shall give just one or two specific reasons why this is the case. The details are often overlooked. As the dictum goes, the devil is in the detail – and in this case, the devil is in the wording of the United Nations Charter.

I agree with Amr Moussa that by far the most important institution of the UN is the Security Council – because it is the body that decides on the preservation or restoration of peace between nations. The problem is that the statute (the UN Charter) is drafted in such a way that the Council is paralysed if one of the great powers – or, in the present constellation, the hegemonial power in particular – does not play by the rules. Why is that so?

The facts are simple. One just has to look at the wording of Article 27, Paragraph 3, of the Charter. The problem is not at all a lack of specific rules of international law. They are all there: There is the prohibition of the international use of force, clearly and unambiguously written into the Charter. There is the prohibition of interference into the internal affairs of states, and there is also laid out in the Charter the clear and full authority of the Security Council to deal with any violation of these rules, namely, to impose sanctions and also to order or authorise the use of force against an aggressor state. The problem is not in the *rules*. The problems lie in the *procedures*, spelled out in Paragraph 3 of Article 27. The Council adopts its decisions by a minimum of 9 out of 15 votes – which is fair and slightly more than the absolute majority. However, that same provision further states that any decision requires the concurring votes of the permanent members. This is the veto of the five powers of 1945. The text then continues that this procedure is valid “provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI... a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.” At first sight, this sounds fair and reasonable. If I am involved in a dispute with someone else, I cannot be judge in my own cause. That’s quite clear and a natural principle of justice. What is often overlooked, however, is that the Charter refers here only to Chapter VI that regulates the peaceful settlement of disputes. The binding decisions of the Security Council on war and peace, namely on sanctions and the use of force against an aggressor state, are not decisions on the basis of Chapter VI, however. This chapter merely deals with *recommendations* for peaceful settlement, which have no legal consequence. The legally binding decisions are those adopted on the basis of Chapter VII, for which the obligation of a party to abstain from voting does not apply. The provision of Article 27 means, in actual fact, that an aggressor state is not obliged to abstain from voting if that state attacks or invades another country. It is exactly for that reason that the Security Council will be paralysed in most matters of coercive action to maintain or restore peace – unless one removes those few words (“in decisions under Chapter VI”) from the wording of Article 27. To omit this phrase would be a rather simple, straightforward step by the international community. Of course, it would require the consent of all five permanent members, which is highly unlikely to occur. Should such a move on the basis of the present Charter ever be taken, it might at least have a kind of civilizing effect, even on the

major global player, because no country is happy about being condemned by the world body. That’s the point I wanted to make.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I invite the outstanding lawyer, attorney at law, legal expert Henry Markovich Reznik, Doctor honoris causa of our University, to take the floor.

H. M. REZNIK: – Alexander Sergeyevich was a brilliant and artistic moderator. He said directly, “to stir up the speakers” – and he managed with this task wonderfully. Look how elevated the speakers are. What categories sounded from this rostrum! Happiness, the meaning of life, saving. On the whole, it’s our way to fly, to dream. And I’ll be carried away a little together with the rest.

I’d like to share my ideas of humans. I strongly doubt that God created us in His image and likeness. Man is an aggressive, cruel, evil, envious, lazy creature. Besides, there is no prohibition for him to kill representatives of his species. Look how humanity lived till the middle of the previous century: it waged wars all the time, killing other men.

But humans have a creative potential – and happily for us people invented a nuclear bomb. Only thanks to it we live without wars now. Because another great achievement of ours – humanitarian culture – though it works, is a too light barrier when great-power ambitions, first of all national, come to the fore. Because of that when Alexander Sergeyevich gave us the shivers today, I did not feel fear. I think it was done for the debate, and really there is no need to save anyone.

Our world has always been imperfect – and it stays imperfect. But as we are having a scientific conference here, I’d like to draw your attention to the following. Science in general appears when certain governing laws are fixed. It is easy to establish them in the physical world. But we have a humanitarian conference, mostly economists and legal experts are assembled here today. Let’s put law aside for some time and review economy as an example. Is economics a science at all? The question is very important because everything reviewed in it is the consequence of human choice. Actually, some idea that later captures the masses, originally comes to a certain individual’s head. Collective on the whole is incapable of any creativity. That is, there was a time when some advanced individual appeared, he went down from a tree, then the second followed his example, the third, the fourth, the fifth, etc. It’s the same with economy. Some choice is made at a certain stage and later, if we remember the terms introduced by Marx, social relations originate, and new and new generations join them. How do you think, should these social relations be taken into account? For example, Hitler was a great admirer of Schopenhauer. At the same time, exactly economy was the basis of Hitler’s regime collapse – as well as the Soviet totalitarian regime because the economic model no longer functioned.

And the last thing I’d like to say. What is the function of scholars, our function? We should fix some governing laws and make forecasts and advise politicians basing on forecasts. In conclusion, I’d like to read the verses by a great poet. The most horrifying thing that threatens us is ideologists and fanatics coming to power. We have already seen ideocratic systems leading to great sorrows. Because of that we should make the authorities doubt all the time.

Be afraid of those with the iron spirit,
 Who put an obstacle for doubts,
 In whose heart the fear to see abyss
 Is stronger than the fear of stepping into it.
 Sorrowful experience is nothing for them.
 Their slogan is "Belief is like granite!"
 Such a person will drown the whole world in blood
 In order to preserve the wholeness.

Now, we have to stop especially idealistic politicians looking into the mists of time, at sacred values. They want to stop humanity's development that naturally goes along the globalization way.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to Valery Alexandrovich Chereshev, Academician of the RAS.

V. A. CHERESHNEV: – We have already heard the terms of "instability" and "unpredictability", we listened to the related to them academic discussion of futurologists about the existence of universal laws in general that may forecast the future of humanity. Ilya Prigogine's book *Order out of Chaos. Man's New Dialogue with Nature*, which he wrote in the 1990s together with his colleague Isabelle Stengers, was already mentioned today. This work created quite an uproar at one time.

When we start comparing something in science – for example, the natural and the social – we always act basing on the principle of analogue. That is, phenomena are described in such a way as to provide complete conformity with one another, exactly, to a T. At the same time an important principle is forgotten – the principle of irreversibility about which Prigogine wrote exactly. He writes that the principle of irreversibility is the main law on which traditions are based, and which allows to transfer chaos into order at all levels. Prigogine also says that order appearing out of chaos is a paradox. But the future is completely made of paradoxes.

The main paradox is that the future only seems inaccessible, incomprehensible, unpredictable. However, it is possible to foresee the general direction as our previous experience tells us. Plans, forecasts, etc. are built on that. Sure, forecasts do not always coincide with the reality but the general dynamics becomes clear on their basis. Besides, it is important to take into account that the future includes both the past and the present – and that refers to individuals, countries and civilizations. You will obligatory have to pay in the future for everything. As M. M. Zhvanetsky says, "we always have bright future and unpredictable past." This is really so but we know where we are approximately going and for what we are developing. Because of that all environmental bombs from the present and the past will definitely have their consequences in the future – Fukushima and Chernobyl nuclear disasters, many wrong governmental decisions and many other things. There is no avoiding the consequences. Understanding that we can say: yes, it's difficult to foresee, but the knowledge of predetermination based on the principle of irreversibility allows to bravely fight against instability and pave the way to long-term strategies, thanks to which prospects of normal life are opened up for millions of people.

And the future runs through human life practically from the first minutes. Here is a paradoxical phenomenon: a newborn baby eats for the first time when brought to his/her

mother. However, the baby will drink mother's milk at once but will spit out three drops of warm, sweet physiological (saline) solution. How does the baby know what to expect? But the food analyzer is already tuned to milk. Here it is, the future: the baby has just been born but already knows what can be eaten.

Sure, it is easier to forecast in science than in other fields of activities. Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov said about that as the general cultural governing law and gave the following example. It is impossible to foretell a genius work of art but it is possible to foretell a genius discovery in science. Why? Because discoveries are made in the environment of a certain level of science and technology development, and for this reason they are often made simultaneously in different countries by different scholars. Because of that forecasts can be various. For example, Yasunori Nomura, the leading futurologist of the United States from San Francisco says that analysis of radiation coming to the Earth certifies that there are many intelligent civilizations, and in the next 30–50 years we'll see what intelligent species exist besides us. The time will show if that is the case or not.

I am concluding my speech with the forecast by the outstanding scholar Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadsky. He wrote in the 1920s that the technosphere created over the 200 preceding years would be definitely replaced by the noosphere – intelligent thinking. We should not only understand it but create as well, act practically for the Earth to become intelligent, warm, bright – like Vernadsky predicted. It can't be achieved without the efforts of the whole world.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to foreign member of the RAS, outstanding Italian philosopher Mr Agazzi.

E. AGAZZI: – Mr Rector I am particularly honoured to be here for the second time and I am actually an admirer of Russian culture. I have read many works of your literature, I am fond of your music, I admire your philosophy, I know your scientists, and I am especially honoured to be a member of the Russian Academy of Science. This is the reason why, when I am here, I am impressed by the exceptional intellectual level of our conferences. I have been the President of the International Institute of Philosophy and of the International Federation of Philosophical Societies, but I can tell you very honestly, that the atmosphere, the intellectual level of the debates here are absolutely exceptional.

Therefore, it is a particular satisfaction for me to say two words about the extremely complicated issue which is under our scrutiny. How can we predict and manage the future? Why is this a question? The future is the only time we have at our disposal. Because the past is over, the present is going away quickly. So, the only time at our disposal is future. This explains why from time immemorial human beings have made efforts to know the future. The oracles, the fortune tellers, and many other people were believed to be able to predict the future, so it's very spontaneous to cultivate such a concern also today. But how can we hope to predict the future if we go out of this mythical perspective? Only if we believe that there is something different from a purely mystic force driving human fates, cosmic events and so on. This is the idea which is born with modern science in the 16th century, with Galileo, Newton and many other scholars. And what was the application of this idea?

The construction of *machines*. In a machine nothing is mysterious. You can tell how a machine will function and why it will function like that before constructing the machine.

This is actually a wonderful model and if you start thinking according to this model you try to be able to uncover, for example, the “mechanisms” of the market, the “mechanism” of the political decisions, the “mechanism” of psychological life, and so on, in order to be able to predict the future and to manage the future. You see how powerful is the idea of deterministic trends which are supposed to allow us to predict the future. But, unfortunately, this idea doesn’t work. Why? Because in this approach one ignores completely the *complexity* of the structure, the *interactions* between its constituent parts. So, even if we have to do with deterministic trends which interact (such as in the early studied elementary case of the gravitational force) we are already confronted with what is known as non-linearity (that is strictly related with the notion of complexity). To express the idea of non-linearity in a few simple words, we can use the idea of prediction that can be intuitively rendered by the image of a trajectory drawn on a sheet of paper: if we fix a point of the curb corresponding to the state of affairs of the complex system at an initial time t_0 , we can find on the curb a point “predicting” what will be the state of the system at a successive time t_n and if the point on the curb has been fixed with an order of precision ϵ , also the point at time t_n will be determined with the same order of precision. This is the sense of linearity. In the case of complex systems, however, this is no longer the case. Small differences in the determination of the state of the system remaining inside the order of precision ϵ can give rise to very divergent trajectories such that, after a short time interval, their values become divergent and we could not predict what will be the state of our system at time t_n .

What can we do in such situations? We have no maps for the territory of the future, that would consist in the existence of reliable trajectories. And if we have no maps can we try nevertheless to uncover the future? Yes, to a certain extent, in case we have at our disposal a compass. A compass means a means for *orientation*. So, in order to drive the progress, we must have ideas, goals, values. This is the reason why we cannot rely on science and technology for a better future unless we have a deep analysis of values, ideas, hopes and we engage for the realisation of all these.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I invite Alexander Mikhaylovich Kramarenko to take the floor.

A. M. KRAMARENKO: – There is some advantage in my taking the floor after such attention-getting speeches, and related to various fields of science. In my turn, I’d like to say that the best way to find out what will definitely not take place is to forecast the future based on what we already know. The foreign policy analysis I have been engaged in for a long time, unexpectedly brought me to post-modernist philosophy – really, at the suggestion of my daughter who read a lot of absurdists and started buying all postmodernists. Then I really started understanding at least what was happening to the world in recent 30 years.

First, I agree with the postmodernists’ opinion that we are living not in the present time. That is, we still have to acquire the present. We live in the shadow of the Cold War that is already over, its politics, institutions, etc., and that

casts a shadow as well as it is cast by the future before it comes as Akhmatova wrote. I also agree with what Jean Baudrillard says about reversibility of things as well as the existence of the object’s irony and fatal strategies that lead to trite strategies.

I’d like to say the following in this connection. Struggling against totality, which is the central topic of post-modernist philosophy, is very convincing. It’s required to leave the back worlds, Nietzsche with his “God is dead”, all fantastic ideologies starting from Martin Luther – because we know what that Protestant Revolution, which became the mother of all revolutions, turned into. We are finishing the Protestant period, and two Protestant cultures – Anglo-Saxon and German – turned out to be the reason of intra-West bipolarity. In its time it led to World War I, the rest was already the function of this event, including the Russian Revolution, Cold War and everything we are living through now.

It really seems to me that before acquiring the future, it is necessary to acquire the present, and to overcome the past for that, but we have not still managed to do that to the end in 30 years. It was easier in Russia because we just collapsed, and we had no choice. The collective West is another matter: they had the intellectual choice that they could not make. Because all the reasons of the systemic crisis of the Western society we are witnessing now – financialization of economy, elimination or erosion of the middle class – were laid already in the early 1970s. The Vietnam War, liquidation of the gold standard, deregulation of the financial sector took place exactly at that period. The language issue arises here as well, with all those euphemisms. Heidegger wrote that there was pre-understanding in the language, but when euphemisms started accumulating, hiding the essence of what took place, we found ourselves in a very drastic situation.

I am sure that now it is necessary to dismantle any ideology because it is always connected with fanaticism, aspiration to live not for oneself and not now but in the name of some fascinating idea. We can put an end to even liberal ideology because in essence it has turned into something totalitarian and the reasons for that are political correctness, strangulation of the freedom of speech via control over traditional mass media.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to Jan Aart Scholte.

J. A. SCHOLTE: – *Dobry Dzen*. Thank you very much for having me. My remarks concern legitimacy in global governance as a basis for manageable global development. I am first going to say why legitimacy in global governance is important. Then I will say something about the institutional, the individual, and the world order bases for getting legitimacy in global governance. And then you will tell me that it is an impossible project, which is fine!

We have heard a lot at this conference that we live in a global world and face problems of global scale. We do indeed have global problems: climate change, other ecological problems, financial markets, trade networks, internet, migration, peacebuilding. And think of the technological developments of the future: artificial intelligence, geoen지니어ing, nanotechnology, genetic modification. We need global cooperation and global governance to deal with these

issues. In a global world, we need governance that is in some measure global, too. We need to have planetary-scale governing of problems that are common to the planet.

But as of today we do not have very much global governance. The United Nations has been mentioned at various times today. Yet the staff of the United Nations, the core staff of the United Nations, do you know how big it is? Smaller than the New York Fire Department. And the size of the core budget of the United Nations? The same as the capital of the country where I live, that is, the city of Stockholm. So we do not have enough capacity for effective global governance. How can we get enough resources? One big boost could come from legitimacy in global governance.

“Legitimacy” in global governance means that people believe in the regime. Legitimacy means that people perceive that a regime is exercising its authority in an appropriate way. We don’t have that belief very strongly today. We need that belief if we are going to deal with these global problems. Expand the resources of global governance, expand the decisions of global governance, expand the compliance with global governance, expand the problem-solving capacities of global governance.

But how do we get there, to greater legitimacy for global governance? It is a far longer story than I can relate in my few minutes here. In a word, I think we need institutional changes, we need individual changes, and we need world order changes. *Institutional* changes mean we get better procedures and get better performance in global governance organizations: they need to be more fair, more democratic, more effective. *Individual* changes mean that people begin to see that their interests are served in global governing, that they identify more with a global world and its global-scale problems. In fact, studies show that – contrary to what you might expect – people today actually have as much trust in global institutions as in national government. So, there are bases to get going on that. In addition, we need *societal* changes: for example, a more fair distribution of power and resources in world order. People will not buy into global governing that is unfair. Societal changes can also involve about new ways of dealing with cultural diversity.

In summary: for more legitimacy in global governance we need institutional changes, individual changes, and world order changes. We need all three. It is a tall order. You may even tell me it is impossible to achieve. However, our global problems are extremely difficult and urgent. If we do not get started now on moving to more legitimate global governance, we may be sorry later. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I invite the General Manager of Banque “Eric Sturdza SA” Bruno Desgardins from Switzerland to take the floor.

B. DESGARDINS: – Globalisation, according to me, it’s cooperation on one side, but it’s mainly competition on the other side, and so the world is much more complicated. In 1935 there were 45 states in the world. Now it’s 198, and over the last 20 years we have seen 30,000 new frontiers in the world, so competition is there. I would like to take one example with China and China with the rest of the world. I have done a long paper on that, but just to summarise a few points.

First of all, it is a huge success, then I think it is not an example and then I would like to elaborate a little on the

Silk Road, just to offer a different view from what we have heard this morning. China is a huge success. Since the year China entered the WTO, the GDP of China was multiplied by 12. Nowadays, the GDP of China is 15 (one five) percent of the world, as compared to 2% in 2001. Huge success if you compare with BRIC, the 3 other countries; Russia, India and Brazil. The total for them is 8% of the world GDP. Huge success, but is it an example? I don’t think so. Why? China has built very strong capabilities in many sectors with public companies which are not always competitive, and they can’t afford it. And nowadays China, just in a few years, becomes a world leader in many sectors: traditional technology like iron and steel with more than 50% of production, coal industry with more than 50% of world production, but also in new technology like the solar industry or the wind industry, where we can see that 5 of the 10 leaders in the world are Chinese. And I can take many examples of that. But today the problem is that we have too many capacities. Too many capacities because over the last 10 years economic growth in China was financed by debt. \$1 of GDP nowadays requests \$4–5 of additional debt. And so, when China is investing such a huge amount every year, they are increasing over capacity in local sectors like real estate, but also in global capacity in the world, which is creating deflation pressure all over the world, and this is a problem.

I would like to continue with the Silk Road – a fantastic project. More than 100 countries, 4 billion people now concerned. It has been set up in 2013 and with the prospect to spend 1 trillion USD, 1,000 billion USD. If I want to compare with the Marshall plan in 1947, it was 13 (one three) billion USD which means 130 billion USD of today. So, you see the difference. The problem is that it’s very attractive and you have heard this morning some friends who were quite excited with that. Definitely it is helpful. For example in Egypt when Mr Moussa is speaking about Silk Road, it is very nice to finance a new city around Cairo. One minute, but in the same time we can see that in Tajikistan, the debt per habitant, the revenue per habitant is \$1000, and the debt to China is \$700. You can see that in Maldives, the GDP is 5 billion USD, and the loans from China is 3 billion USD. I can take many examples, so we need to be very cautious with that. And I think the competition between free capitalism and state capitalism has to be organised, and I will just give this example when there was this merger between Siemens and Alstom in Europe, I think it was necessary to do it, it was not accepted and it was a mistake. Thank you very much.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to Russian sociologist, Professor Zhan Terentyevich Toshchenko.

Zh. T. TOSHCHENKO: – We are discussing the issues of social and economic changes, the processes taking place in the society, in the world, but to my mind not everyone pays attention to the fact who carries these changes out, who realizes these processes and brings these social phenomena into life. Attempts to analyze who the subject of the historical progress is were always made, but recently in view of the socialist system crisis, the former class stratification structure (working class, peasants, bourgeoisie, intelligentsia) was criticized. It was announced that such an approach no longer works, and a lot of suggestions appeared that completely denied such structure – both class and so-

cial. But recently other suggestions appeared. I'd like to tell about one of them in detail.

It's fairly natural that people claim to arrange their life, their well-being. The problem of employment originates based on that. Here I like a sociologist would like to draw your attention to the following. Our analysis showed that currently 15% of the population are employed without labour contracts. Let's not go into what their work may be like. These details don't interest us now. 20% more are employed temporarily, when the contract is signed for some part of a year, one year, 18 months, etc., and that by the ways especially refers to teachers and lecturers. All these people are in limbo. It is profitable for some sectors to have people working part-time as a result of which people have limited opportunities for arrangement of their lives. It is also possible to mention seasonal employment that also puts people in a rather dependable position.

The listed groups make about 40–45% of the employable population. The question arises – how to name them in this case? The term of precariat was introduced for that in world literature (coming from the Latin *precarious* meaning unstable, unsustainable, non-guaranteed). People referred to this group now make a considerable part of the employable population together with the disputable middle class and some other groups. At the same time, there is mass dissatisfaction with the condition and content of labour, social position, lack of clear prospects in social and personal life in this community of people. They have such common problems as instability of remuneration for their work, lack of social guarantees and protection, uncertain future and professional career as well as some other problems. At the same time, this category of people is well-educated and does not want to lose social ties with the society.

It is possible that many people will not agree with my opinion, but it seems to me that exactly the American precariat brought Trump to power. Now, there are “Yellow Vests” in France – people who are not satisfied with a certain way of life and who represent various social groups and are the French precariat. In our opinion, precariat members showed their worth when Zelensky was elected the President of the Ukraine. This group also brought Pashinyan to power in Armenia. And our participants of environmental riots, recent conflict in Yekaterinburg and other actions related, for example, to city building issues, are people from various strata. So, I am sure that this phenomenon should be paid close attention to and be made the object of not only scientific research but also the subject of state economic and social policy.

V. A. CHERESHNEV: – Allow me to give the floor for the closing remarks to the President of SPbUHSS Alexander Sergeevich Zapesotsky.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, our today's meeting is coming to an end, but we'll have another eventful and very interesting day tomorrow. It so happened that I have not prepared a report for the first time in many years. But I wrote a big book, in which I analyze the previous Conferences – though I am not very satisfied with it. I hope that all of us together will be creating something profound and outstanding in future.

Many interesting and original thoughts were presented today – I can't aspire to such depth. I think that everyone

present will come to some conclusions. Because everything I'll say is just my personal opinion, and I'd like to share it as we share experience with colleagues. So, I do not believe it. Professor Köchler writes brilliant reports for all our Conferences, I admire him and every time I hope that he will come to us again. But I do not agree that if we change several paragraphs or several words in the UN Charter, everything will be fine in the world. The attitude to the UN Charter now is extremely contemptuous and scornful in general. No one prevented the United States from bombing Yugoslavia with no UN sanctions at all, from disintegrating this state together with NATO countries. No one took a decision for NATO countries to stop flying over Libya, no one prevented them from destroying Libyan air force at first and later all its armed forces. The “rule of the strongest” is predominant in the world.

Sure, our friend Professor Köchler says that these actions are unacceptable from the moral point of view, and the whole world understands it. But we have already run across the situation for dozens of times when those with the monopoly in mass media control the information – and we know that 95% of mass media in the world is controlled by the United States. They can say that white is black and black is white and prove it. Currently, for example, medals are minted with the banners of the victors in World War II – but there is no Russia there. Today, we can consider the one having the power of mass media to have the truth monopoly.

I spend a lot of time in the West, I speak at Universities, I meet with scholars, with the public – and I see amazing things. I came to Berlin when the war in Georgia ended – Saakashvili ordered to attack Russian peacemakers, and that order was fulfilled. But the Germans were sure that it was Russia attacking Georgia. The recordings of Georgian army attacking were demonstrated all over Western Europe but it was said at the same time that it was not Georgia attacking but Russia. I saw the news with my own eyes. Billions are spent on that. Corporations are bought, there are grand advertizing campaigns, UN Charter violations are justified as well as invasions into various countries, etc. Today, the strong do whatever they like. At the same time, it is possible to enter any provisions into the UN Charter.

At the same time, it seems to me that the West is in trouble – as well as Russia. And what is more, I think that Russia is in much bigger trouble because here the historical experience of the West's development that brought it to the dead end is copied very unsuccessfully and implicitly. Henry Markovich, who brilliantly entered into polemics with me at the previous Conference, asked why everyone was anxious to move to the United States. No one is anxious any longer. The Russians who left for the Western Europe or the United States would be happy to come back. In essence, this is the mass public sentiment encompassing hundreds of thousands if not millions. But it's impossible to enter the same river twice.

The trouble of the West is that capitalism, this amazing global economic pattern, amazing economic formation, suddenly lost its vital force. We had socialism in the Soviet Union – a wonderful, extremely promising formation that is developing today in a very interesting, its own specific way in China, and very successfully, integrating achievements of capitalism in accordance with the convergence theory. But socialism lost its force in our country, and instead of mod-

ernizing it, shifting in the direction of the population's material interest and sensible democratization of the society, there was a jump made to wild, barbarian capitalism, and God knows what is happening to it now. And capitalism lost its force in the West because it turned into fake capitalism, a resemblance of capitalism.

What was the strength of capitalism related to in general? I think, with its main idea being brought into life: an individual producing a lot of public goods should be remunerated, he should become rich. An individual makes an electric car – and he becomes a billionaire. He invents a tube instead of a shaving brush and bowl, and the shaving cream gets out of this tube itself – and he becomes very rich. There were many books published in the West about people that gave something to mankind. It's wonderful when such people make a lot of money. When a brilliant lawyer becomes a well-to-do man, it's wonderful, he works for the public benefit. It's wonderful when a singer, whose songs and listened and enjoyed by millions, makes a fortune as well as a scholar, who created or invented something genius. Though our Doctor honoris causa Zhores Alferov, who was such a scholar – there would not have been our cellular phones without him – did not become rich, and we can guess why.

Capitalism lost this special feature, this characteristic – to give an opportunity to make money working for the benefit of the people. It's clear in principle how the situation can be corrected but it seems that the West is incapable of that – as well as the Soviet Union was incapable

to repair its poorly functioning socialism. Because of that Irina Olegovna Abramova is right – the power pole in this case will inevitably move from the West to the East. Sure, when the Bretton Woods system is destroyed – and it will be destroyed and the Americans won't be able to print money, keep 800 military bases all over the world and spend so much money of the others on armaments.

Sure, all powerful institutions will be transferred under the Asian countries control. From my point of view, this is practically inevitable. And that does not make me happy at all because I am afraid that Russia will find itself on the wrong side. To my deep regret, this giant re-division of the global power can take place if not in front of our eyes, then during the life of today's young people. And sure, we, here in St. Petersburg, would not like to find ourselves in the backwoods of the new Asian world.

The crisis of Christianity, destruction of all its ideals and ideas should be added to that as well. I think that, no matter how strange it may sound, restoration of the potential of the Christian civilization model – both liberal Western and socialist that also really originated in the West – is in the field of morals, because avarice destroyed everything. You see, no matter where you look, that there is avarice everywhere, contempt to the high humanitarian essence. We as if do not believe that humanism will win over avarice. But Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov said that surely the evil sometimes triumphs, and sometimes for long periods of time. However, later humanism in any case pushes through savagery like grass through asphalt. I believe in that.