

A. S. Zapesotsky<sup>1</sup>

## CULTUROLOGICAL COMPREHENSION OF GLOBALIZATION PROCESSES

During one of our talks academician Abdusalam Abdulkerimovich Guseynov expressed an opinion that when in future, in about 100 years, historians would try to phrase the urgent issues that worried scholars, politicians, prominent figures in the field of arts in the late 20th century – the ear-

ly 21st century, the proceedings of the Likhachov Scientific Conferences would be a priceless material for them as the topics of the Conferences and section titles can be viewed as indicators of urgent issues.

But without waiting for the next century, we can also try to comprehend the history of the Conferences that unfolds like comprehension of the history of Russia, history of global civilization of recent decades. The walls of this hall witnessed farsighted and erroneous forecasts, hopes and disappointments, acquisitions and losses.

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel introduced the Shakespearean expression, “the mole of history”, into science, it is used to designate unfamiliar logic of historical events and historical process as a whole. In the period of our Conferences’ establishment and development, the mole of history also made its way but that took place, if we use W. Benjamin’s words, in the environment of “Messianic times”. It went on in the space of the unfinished past and at the same time the incomplete present.

This explains a lot: first, the topics of the Conferences encompassing the most urgent issues of the modern times. Second, many aspects of the said issues’ analysis as human-

<sup>1</sup> President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation. Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia. Author of more than 2,800 published works. Deputy chair of editorial boards of the following magazines: “Philosophy and Culture”, “Philosophical Thought”, “Pedagogy and Enlightenment”. Member of editorial boards of magazines: “Issues of Cultural Studies”, “Literary Studies”, “Partnership of Civilizations”, “Philology: Scientific Research”, “Search: Politics. Social Science. Arts. Sociology. Culture”, “LITERA”, “Contemporary Education”, “Simurg” (Azerbaijan). He was awarded the Order of Friendship, “For Life Saving” medal, “In Memory of the 300th Anniversary of St. Petersburg” medal, K. D. Ushinsky medal, Gold medal of the Russian Academy of Education. He was awarded the Diploma of Merit by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Bulgaria, SIMURG medal by the Azerbaijan Association of Culture and Academician Sapargaliev medal (Kazakhstan). Russian Federation Government’s Prize winner (2007) and St. Petersburg Government’s Prize winner (2010, 2016) in education, Gorky Literary Prize winner (2007), RAS G. V. Plekhanov Prize winner (2015). Doctor Emeritus of universities of the USA, Ireland, Ukraine and Poland. Academician of the Academy of Sciences and Arts (Paris), European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salsburg).

ities scholars, public figures, statesmen, politicians, diplomats, actors, artists present their views on social, political, economic and other issues, and that gives special meaning to every meeting. Third, popularity of “The Days of Science” and later the Likhachov Scientific Conference at the University, where the unique community of people representing the elite of post-soviet Russia assembles.

And what is more, the well-known now Valdai Discussion Club established in 2004 is built according to the Likhachov Conference model to this or that extent. A number of our traditional speakers and members of the Organizing Committee take part in the Valdai Club meetings, and that reflects continuity and ties of these discussion venues.

If we look from today’s point of view, it becomes evident that the unfinished character of the past and incompleteness of the present are to a large extent overcome by intellectually hard-driving program that always characterizes the Conference.

### **Social practice as the source of scholarly discourse**

Life itself forms the range of issues for our discussions. As many of those present in this hall remember, the first half of the 1990s was the period of chaos, time of troubles and hopeless time as it could seem. The humanitarian scholars, who assembled at our University venue in the environment of disintegrating “Soviet world”, voiced the great mission of national culture that became the main target attacked by liberal reformers, and sent a clear message.

If we use the words by Vyacheslav Semenovitch Styopin, who is unfortunately not with us any more, culture has been comprehended since then as the spiritual “gene pool” of the nation, the means of arrangement and transfer of the spiritual memory of the people, the system of developing suprabiological programs of human activities. The understanding of culture as a condition for preserving sanity and providing spiritual security of the society was established then. The necessity to preserve and strengthen human values, universals being the basis of dialogue, tolerance and accord, was comprehended.

The humanitarian mission of the Scientific Conference in the 1990s was research of global issues and civilization challenges as well as forecasting the future world order scenarios. Culture in the discussions taking place in the 1990s, was viewed not only as the condition for economic and political reforms but also as the only justification of the past and guarantee of the future of humanity. The result of such an approach to comprehending functions, development trends and wider – the mission of culture – was the initiated by academician D.S. Likhachov project “Declaration of Culture’s Rights” worked out in the St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences and supported by scholarly and arts elite of the country, a number of statesmen and politicians.

We built our discourse in the context of academician Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov’s understanding of the main culture development vector – from chaos to harmony, advancement of cultural environment forming individuals, enlargement of the “sector of freedom” as the key condition for person’s self-realization and establishment of values of humanism.

The topics of Scientific Conferences expanded as the years went by and the problems challenging culture, bring-

ing order to the society, deepened. Participants of the Likhachov Scientific Conference raised such issues as globalization of radicalism and extremism, expansion of geography and social basis of violence; deformation of basic cultural and anthropological models and destruction of culture’s regulatory functions; aggravation of technology-related problems having a negative impact on the habitat and biological human nature; developments of genetic engineering threatening the habitat and biological human nature.

Then the dialogue of cultures and civilizations became the focus of the Likhachov Scientific Conference’s attention. Its new facets appeared every year. And this is not accidental: the world gradually comprehended that further civilization development was only possible based on mutual understanding, dialogue and partnership when all parties enjoyed equal rights. Reviewing the dialogue of cultures as the fundamental principle of modern civilization development, the Scientific Conference in essence conceptualized the universal methodology of humanity’s survival in the system of humanitarian knowledge, worked out world-view platforms for creation of new models of civilization development and alternative globalization strategies, modeled the environment where efficient ways of overcoming global crises of contemporary world were formed.

Integration processes intensified in the world in the late 20th century – the early 21st century. Participants of the Scientific Conference systematically researched the concept of “interaction of cultures” and the dialogue nature of global cultural space, analyzed the ratio of the global and the local in sociocultural dynamics, assessed the impact of globalization on interaction of cultures. Globalization and dialogue of cultures have various sides, they are made from various processes, they sometimes integrate contradictory trends. Perception of these phenomena is to a large extent determined by not just scientific criteria of their comprehension but also that political and cultural context, which is dominating in the society and reflects both historical traditions and current understanding of the reality.

### **Globalization on the analytical field as the subject of cultural studies**

The globalization topic is constantly included in the Scientific Conference program in some or the other formats. Currently, it seems urgent to comprehend not only the phenomenon of globalization as such but also dynamics of views’ development in case of representatives of various fields of social practice – participants of our scientific forum.

The phenomenon of globalization was variously treated and assessed in the speeches and discussions at the Likhachov Scientific Conference in various years, sometimes treatments and assessments were diametrically opposite. This is related to the fact that globalization both as a theoretical category and as a real process has many facets and encompasses a number of fields – political, economic, legal, social, etc. At the same time, there are both positive and negative results found in each of them.

Globalization is a cultural phenomenon, with the maximally wide understanding of culture. It is of dialogue character by nature. It intensifies the process and expands the field of interaction of cultures and civilizations that are viewed by us in the context of spiritual kinship of European and Russian cultures. At the same time, Europe is not

understood geographically, with the Urals as the borderline but as a cultural and economic space, including Big Russia and stretching from Iceland and Gibraltar in the West of the European continent to Chukotka in the East, from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean. Because of that, as it seemed in the beginning of this century, the European Union and Russia are interested in and have similar motives for rapprochement, they need jointly fitted out Europe that should acquire its identity, integrate efforts to be competitive in the global world of the future. In this connection, it seemed necessary to critically assess and overcome national and regional egocentrism.

Establishment of monopolarity of the world and Western culture's transfer to the era of Post-Modernity became principally new phenomena of the last decade of the previous century. The end of history, geography and state was announced at the worldview level in the United States. "The end of history" established the American development model as the basic and the only legitimate one, its spreading all over the world was provided by intervention (bombing Yugoslavia as well as military interventions into the life of states in the Middle East and North Africa). "The end of geography" fixed disappearance of borders of sovereign states and inevitability of globalized world without borders, free migration of people, goods and capitals. "The end of states" forecasted their gradual turning into an appendix to transnational corporations in the context of global market.

These concepts provided foundations for globalization's expansionist practice. However, American-style globalization generated sociocultural, political and economic problems, for solution of which there was no respective methodology and efficient tools. As G.M. Gatilov mentioned, global processes, generating aggravation of social and international contradictions, put uniqueness and distinctiveness of countries and nations under a threat, making the danger of inter-civilization split real.<sup>1</sup>

Globalization is becoming the means of "stifling" national economies and the world's destabilization, more and more increasing the gap between poor and rich countries.<sup>2</sup> It aggravates (and to a considerable extent conserves) contradictions between various ethnic and cultural groups and nations, nation-states and international structures, regional communities and inter-state associations.<sup>3</sup>

The growing gap between developed and emerging countries (by economic, sociocultural indicators, etc.) stimulates opposition to the West's expansion. The global world engaged in cultural standardization, making existence of nation-states as a sustainable form of community problematic, provokes intensification of anti-global position of minorities, movements and organizations (ethnic, religious, cultural, etc.), development of separatist movements accompanied by revival of ethnic, cultural and national identities.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Gatilov G. M. International Aspects of the Dialogue of Cultures in the Era of Globalization // Dialogue of Cultures under Globalization : the 13th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 17–18, 2012. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2012. Vol. 1 : Reports. P. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Styopin V. S. Theoretical Knowledge. Moscow, 1999. P. 31.

<sup>3</sup> Granin Yu. D. Globalization and Nationalism: History and Modern Times. Social and Philosophical Analysis: extended abstract of Ph. D. thesis ... Doctor of Philosophy. Moscow, 2008.

<sup>4</sup> Mironov V. V. Dialogue of Cultures or Globalizational Monologue? // Dialogue of Cultures and Partnership of Civilizations : the 14th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 15–20, 2014. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2014. P. 114.

### Unification intentions of globalization

"The intention to unify humanity, suppressing any manifestations of uniqueness and independence on the part of certain countries and regions under the pretext of the necessity to centralize power in the globalized world in the face of common challenges of the time, and aspiration of states and nations to preserve the foundation of state sovereignty and their confessional and civilization identity"<sup>5</sup> become the key contradiction of globalization. According to P. S. Gurevich, "Globalism has a great unifying power. However, it runs across its own limits. The advocates of globalism insisted on elimination of traditions, ethnical and national identity. They called for cosmopolitan practice and accused any attempts to rely on one's own fundamental spiritual sources of archaism and anti-progress. But religious and ethnic trends started reviving in the global space. Many philosophers assessed this governing law as a 'dialectic paradox'.<sup>6</sup>

Globalization in its American understanding is anti-cultural in its essence as culture is national by nature. On the one hand, anti-cultural pathos of globalization lies in its striving for maximum simplification of the global system, making it homogeneous. "Globalism is 'the end of history' as spiritual and personal form of human life, when the world turns from 'flourishing complexity' into a uniform 'world-economy'."<sup>7</sup> "Interaction of people on the globe acquires exactly this character now, making one worry about the fate of nations, cultures, traditions, preservation of humanity as such. The world has been becoming united for a long time, at least since the Modern Times but as a complex, and now it is transferring into a naturally homogeneous state. However, this is not a live organism. This is an organism-like, more and more artificial system."<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, globalization has already launched the mechanism of "involution of culture" – collapse of the idea of its victorious advance "generates actual localization of culture according to countries and regions".<sup>9</sup>

It could seem that modern information technologies of the global world make access to cultures considerably easier and increase their variety. Besides, globalization encompasses all institutions and spheres of human and the society's vital activities, being manifested in integration processes. This is well manifested first of all in the field of geopolitics, global economy, culture, formation of national political and economic structures. Globalization directs formation of global economy as one whole organism, united global culture, with unified value, regulative and behavioral models. In the environment when problems threatening human civilization are growing, globalization is often presented as the way to save humanity from future catastrophes. However, all that looks attractive only in theory.

<sup>5</sup> Chereshnev V. A., Rastorguev V. N. Long-term Development Strategy: Challenges of Our Time, Global Instability and Methodology of Determination of Priorities // Contemporary Global Challenges and National Interests : the 16th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 19–21, 2016. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2016. P. 259.

<sup>6</sup> Gurevich P. S. Spiritual Confrontation of Civilizations // Contemporary Global Challenges and National Interests : the 16th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 19–21, 2016. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2016. P. 69.

<sup>7</sup> Kutyrev V. A. Globalism: Regions Instead of Nations, Technos Instead of Society // Contemporary Global Challenges and National Interests : the 16th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 19–21, 2016. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2016. P. 418.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Kapustina L. B. Globalization and Global Culture: Two Decades in the Crosshairs of Analytics // Managerial Consulting. 2010. No 4.

Realities are far from the ideal. Researchers of globalization name intensifying aggressiveness of the key agents of the globalization project, aggravation of destructive trends by them for modification of national and cultural identities and destruction of foundations of national cultures as special features of today's globalization. The contrast between technological, military "muscles" of Western powers and wretchedness of their purposes, between pathos of ideological sentiments, intentions and lack of moral limitations in striving for personal profits is becoming more and more evident. As a result, globalization is becoming a catalyst for aggravation of competition between world powers, each of which strives to take leading positions in the world, presenting its national interests as global.

### **Multiculturalism: hopes and disappointments**

The issue of establishment of multiculturalism as the basis for cultural policy and international dialogue in European culture was discussed at the Likhachov Scientific Conference for a number of years. Multiculturalism was viewed as a conceptual basis for state politics. Participants of the Conference discussed various scenarios of multiculturalism's realization, its models and the problems of their bringing into life, capabilities of a multicultural dialogue in formation of a new global pattern. Multiculturalism was viewed as a resource for optimization of international relations, assisting in preservation and strengthening of common human values.

According to Eberhard Schneider, approval of the multiculturalism policy means that representatives of the culture of the majority should allow representatives of cultures of the minority to be full-featured participants of the society, and representatives of cultures of the minority should want to be participants and not just be physically present. At the same time, in order to preserve national unity of the multicultural society it is required to focus attention on the common, consolidating and not separating aspects.<sup>1</sup>

For a number of years, multiculturalism was a reality in the European Union that existed within the legal framework basing on constitutions and laws of states. It was viewed as a condition to provide and protect cultural diversity, establish the principle of tolerance as respect to another system of values, worldviews, way of life. It was supposed that there is no alternative to the multiculturalism policy.

However, practical embodiment of multiculturalism ideology took place in the environment of globalization's conflict potential growth, in the environment of complex interaction of various cultures when differences of civilization order make themselves known. As a result, optimistic expectations of globalists as to success of the multiculturalism policy did not come true.

### **Globalization versus dialogue of cultures**

The forecasted inevitability of confrontational practices in a dialogue that was not once spoken about at the Conference, has been fully and many times confirmed. Self-aware ethnic and cultural communities communicate, because of that cultural identity serves as one of important tools

having an impact on communications. Self-awareness of one's identity by an individual subject and ethnic group as a whole is formed in the process of opposing one's own and alien, and the idea of oneself is formed as a result of comparing with "alien". Because of that the notion of "alien" acquires great importance in inter-cultural communications. Division into "alien" and "ours" may lead to both cooperation and rivalry.<sup>2</sup> There are three globalization and cultural paradigms (models, prospects) singled out in modern literature: cultural differentialism with intensifying differences as the background; cultural convergence with growing sameness; cultural hybridization accompanied by mixture of heterogeneous cultural systems.<sup>3</sup> The contemporary dialogue of civilizations includes all three paradigms mentioned above.

Currently, the geopolitical landscape is changing, social and inter-national contradictions are aggravating. The said processes are accompanied by mutual enrichment of cultures but at the same time they put the uniqueness and distinctiveness under a threat, generate the feeling of danger brought about by a possibility of inter-civilization split. Global challenges and large-scale tasks of international relations give additional importance to interaction of cultures. Striving for harmonization of relations, productive dialogue, decrease of the number of conflicts becomes the alternative.

Trans-border challenges demand a joint answer. At the same time, a problem arises in the process of collective organization of inter-culture dialogue, and the problem is related to its moral component. The urgent task is not to allow conflicts of inter-civilization character, clashes on inter-ethnic, inter-cultural and inter-confessional basis, to unite efforts of international community based on the rule of international law, strict observance of the UN Charter principles, formation of more flexible interaction mechanisms outside blocs, network diplomacy based on equality and taking into account interests of participants united by common aims. There are new opportunities originating, based on the past, freed from intellectual inertia, deideologization, creative approaches to joint opposition to common challenges, objective matching of national interests.<sup>4</sup> Future Europe is only possible in case if the optimal form of cooperation is determined, satisfying the interests and demands of the European Union, CIS, Eurasian Community and the Russian Federation.

However, Russia's attempts to organize a dialogue with the West European world, based on common cultural dominants, have not been successful. One of the participants of the dialogue – Russian culture – did not accept the values of West European Post-Modernity. Western culture is authentic and whole: it has been moving in the direction of the paradigm of values based on usefulness and pragmatism for several centuries, starting from the Reformation. Russian culture was originally built on the values of the good, justice, value of labour. Today, it is on historical development crossroads, it has to choose one of the mutually excluding value models. Russian experience in building capitalism according to the Western pattern, based on the attempt

<sup>1</sup> Schneider E. Multiculturalism in Germany // Dialogue of Cultures under Globalization : the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 17–18, 2012. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2012. Vol. 1 : Reports. P. 241–242.

<sup>2</sup> Manapova V. E. The Review of "Alien" in Inter-Cultural Dialogue // Dialogue of Cultures under Globalization : the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 17–18, 2012. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2012. Vol. 1 : Reports. P. 387–389.

<sup>3</sup> Pieterse J. N. Globalization and Culture: Global Mélange. Lanham : Rowman and Littlefield, 2009. P. 44.

<sup>4</sup> Gatilov G. M. Op. cit.



to change life strategies, shows that the “national soul” rejects any alien model of being.

### Russia on civilization crossroads

Establishment of capitalism in Russia in recent decades created the illusion of cultural proximity of “the Russian world” and West European civilization for some time. However, the system of values, with the cult of material benefits, hedonism and individual’s autonomy as its center, is the nucleus of West European culture. It has become evident now that the strategic objective of the West in “globalization” of “the Russian world” is destruction of the cultural code and deformation of mental models of Russian civilization, marginalization of carriers of traditional values (they are given the role of functionaries of subculture that has the right to exist in closed communities). Life strategies, actively introduced to public consciousness, historically alien to the people of Russia, are natural for European civilization. As a result, mental bases of Russian culture are destroyed, moral imperatives are devalued: the good, truth, authenticity, beauty, justice.<sup>1</sup> Destruction of the spiritual world uniting the society in perspective deprives the subject of culture of will for consolidation and mobilization of inner resources required to answer the challenges of the 21st century.

In his time, L. N. Gumilev, when criticizing primitiveness of discourse on creation the united global culture, convincingly proved that “culture common to all mankind, the same for all nations is impossible”. He wrote that “It is known that only a fairly complex system is viable and can function successfully. Culture common to all mankind is only possible in case of maximum simplification (at the expense of destroying national cultures). The limit if system’s simplification is its death”.<sup>2</sup> Because of that its main support is uneducated, poorly cultured people, no matter if it is recognized or not by advocates of the globalism idea. “An individual sensitive to culture, always asks himself a question about the meaning of every phenomenon, including the one presented as the latest innovation of Western civilization. Change of culture of everyday life (if it takes place freely in the society, in the direction of bigger pragmatism) is not dangerous as such. But globalism will become a real threat if national humanitarian education dies in the society, the one in which education in the field of arts should play an important role. Exactly it is the guarantee of the society’s preserving the ability to produce unique cultural values, a guarantee of respect to cultural traditions, ability to recognize and preserve timeless values.”<sup>3</sup>

Globalization as it looks now is first of all realization of the scenario promoted by Western countries led by the United States. Globalization that (as it seemed in the past to scholars and politicians) is a natural development process of interaction of cultures, civilizations, nations, states, currently brought to light significant contradictions between various cultures and civilizations. The globalization process

did not eliminate but even more aggravated striving of each state to participate in global processes on privileged terms with minimum concessions. Today, we witness differentiation of certain civilizations, their confrontations up to clashes. Interaction of cultures takes place within the framework of established oppositions “globalism-localism”, “modern-traditional”, “Western-Eastern”.

### What is the coming century preparing for us?

Life has shown that the dialogue of cultures gradually turns into their conflict and cooperation of civilizations into their confrontation. In this connection, system shifts and challenges of today’s civilization, determining contours and scenarios of the future became the central topic of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference, and that was reflected in session titles as well as the raised issues and topics of discussions.

Expansion of the topics of the Conference in the recent decade was dictated by intensification of ethnic, social, political and other conflicts in various regions of the world, expansion of processes characterizing relations of humans and the environment, change of the role of science and technology in the life of individuals, society, country and the world as a whole. The dramatic nature of the situation in recent years is intensified by the financial and economic crisis, with the prospects of its overcoming being rather indefinite. This gives blurred contours to the future world projects. Pessimistic conclusions are heard more and more often: technology-related civilization has come to the limit after exhausting possibilities of extensive development and generating global crises and problems.

All these problems are in this or that way related to change of spiritual foundations of being and have the culturegeneous nature. The necessity to comprehend contours of the future is brought about by the necessity to cognize the future world order, arrangement of human society, opportunity to work out measures to oppose negative trends, transfer destructive processes into constructive. The system analysis of the modern civilization development issues became the starting point for searching for the answers to global challenges.

Treatment of culture as a national security factor has become one of the most important results of scientific discussions that took place at the Conference for many years. It was many times mentioned in reports by participants of the Conference that revival of national culture was the basis of spiritual security of the society. These problems seem extremely urgent because the Russian society was experiencing the global crisis of identity for a number of years, that took place with ideological chaos, destruction of basic spiritual and moral grounds of social being, decrease of the role of Russian culture in the global civilization process as the background. In this connection, the problems of searching for resources for spiritual revival, understanding value and regulatory specific features of Russian ethos, analysis of national mentality as an anthropologic model of Russian culture, conditions for realization of identification potential of Russian culture were and still are extremely urgent for participants of the Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Such a way of raising the issue is justified both from the point of cultural studies and political point of view – life and the notion of “security” become meaningless with-

<sup>1</sup> Gorshkov M. K. Culture as a Space for Dialogue of Civilizations // Dialogue of Cultures and Partnership of Civilizations : the 14th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 15–20, 2014. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2014. P. 48.

<sup>2</sup> Gumilev L. N. The Rhythms of Eurasia. Epochs and Civilizations. Moscow, 2008. P. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Avdeyev A. A. The Culture of the Early 21st Century and its Role in the Making of the International Dialogue // Dialogue of Cultures and Partnership of Civilizations : the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2010. P. 21–23.

out a man (his moral and spiritual health). The world history shows that nations fight not only for material resources, economic liberation but also for values – intellectual, moral, religious. Danger (including cultural, generated by spreading of values from other cultures) nullifies the feeling of the fullness of life and generates internal disorganization. In this connection, spiritual security is understood as the system of conditions, helping ethnos to preserve vitally important indicators within the framework of regulatory, historically formed borders. Exit beyond the norm leads to system's disorganization and can lead to catastrophe, death of nation and state.

Analysis of the global order genesis, determination of the main sources of international tension, working out scenarios for resolving today's international conflicts, comprehension of contours of the future in the context of global cultural development became the thematic "nerve" of the Likhachov Scientific Conference in 2017–2018.

### **Aggravation of conflicts as the vector of today's civilization development**

Humanity entering the III millennium ran across aggravating conflicts in international relations. Increase of the number of domestic, local conflicts leads to their internationalization and escalation of scales and consequences, has an impact on the international system as a whole. The repertoire of international conflicts in the 21st century was enriched by a whole number of new expansion forms (economic, cultural, religious with predominance of fundamental sources).

Modern conflicts are aimed not as much at changing territorial configuration of other countries as at deformation of economic relations, changing nations' world views and world perception, redistribution of spheres of political influence, forcing other cultural models and values on weaker countries destroying the nucleus of national culture.

Participants of the Scientific Conference found out essential characteristics of an international conflict as the object of management and control; systematically analyzed global and regional tensions taking into account new types of non-military conflicts and threats; found out structural shifts in the system of international relations having an impact on the level of tension; substantiated means for peaceful resolution of international conflicts and resources of international organizations; offered ways of optimal correlation of strong-arm and "soft" methods of resolving international conflicts.

Social state and consumer society building compete and are combined in different ways in modern capitalism development. The West has been the unquestionable leader in such a society's creation, however, movement in this direction led it to an evident dead-end. A number of reports at the Conference were dedicated to the systemic crisis of Western-type capitalism.<sup>1</sup> It was said about fundamental market changes, loss of the role of economic development lo-

comotive; deformation of national elites and loss of their ability to generate new meanings, reveal promising development ways; total degeneration of democracy, increase of manipulations with the society and elimination of freedom of speech; destruction of the Christian matrix of culture development. The efficiency of classical capitalism was based on free market with its spontaneous forcefulness of economic mechanisms. Rivalry of producers, struggle for satisfaction of consumer needs by offering high-quality products were the basis of it. But this market is a thing of the past.

The economic center of gravity shifted from factory shops to human consciousness. Material production was shifted to periphery of economy by producing meanings, and requirements became manufactured as products. The modern information society has not been the sphere of free vital activities of people since the moment of its origin, being in essence only a new form of state and monopolistic arrangement of production. The late 1960s – the early 1970s were the period when relatively free intellectual life of the West was decisively replaced by mechanisms of total manipulations with consciousness. The mechanisms of elites' formation and functioning changed radically.

Previously, intellectuals played a special role in the society – writers, philosophers, scholars, professors. They enjoyed considerable freedom in analysis of the reality, generation of ideas and their delivering to the society, they had a considerable and sometimes key influence on its development. Their dependence on economic and political elites was relatively weak. Later practically all spiritual production in the West was privatized by monopolistic structures like the state as such. Intellectuals turned into employees of corporations, producing ideas by their orders and in their interests, often with no correlation with reality or related to it but not improving it from the point of view of public benefit. Big bourgeoisie creates spiritual products in its own narrow selfish interests and forces it on the others via the mass media system, with the help of mass culture spreading mechanisms. Democracy functioning institutions are privatized in a similar way, and that leads to degeneration of the political class, disappearance of political leaders as Franklin Roosevelt, Charles de Gaulle. It is not accidental that today the leaders of the European Union countries are a uniform row of officials without distinctive personalities, with rare exceptions.

Democracy, freedom of speech and meanings of being turning into commodities means that Western capitalism is entering the phase of critical degeneration that should be called malignant. Recently, cultural degeneration of the West is being actively discussed and criticized in the global community. The whole range of global crises (exhaustion of natural resources, climate change, growth of terrorism, multiplying technology-related catastrophes, pollution of the human habitat, etc.) is more and more tied with the crisis of Western civilization paradigm. Unfortunately, the newly appeared Russian elite started cultivating this model on local soil without fully understanding it and not knowing how to cultivate anything.

Commercialization of democratic institutions nullifies competition as the most important element, providing efficient market functioning, and expands corruption pace. Big corporations all over the world get more and more profits as an absolute rent, realizing political and economic dominance. Financial institutions refused from their original

<sup>1</sup> See e.g.: *Zapesotsky A. S.* Historical Controversy between Capitalism and Socialism as Dialogue of Cultures // Dialogue of Cultures under Globalization : the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 12–13, 2011. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2011. Vol. 1 : Reports. P. 67–73 ; *Zapesotsky A. S., Cheberko Ye. F.* Transformation of Economic Relations in the Environment of Today's Civilization Crisis // Global World: System Shifts, Challenges and Contours of the Future : the 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 18–20, 2017. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2017. P. 83–87.

function of servicing production in favour of financial speculations. There are many ways created in financial sphere to increase profits, without satisfying public needs. Money turned into independent means of production, avoiding trade turnover. Such capitalism already can't be effective.

Today, a question arises as to refusal from expansion and deepening of Western economic principles in favour of principles of justice, moral obligations to the society, care of people.

### Russia as the field of global experiments

The phenomenon and prospects of Russian capitalism systematically become the subject of discussion at the Likhachov Scientific Conference. It is already clear today that a unique and grand in its scale socioeconomic experiment has been realized in our country again, for the second time in 100 years. The unheard of before in human history defective formation has again been created, this time it is ultra-liberal.

It is not difficult to correlate what was built in our country with the world practice: the argument between socialism and liberalism ideologies has been going on for several centuries and has been going on following the theory of convergence course for about half a century already. The basis of the argument is differences between two systems of values. As it is known, according to one of them, vital activities of the society are regulated by the state, human behaviour is subordinated to collective interests, and an individual is understood as a social creature. According to the other system, the society's vital activities are regulated by the market, human behaviour is determined by personal profits, and an individual is understood as an economic creature. Contemporary developed states compete today in creating socioeconomic and cultural life mechanisms, efficiently combining advantages of the socialist and liberal approaches.

The global civilization transfer to the post-capitalist phase is related to Industry 4.0 (or the Fourth Industrial Revolution) that comes to replace the today's information revolution (the third one after the agrarian and industrial), making transfer to the sixth technological wave inevitable. The infrastructure of the new economic pattern, many times increasing the efficiency of production and reducing its energy consumption and materials consumption, is made by artificial intelligence, robotics, nanotechnologies (creating new technological chains for electronic, chemical, aerospace industries); biotechnologies basing on achievements of molecular biology and genetic engineering (especially effective in medicine and agribusiness); global information networks; additive 3D printers and cognitive technologies.

The new technological pattern entering the growth phase radically changes the structure of economy, deforming its institutional basis and destroying the human factor of production. We are on the verge of a new evolutionary leap beyond the borders of capitalism.<sup>1</sup> Industry 4.0 radically changes the traditional capitalist model with its ruthless rivalry, repressive attitude to people, nature, culture. The system becomes post-capitalist and signifies the start of humanity's transfer to the new type of development, transfers civilization to the era of Trans-Modernity, incompatible with our lifeworld – the time of the so-called singular transfer of reality to another, post-human state.<sup>2</sup>

Comprehending the historical experience and the logic of development of social practice's actual spheres within the framework of the Likhachov Scientific Conference, one can say that the future is not fatal and not preordained by the higher forces, divine Providence, or other similarly incognizable and unpredictable sources. The future is formed by people, thinking, living and working here and now – various political, economic, artistic, scholarly elites in accordance with their ideas. It can't be brought to strict determination by both national historical and cultural matrixes, and by some forming global world culture.

The world can oppose the future global risks and threats based on systematization of the ideas of the future, formed in various fields of academic knowledge, comprehensive analysis of contemporary natural, technology-related, social, political and economic problems, uniting efforts of various academic schools and research institutions.

Creating the concept of the future is only possible based on comprehensive analysis of processes in the leading fields of the society's vital activities, using the scientific forecasting methodology. It's difficult to overestimate the scientific and humanitarian role of the Conference in this respect. The President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin highly assesses the mission of our academic forum and mentions in his greetings to participants of one of the previous Conferences that "the Conference has become the recognized venue for meaningful and constructive discussions, serious talk about the most important issues of our times."<sup>3</sup> This assessment is a strong incentive for our work at the Conference 2019 and going on with further research of the most urgent humanitarian issues related to development of the dialogue of cultures and civilizations in today's world, strengthening spiritual and moral foundations of the society, preservation of the priceless heritage left by academician Likhachov that becomes more and more important and relevant every year.

Thank you for your attention!

<sup>1</sup> Paul Mason: The End of Capitalism Has Begun. What's Next? URL: <http://left.by/archives/6825>.

<sup>2</sup> See: *Kutyrev V. A.* Let's Give Everything to Machines!.. And Ourselves as Well? // *Global World: System Shifts, Challenges and Contours of the Future* : the 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 18–20, 2017. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2017. P. 355.

<sup>3</sup> *Humanitarian Challenges of Today's Civilization* : the 6th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 26–27, 2006. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2006. P. 5.