

## Plenary Session

# GLOBAL CONFLICT AND THE CONTOURS OF A NEW WORLD ORDER

---

June 9, 2022.

A. P. Petrov Theatre and Concert Hall, SPbUHSS

### CHAIRPERSONS:

- S. Yu. GLAZYEV *Minister for Integration and Macroeconomics of the Eurasian Economic Commission (Moscow), Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor*
- T. Ya. KHABRIEVA *Director of the Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law under the Government of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Deputy President of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Law), Professor, Honored Lawyer of the Russian Federation, Honored Lawyer of the Republic of Tatarstan, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*
- K. I. KOSACHEV *Deputy Chairman of the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation (Moscow)*
- M. B. PIOTROVSKY *Director of the State Hermitage Museum, member of the Presidium, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Chairman of the St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*
- M. V. SHMAKOV *Member of the State Council of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, Professor Emeritus of SPbUHSS*
- A. S. ZAPESOTSKY *President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS, Academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation*

### SPEAKERS:

- I. I. BUZOVSKY *Deputy Minister of Information of the Republic of Belarus (Minsk), Candidate of Sociological Sciences*
- E. G. DRAPEKO *First Deputy Chairman of the State Duma Committee on Culture of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Deputy to the State Duma of the Russian Federation, Candidate of Sociological Sciences, Honored Artist of the Russian Federation*
- M. S. GUSMAN *First Deputy Director General of the Russian News Agency "TASS" (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (Political Sciences), Professor, Honored Journalist of the Russian Federation, Honored Worker of Culture of the Russian Federation*
- S. I. KISLYAK *First Deputy Chairman of the Committee of the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation on International Affairs (Moscow), Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation to the USA (2008–2017)*
- G. B. KLEINER *Deputy Scientific Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the RAS (Moscow), Head of the Department of System Analysis in Economics of the Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor*
- A. S. MAKSIMOV *Chairman of the Committee on Science and Higher Education of the Government of St. Petersburg, Candidate of Technical Sciences*
- G. METTAN *President of the United Chamber of Industry and Commerce "Switzerland – Russia and CIS States" (Geneva), Executive Director of the Swiss Press Club*
- A. D. NEKIPELOV *Director of Moscow School of Economics at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*
- M. V. ZAKHAROVA *Director of the Information and Press Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary*
- K. F. ZATULIN *First Deputy Chairman of the State Duma Committee of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation on CIS Affairs, Eurasian Integration and Relations with Compatriots (Moscow), Deputy to the State Duma of the Russian Federation, Director of the Institute of CIS Countries*

**M. B. PIOTROVSKY:** – Good afternoon, dear colleagues, I invite Aleksandr Sergeyevich Zapesotsky to speak on behalf of the Organizing Committee of the 20th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Dear friends, we begin the plenary session of the 20th Likhachov Conference.

I am pleased to welcome everyone at our University. For many of you, this is the first time at this forum because the pandemic significantly updated the audience. This year, unlike in the previous years, we prioritized delegates from the Russian Federation over foreign participants.

The idea for this scientific conference was proposed by the first Honorary Doctor of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Academician Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov, who is a symbol of the Russian humanitarian culture and science, of the Russian intelligentsia. He was officially inducted as an Honorary Doctor of St. Petersburg State University of the Humanities and Social Sciences on the stage of the Theater and Concert Hall in 1993.

Initially, this scientific event was called “Days of Science at the St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.” But after Dmitry Sergeyevich passed away in 2001, Daniil Aleksandrovich Granin, Honorary Doctor of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, and I appealed to Russian President Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin with a proposal to immortalize the memory of Dmitry Likhachov. Three days after our letter reached the Presidential Administration, the Decree “On Commemoration of D. S. Likhachov” was issued. Such a rapid response (unprecedented for peacetime) by Vladimir Vladimirovich and his administration, which prepared the documents, speaks of the president’s special attitude toward the personality of D. Likhachov, his scientific and moral legacy, and Likhachov as a spiritual symbol of Russia.

In 1999, shortly before Dmitriy Sergeyevich passed away, I registered the public movement “Congress of Petersburg Intelligentsia” at the initiative of D. A. Granin and following the instructions of Likhachov himself. By coincidence, all of its founding fathers were honorary doctors of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, except for me and one other person who is also our Honorary Doctor today. I will name the founders: D. S. Likhachov, D. A. Granin, Zh. I. Alferov, A. P. Petrov (the composer whose name is given to the hall we are now in), K. Yu. Lavrov (People’s Artist of the USSR, then artistic director of the Bolshoi Drama Theater), M. B. Piotrovsky (Chairman of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intellectuals) and your humble servant (Chairman of the Congress Executive Committee).

Presidential Decree No. 587 of May 23, 2001 “On Commemoration of D. S. Likhachov” contains clause 4, according to which the Congress of Petersburg Intelligentsia is assigned to hold the International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Some time later, Vladimir Vladimirovich supported the International Likhachov Scientific Conference with his grant. In 2022, the socially significant project “20th International Likhachov Scientific Conference” is implemented using a grant from the President of the Russian Federation for the development of civil society, provided by the Presi-

dential Grants Foundation in accordance with Presidential Decree No. 30 of January 30, 2019. The systematic support provided by the President of Russia to the Likhachov Conference explains its unprecedented scale: every year more than 1,500 people take part in the Conference (and 2022 is no exception).

Throughout the entire time, Likhachov Conference was attended by representatives of 59 countries – from Western Europe and the U.S. to Asia, Africa and the Pacific Islands. Every year before the pandemic, more than 25 countries participated in the forum. This year, in view of the difficult political situation and unwilling to put our friends (especially from NATO countries) in a difficult position, we have narrowed the guest list – the Conference is attended by representatives of 8 countries, most of all from Kazakhstan and Belarus, but there are also representatives of Western countries (Australia, Switzerland, Britain, etc.).

Today more than 20 academicians and members of the Russian Academy of Sciences, heads of major research institutes of the RAS, members of the Federation Council and the State Duma of the Russian Federation, representatives of trade unions, over 150 doctors of sciences, professors, representing about 40 regions of our country participate in the 20th Likhachov Conference, suggesting extremely large coverage and representativeness of our forum.

I give the floor to Mikhail Piotrovsky, member of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the State Hermitage and Chairman of the Congress of Petersburg Intelligentsia, to open the 20th International Likhachov Conference.

**M. B. PIOTROVSKY:** – Dear colleagues, I am glad to welcome everyone at the intellectual celebration which is the Likhachov Conference. Today, June 9, is a great day, 350 years since the birth of Peter the Great, so I think it is appropriate to quote D. S. Likhachov’s words about Peter the Great: “Peter’s reforms... were the natural result of the entire development of Russian culture,” that is, essentially, they were not a revolution, but a result of the evolutionary development of Russia.

Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov’s main testament is the “Declaration of the Rights of Culture,” which was prepared at St. Petersburg State University of the Humanities and Social Sciences and which we are working to implement. The Russian tradition is primarily the Roerich Pact (the Treaty for the Protection of Artistic and Scientific Institutions and Historical Monuments) and Dmitry Likhachov’s “Declaration of the Rights of Culture.”

Recently an international conference was held at the St. Petersburg Legislative Assembly to discuss, among other things, the problem of observing cultural rights in the Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics, Abkhazia, Ossetia, and other places. A number of striking examples shows that there is a shift in the way we work to ensure respect of the rights of culture in the world.

After the start of the special operation and “canceling” of Russian culture, it turned out that many Russian exhibitions were abroad. Russia’s cultural “offensive,” including exhibitions in Western countries and the fact that many people had a chance to see them (e.g., “The Morozov Collection. Icons of Modern Art” in Paris, “Faberger in London: Romance to Revolution”), meant that at

such a difficult time the Russian flag flew over the countries of Europe.

The return of the exhibitions to Russia is a great victory, for which we are grateful to embassy officials, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Russian government and many others. To make it work, it was necessary to ensure observance of those guarantees (in particular, concerning the return of exhibitions), which in accordance with the "Declaration of Cultural Rights" and in development of its ideas, were formulated in due time and adopted by efforts of Russia in the global cultural space. All conditions were agreed in advance, so it was possible to put these guarantees to life. The story with the return of the exhibitions to Russia showed who is a friend, who is an enemy, and who took a middle position in the global cultural space.

We associate Dmitry Sergeyevich with memory of the siege of Leningrad and cultural life at that time. The life and efforts during the siege are always on our mind and can be seen as a guide to action. We know how well the system of safeguarding and protecting cultural property was organized during the siege. It was the time of a motto, "When the guns speak, the muses are not silent." Today this motto is more relevant than ever. The siege taught us to speak through its ring, overcoming its boundaries. Cultural events that took place in the besieged Hermitage (such as the Nizami Memorial Festival and others) were held not only for St. Petersburgers, but for the entire world.

Now Russia is also in a partial siege, and we are finding ways to communicate bypassing this ring. Just as the image of the Mother of God appears clearly visible in the clouds, so the phenomena of the Russian culture will be visible to all.

I thank everyone here for being with us today. The topics declared for discussion at 20th International Likhachov Scientific Conference are relevant and interesting, important from the point of view of both today and the future.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you, Mikhail Borisovich. I give the floor to Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov, member of the State Council of the Russian Federation, Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, Professor Emeritus of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

**M. V. SHMAKOV:** – Dear participants, first of all I would like to read greetings from President Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin to the 20th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

'Dear friends,

Congratulations with the opening of the anniversary 20th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Holding your meetings at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences has already become a good tradition. The Likhachov Conference has an eventful agenda and engaged participants – famous scientists and politicians, public figures, representatives of culture and art. This ensures a productive dialogue on the most important problems of our time, substantive discussion of ways to solve them, taking into account the entire range of opinions. That is why the Likhachov Conference attracts unwavering attention of experts and the widest circles of audience.

I hope that this year's forum dedicated to international issues will serve to develop fruitful humanitarian ties, strengthen mutual understanding between countries and peoples, and, of course, become another contribution to the preservation and further study of the rich creative and spiritual heritage of Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov, whose humanitarian ideas are especially relevant and in demand today.

I wish you effective communication and all the best.'

Aleksandr Sergeyevich Zapesotsky described the history of emergence and organization of the Likhachov Conference in sufficient detail. I just want to add that the Federation of Independent Trade Unions is a founder of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences and we are always attentive to all initiatives of the University.

Over 20 years, the Likhachov Conference has become an important event in the global humanitarian and cultural science. We believe that St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences makes a great contribution to the development of our country: trade unions (which include representatives of various professions from different sectors of the economy, production, culture, etc.) understand that the development of culture contributes to economic development, productivity and labor efficiency, no matter what work a person does. At the same time, improvement of culture cannot be effective if the economy does not develop. Only in symbiosis, where one thing flows from the other, can we build a society of free people living and working with dignity, with an objective view of life that is not clouded by various technologies of influencing consciousness, will, and actions.

For my part, I can say that St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences is the best humanitarian university in the world. First, there is not even a hint of such a scientific and educational institution in international trade unions. Second, if we look at the humanities universities that exist in the world as a whole and in our country in particular, we will not find such a unique one as St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. Federation of Independent Trade Unions as the founder is proud of its offspring and will continue to develop the University.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I give the floor to the Deputy President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, a renowned legal scholar, Honorary Doctor of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Academician Tاليا Yarullova Khabrieva.

**T. Ya. KHABRIEVA:** – Dear colleagues, I would like to return to the topic of the plenary session, 'Global Conflict and the Contours of a New World Order.'

As a scientist, my first thought is that to predict the future, we need to assess the present. Such assessments have already been given in the materials presented for the 20th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. First of all, I studied what the legal scholars suggest, and here's what I think: Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov was absolutely right when he urged us to remember that the achievements of civilization must serve the good of people. And law is no exception.

But the question is, how do people feel when globalization advances (sometimes very aggressively) and pandem-

ics have not yet receded, economic wars are being fought, and international tensions are rising? How comfortable are they? Today one dwells in a multidimensional legal space (international, regional, national, local, etc.), but is that an improvement?

Our colleagues in the plenary and panel sessions will try to provide answers to these questions. There are politicians in the audience today who take the first punch, like Maria Vladimirovna Zakharova. But I speak as a legal scholar, so I think that first of all we need to understand what is going on with international law, and then propose a solution.

In assessing the general state of affairs, I can say that international law today is in a crisis (and my colleagues, such as RAS Academician A. G. Lisitsyn-Svetlanov, will agree with me on this). The fragmentation that has plagued international law has led to a loss of universality. Hence there has been a transformation of the common international law, its core, into a normative system of parameters of a unipolar world. It is a dysfunctional system, short-lived, and it is necessary to look for ways out of this situation using science, *inter alia*.

I believe that in this part it is necessary to use all means, scientific and practical, to revive the categorical imperative, the conciliatory nature of international law. It originated and was shaped precisely as the right of consent of sovereign states.

Another rescue trajectory is regionalism, which is also part of international law, but is not in a crisis. Regionalism, according to the logic of the development of civilization, begins to spread actively when globalization trend does not go upward. This is exactly the situation we have now. And the fact of proliferation of the international and regional integration law, these large legal frameworks, shows that it is regionalism that we must pay attention to. A successful example is the Eurasian Economic Union.

What good are these legal frameworks and why is it important to us now? Because these normative systems do not deny the core of international law and advocate the preservation of the UN Charter, universally recognized principles and norms of international law, as proclaimed in the Treaty on the Eurasian Economic Union. I believe that positive development of integration alliances will help us shape the outlines of a secure world as modeled by this union. Expectably, other integration associations, such as the SCO and BRICS, will also evolve. I would call this a “rescue trajectory” as it is one of the directions for creating a multipolar world to which we will aspire.

But there is another direction. In preparing for the conference, I turned to the research conducted by our Institute of Legislation and Comparative Law (in particular, we recently completed a translation of the constitutions of the world, 20 volumes all in all). Judging by the expert commentary, the states, increasingly striving to acquire political sovereignty, want to achieve value sovereignty as well, because the value component in the Constitution is becoming more and more important. Today, the focus of peoples and nations is on worldviews.

The constitutional reform that took place in Russia prepared us for the current situation. Our advantage in this regard is not only that we have returned to our roots, but also that now we can re-establish the legal and legislative system and prepare to create the outlines of a new world order

in which the sovereign rights of states and the cultures of all peoples will be respected.

That is, the vector of evolutionary development will turn not in one direction, which was, in fact, previously imposed on us, but towards recognition of the equality of all cultures and peoples, including the legal culture. In this sense, Article 79 of the Constitution of the Russian Federation was revised in due time: “The Russian Federation may participate in interstate associations and transfer some of its powers to them in accordance with international treaties of the Russian Federation, if this does not entail restrictions on human and civil rights and freedoms and does not contradict the foundations of the constitutional order of the Russian Federation. Decisions of interstate bodies adopted on the basis of provisions of international treaties of the Russian Federation in their interpretation which contradicts the Constitution of the Russian Federation shall not be subject to execution in the Russian Federation.” This article proposes a new relationship between the universal and the national, prepared by efforts of the RF Constitutional Court. In this part, we will be able to provide our citizens with better protections than those that have failed. We are now entitled to replicate our own legal designs.

I wish everyone success and confidence in the future in a stable multipolar world.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you, Talia Yarullova.

Our Conference is held under the auspices of not only the Congress of Petersburg Intelligentsia, but also the Russian Academy of Sciences, as well as with the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs is one of the most respected in our country. Two of its officers are more popular than movie stars – Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov and our amazing guest, Director of the Information and Press Department of the Russian Foreign Ministry Maria Vladimirovna Zakharova. You have the floor, please.

**M. V. ZAKHAROVA:** – Aleksandr Sergeyevich, thank you for the invitation and for the high praise you have given to our work.

First of all, I would like to read the welcome address from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Sergey Viktorovich Lavrov, to the organizers and participants of the 20th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

“I bid a most cordial welcome to organizers and participants of the anniversary 20th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

This event organized at the premises of Saint-Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences has rightfully gained a reputation as one of the important venues for the joint intellectual effort of eminent public figures, scientists and cultural luminaries from various countries. It is inspiring that the experience of academician D. S. Likhachov who has made a priceless contribution in the common heritage of Russian and global culture is in high demand and still used in the search of responses for modern challenges and threats arising from the potential for confliction that has accumulated recently.

The matter of establishment of a truly democratic multipolar world that is studied at the Conference this year is particularly relevant today when we witness such a hot

and strong resistance to the current changes displayed by the states that do not want to lose their dominant position in the system of international relations — the resistance that contradicts all the legal, moral and ethical norms. It is important that special attention during the upcoming discussions is supposed to be paid to assets and culture as well as the place of Russia in the global processes.

I am confident that the work of the forum will be productive, and its result will give momentum to development of cooperation and mutual understanding between peoples for the purpose of solving global problems.

I wish you all fruitful discussions and all the best.”

During the plenary session, we will discuss the contours of a new world order, which is the theme of the session.

Today one often hears the phrase (from political scientists and public figures on television, radio, and the Internet): the international system that has evolved over the past decades has changed dramatically, the architecture of international relations has been completely transformed, the familiar, established format of communication is becoming a thing of the past, and so on. But it seems to me that this is not entirely true. We need to be more precise in wording, especially when the ones who speak are not participants of mass events, rallies and talk shows, but people who are engaged in science.

The system of international relations is fluid, it changes every day, responding to challenges and thus shaping reality when new circumstances arise. This process is like the flow of a river that changes every second.

What is happening today? In my opinion, new factors and arguments are appearing on the international agenda and are being presented to Russia. These factors are so global and serious that they cannot be ignored.

You can assess the place of the Russian Federation in the world however you want – as a regional player or as a global power; in any case, what is presented to us as an argument in international relations forms the agenda not in the regional, but in the global scale, because deep processes have been affected in all areas and in all parts of the globe. It would be misleading to think that everything that is happening now is a response to some specific recent facts and the apparent (for us) lack of respect for our country. In fact, this is not only about Russia as a regional player. It is a deeply thought-out and, in fact, suffered-out response to the processes that were taking place in the world in the late twentieth to early twenty-first century, which have already begun to change reality little by little, leading it to apocalypse. For two decades, Russia has offered the world, and especially those who called themselves the dominant power, a dialogue on an equal footing and in a respectful manner. By “dialogue” I do not mean communication between two subjects, but the development of new principles for the collective construction of the world order. And what was the response to our suggestions? The West’s unwavering, almost maniacal conviction of its infallibility and uniqueness. And most surprisingly, they did not even find it necessary to somehow soften it or put it in a more or less diplomatic form. On the contrary, their stance was rigidly manifested and also imposed on the rest of the world as a concept for perception of reality.

Undoubtedly, the events taking place today will be the subject of careful scholarly analysis. But I would like to suggest a way that we, the contemporaries, should see them.

Many people see this crisis as something dramatic and get discouraged. But those who know the history understand that this is the moment of profound change. A renewal must take place, the secondary and superficial things will fade into the background, and instead a new mainstream path of further world development will emerge.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Maria Vladimirovna, thank you. I give the floor to Konstantin Fedorovich Zatulín.

**K. F. ZATULIN:** – Aleksandr Sergeevich, I am flattered to be named the candidate of historical science, but I do not have an academic degree. I never got my Ph. D. in history. I was doing my post-graduate studies in the early 1980s, and when I tried to defend my thesis and said that we needed an overhaul of industrial management (the topic of my thesis was “Industrial Management from 1965 to 1980”), they wrote in the review of my work that while we did have problems in agriculture, there was nothing wrong with industry and we did not need any overhaul. As a result, the defense did not take place. This was the period when the country was led by Konstantin Ustinovich Chernenko. Then he was succeeded by Mikhail Gorbachev, and the word “perestroika” (overhaul) became common.

When I saw a heading in the mass media “Twentieth Likhachov Conference: Zakhárova to reveal the essence of the West, and Zatulín to solve the Ukrainian question,” a famous saying of Kozma Prutkov came to my mind: “A specialist is like a gum-boil; his fullness is one-sided.” I have never sought to be perceived as an expert on Ukraine. Nevertheless, I am always, and now even more often than usual, invited to talk shows and other programs and events devoted specifically to the situation in Ukraine. Today we will also discuss this pressing topic in a panel discussion, but without ignoring other issues.

So what is going on in Ukraine? First of all, it seems to me that we should leave all these definitions – “hybrid war,” “proxy war” and the like – to narrow specialists. But it would also be wrong to reduce everything to the concept of a “special military operation.” In the early weeks, as you know, there was finger-pointing at those who said “war” instead of a “special military operation.” But as it becomes increasingly clear that we are fighting not only and not so much against the Zelensky regime in Ukraine as against the collective West, this military operation is turning before our eyes not just into a war, but into a domestic war, because the future of our country, the Russian Federation, depends on the outcome of everything that is happening. What will it become as a result, what will happen to Ukraine, Russia, and the whole world? I believe that’s how most of the population of our country perceives it. It is for the sake of Russia’s future that our people, understanding essentially what is happening, are ready to accept hardships and privations (preferably, of course, without them being catastrophic), and our military, engaged in this operation, are acting as their fathers and grandfathers did in the fronts of past wars, that is, with full responsibility, losing health and their very lives, but achieving their goals.

I think it makes no sense now to analyze in detail whether things could have turned out differently. Of course, it would have been desirable if there had been forces in Ukraine able to prevent this armed conflict before February 24. For many years, starting not even from 2014, but from

1991, efforts were made both inside and outside Ukraine to redirect it from the anti-Russia and now essentially anti-Russian path, because an anti-Russia state with mathematical precision turns into an anti-Russian state, which is what is happening today with the official Ukraine. But at the same time, our geopolitical rivals were trying their best to realize their goals that were the opposite of ours. They saw Ukraine as a convenient means to prevent the revival of Russia, to create problems for us for many years to come. But we have to admit that all attempts to solve these problems by humane methods, without taking matters to the point of a military confrontation, have proven futile.

Of course, we have had some effect through propaganda and other peaceful activities. We can see that those people who are now in the zone of action of our armed forces in Ukraine, not only in the territory of Donetsk and Lugansk regions, but also in Kherson, Zaporozhye, and Kharkov regions, quickly come back to an understanding of what really happened, because they know how forced Ukrainization was carried out in its time. Let me remind you that it took place under Soviet rule, in the 1920s and early 1930s. In such cases, sooner or later the opposite process begins.

Among my colleagues who are historians, including those whom I have known for decades, there are many highly qualified specialists who, like my classmate Aleksey Il'yich Miller, for some reason believe that Ukrainization is irreversible. Ukrainians are a different nation, and nothing else. But I believe that these processes are reversible, and everything depends on our efforts. Some may think we're fighting for territories, but we're really fighting for people. This needs to be understood. However, in our practical work, unfortunately, we do not always take this into account. At a time when our troops are sacrificing their lives, we, here in the rear, in the State Duma and the Federation Council, in the Presidential Administration and the Government, are inexcusably slow to respond to the needs of the new times. The organization of our economy, measures for refugees and unwilling migrants, and many other things attest to this.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you, Konstantin Fedorovich. Elena Grigorievna Drapeko, Honored Artist of Russia, is invited to the podium. Dear friends, I must say that Elena Grigorievna agreed to the demotion the moment she became a member of the State Duma: before that she was a professor at the St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

**E. G. DRAPEKO:** – Dear colleagues, I am happy to welcome you at another Likhachov Conference. I am eternally grateful to the University for having found the warmest support here during the difficult time in 1993. It was at the University that I, an actress, was taught to approach any problem from a scientific point of view, to translate ordinary human language into the language of scientific works.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Professor Drapeko, like all other professors at our university, had a certain pedagogical rating set on a 100-point scale. Her rating was invariably between 99 and 100!

**E. G. DRAPEKO:** – Today I would like to take this opportunity to talk about the essential. What worries today's

deputies of the State Duma, forced to make both popular and unpopular decisions? We have real positional battles – debates about how the Russian Federation should act in today's international environment and how Russian culture should respond to the challenges of our time.

We continue to implement national projects, including in the field of culture. We are making rural culture centers more modern and comfortable, creating model libraries – and these are real palaces of knowledge! We are modernizing theaters for young audiences and children's puppet theaters. Russian cinematography receives a great deal of support; domestic films are being made, although with varying success. The program for the protection of historical and cultural monuments continues, and many are being restored. I think it is all very noticeable in St. Petersburg, but in other cities, too, it is quite tangible.

And what are the challenges of today? Mikhail Borisovich Piotrovsky talked about how we are fighting back on the outer contours, trying to reach out to our colleagues abroad through the barrier that fences us off, especially in Western Europe, which has chosen the path of canceling Russia. But inside the country some contradictions have also worsened, especially among the Russian intelligentsia. Since the 1990s our intelligentsia has been in a state of partial anemia, in my opinion, especially after the shooting of the White House in 1993. But today there is a change of vectors, which has exposed a lot of problems. We are trying to find a solution how to avoid a split in the society, and, on the contrary, consolidate it. We need to hear from everyone, both those who are “for the Reds” and those who are “for the Whites.” Because the rift runs along the very fracture that has been present in our society since the 1990s. I think we'll find a way out and we can come to an agreement. Such a large-scale forum as the Likhachov Scientific Conference will certainly contribute to this good cause.

Despite the success of the national project, the cultural management system in Russia still has to be improved. When demanding loyalty from cultural actors, the state must take the first step toward them. But how does the state help cultural actors? Creative unions have effectively been declared Stalinist collective farms and deprived of any support other than grants. The officials who sit in administrations, expert councils of the Ministry of Culture and other agencies are not representatives of cultural actors, but of their own persons. I think this is the main problem we need to solve, because associations of artists or intelligentsia express a common position. But their voices are not heard.

Another important and eternal topic is, who are the judges? Take cinema. On the one hand, producers are counting the proceeds from distribution; on the other hand, directors win prizes at international festivals in the nomination “Best spit toward Russia.” You know the names. They are the ones who define our elite today, who make assessments about what's going on. I think this is a very important problem. Culture has no other evaluations than expertise. It is impossible to weigh or measure the quality of this or that film – you can only evaluate it.

As for such a painful issue as monument protection, we have adopted many laws and bylaws in this area. I introduced another bill for consideration. It will regulate the use and preservation of architectural monuments which are now residential buildings, and ensure that the interests of citizens

living there are respected. I hope that we will discuss these problems in more detail.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Elena Grigorievna, you are always welcome and we are waiting for you on the first of September with a lecture about the protection of monuments. And now the floor is given to Academician Sergey Yuryevich Glazyev.

**S. Yu. GLAZYEV:** – Thank you, Aleksandr Sergeyevich. First of all, let me congratulate you and your wonderful university on the anniversary Likhachov Conference. I am very pleased to be able to participate in it once again and to pass on to you the congratulations from the Eurasian Economic Commission.

Dear colleagues, as you know, we are creating the Eurasian Economic Union, in which we really lack the humanitarian dimension. Just two weeks ago the Eurasian Economic Forum took place; at the center of its attention were issues of culture and humanitarian cooperation. In the situation of dramatic trials experienced by our country and its allies it is very important to feel a spiritual affinity, common historic roots and a cultural basis that helps us build a future together. I would like to invite you, Aleksandr Sergeyevich, and your colleagues to join our initiative to create the Eurasian Network University. We believe that your participation will greatly benefit this project.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Gladly, we will be honored.

**S. Yu. GLAZYEV:** – Turning to the topic of our discussion, I must say that everything that is happening today was predicted by our academic science. More than fifteen years ago we developed a theory of long-term economic development as a shift of technological and world economic modes. And today, in full accordance with the scientific forecast, we are experiencing a dramatic moment: a technological revolution that radically changes the world's technological structure, and a governance revolution that completely changes the balance of power in the world.

This is the fifth transition in the history of mankind in the last 500 years, and such a transitions, unfortunately, has always been accompanied by world wars. We also foresaw the current events, and I can say with certainty how it will end: the defeat of the aggressor. Ten years ago I published a report titled “The Last World War: The U.S. starts and loses.” Every time when the world economical patterns change, the countries that had dominated up to that point try to maintain their hegemony at all costs and wage world wars against their competitors in order to maintain their leadership. In the last century, Britain, seeking to maintain its hegemony, first unleashed the First World War and then provoked the Second, in which more than a hundred million people died. Monstrous figures. But as a result, the British Empire collapsed, because by that time it was already less efficient than its competitors – the United States and the Soviet Union, which had built the new world economy. Now it is crumbling, as did the previous ones. This cycle lasts about 30 years, and we predict that we will have another two or three years of military escalation in which the American ruling elite will unsuccessfully try to crush its rivals.

As always, a new leader will eventually emerge, and we can already see it. The countries of Southeast Asia have al-

ready formed a new world economic order. China and India are now overtaking the United States and the European Union in terms of production volumes. The destructive actions taken by the U.S., from sanctions to the cultivation of Nazi regimes against us, objectively entail consolidation of a new center of the world economy. There is no doubt that in five years the Southeast Asia will finally come to dominate the world economic system. The Eurasian Economic Union is well attuned to the current events: we are rapidly changing the structure of our economic relations by strengthening the ties with strategic partners in Southeast Asia. We intend to propose to our partners the creation of an anti-war coalition, one of the goals of which will be to break free from dependence on Western currencies – dollar, euro, pound. Instead we suggest to issue a new world currency, with its own exchange space and pricing system. I'm sure it will all come to fruition, but in due time. The next two or three years will be decisive in this regard.

Unfortunately, as in the previous dramatic eras, the main strike of the aggressor is directed against Russia. This is largely the result of the Russophobia inherent in the so-called geopolitics (a pseudo-science created in its time by the British and German thinkers). Russophobia calls for the destruction of Russia, because in the mythological constructions of Western politicians, the key to controlling the world lies in controlling Eurasia whose main actor is Russia. Therefore, fueled by utopian doctrinaire ideas, they are now unleashing their full power against us.

According to our predictions, the confrontation will peak in 2024. We have to survive this fight. As correctly noted by Konstantin Fedorovich, this global hybrid war differs from previous ones primarily because it is not fought for territory, but for the minds, influence, control of the global financial system, whereas the actual military action is used mainly for punitive purposes. Undoubtedly the victory will be ours, but I wish it had been less bloody. A modern understanding of the nature and driving forces of this war suggests that the key to victory lies in creation of a broad international anti-war coalition, restoration of international law, and formation of a new world economic order. And we, the Eurasian Economic Commission, are looking forward to your recommendations, because this war is not only a military operation, but above all a humanitarian one. I want to wish all my colleagues every success, and hope for further fruitful cooperation.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you, Sergey Yuryevich. I give the floor to Konstantin Iosifovich Kosachev.

**K. I. KOSACHEV:** – I will begin with a thought I loved from the famous German writer and philosopher Lion Feuchtwanger, who once rightly said that people watch the course of events the way children watch the clock: all their attention is fixed on the movement of the second hand, and they do not look at the minute hand, much less the hour hand. This is still the case today when we talk about events in and around Russia. Of course, I would like it very much to talk about specific events and about the course of the special military operation, about our relations with our neighbors in Europe and Asia, but I always try to distance myself from the situation, placing it in the context of the essential processes that continue to develop in the human history.

If we count the history of mankind since the appearance of homo sapiens some 200,000 years ago, then the period from Ancient Rome to the present day is the last half-hour on the clock face. And the entire history of our country, starting with, say, Rurik, is nine minutes. So what has been going on in the last hundred days is much less than a second. If you exclude the history of ancient peoples, I think you would agree that the last four to six centuries can be described as a history of the West's ceaseless attempts to master the rest of the globe. This occurred in many different forms and methods, sometimes in downright monstrous ways. We remember the largest genocide in the history of mankind – extermination of Indians in the North American continent, when about 15 million people died. Let me remind you that about six million people were victims of the Holocaust.

Be that as it may, at the initial stage the West did manage to secure itself an advantage over the rest of the world by being the first to master new technologies. Seafaring, the use of firearms, and the assembly-line organization of production enabled one of the first industrial revolutions. The West's advanced position in the world has long been attributed to its ability to do many things better than other nations have done elsewhere.

But with the advent of the twentieth century, the situation suddenly began to change. There were at least two reasons for that. First, the humanity has reached a relatively high degree of moral development. The advance of morality means that it is considered indecent to oppress other peoples by force and make them work for you, as was the case during the colonial era. Second, other nations are slowly gaining strength and becoming ready to compete with the West, no longer taking its leadership for granted. In my view, this was the main trend of the twentieth century: emergence of many centers of power and beginning of a real, inherently healthy competition.

What is happening at this moment to the West, spoilt by centuries of leadership and sincerely believing in its own exclusivity and being God-chosen? In countries of the West they truly believe that they bring prosperity and happiness. Those who doubt it are seen as evil opposing the good. However, the West is no longer able to “naturally” maintain its leadership position, so it begins to do all it can to contain its competitors. That is, from now on, it is an increasingly obvious strategy to keep other countries in a more backward position, creating impediments to their development.

The whole world has clearly seen these trends over the last 30 years, in the post-Cold War period. The policy for containment of competitors has become the main tool for Western countries to realize their geopolitical interests. In this context, I would note the following: we have not yet fully realized that the globalization we love so much was in fact one of the instruments of subjugation of others by those who invented globalization and at some point began to manage it.

What happened now? The West's policy of containment ended in failure. First Russia, and then, increasingly more, China, rushed forward heedless of this policy. By now many countries are participating in this rally. But the decisive stage came in February this year. There is no need to pretend anymore: the West has moved from a policy of containment to a policy of destruction, in this case of Russia. The same thing is certain to happen to any other coun-

try that does not want to fit into the concept of a unipolar world. There is no doubt that this is a war of annihilation.

The way out of this situation will not be quick. I think it is obvious to everyone that what is happening to Ukraine and Russia is only a small part of what is happening to the mankind. We came to a fork in the road, after which, like in the old comedy “Kidnapping, Caucasian Style,” we go either to the registry office or to the prosecutor. I am convinced that we have every opportunity to achieve first normalization, and then harmonization of international relations, but not under the principles that the West imposes, but under those that our country proposed to the world 30 years ago, defended them in the Charter of Paris for the New Europe and other documents up to December last year, when we put forward the well-known initiatives for a collective security organization. We were not heard in either case. Today we are undergoing severe trials, but sooner or later we will be heard; it is inevitable because there are simply no other alternatives for the development of mankind. We are on the right side of history.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you, Konstantin Iosifovich. I invite Professor Andrey Stanislavovich Maksimov to the podium.

**A. S. MAKSIMOV:** – Dear colleagues, It has already been mentioned here that today Russia celebrates 350th anniversary of Peter the Great. We are in the city founded by Peter, the cradle of science and education of the Russian Empire. Therefore, allow me to take advantage of the honorable mission and read the congratulations of the governor of St. Petersburg Aleksandr Dmitrievich Beglov to the participants, organizers and guests of the 20th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

“Welcome to Saint Petersburg, to the 20th International Likhachov Scientific Conference!

Over two decades a largescale forum brings together public and political figures from Russia and countries of near and far abroad, people of science, culture and arts on the banks of the Neva River. This momentous event ranks high in the life of the Northern Capital and the international humanities community. We cherish the legacy of the talented scholar and educator – Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov, we are proud that he lived and worked in our city, that Russian culture can preserve the experience and traditions of different peoples of the world and assimilate the best aspects of humanity. These thoughts and observations of his acquire special value and significance when compared with the topic of the anniversary Conference “Global Conflict and the Contours of a New World Order.”

I am sure that your fruitful work will encourage further reinforcement of people-to-people ties and will become a foundation for new educational projects.

I wish you good health, well-being, productive and interesting discussions!”

I would like to draw attention to two other points. First, congratulations to all of us that after two years of the pandemic, we have the happy opportunity of truly getting together, seeing each other's eyes and smiles. It is especially wonderful that this is happening now at the 20th International Likhachov Conference.

Second, as Aleksandr Sergeyevich stressed, the international component of the Conference is very important for us



this year. On behalf of the Administration of St. Petersburg, I would like to express my gratitude and admiration for my colleagues from abroad, especially from those countries that pursue an unfriendly policy toward the Russian Federation. Today they are accomplishing a feat. And let me remind you of a wonderful thought of Anton Chekhov, classic of Russian literature: “There is no national science, just as there is no national multiplication table; what is national is no longer science.” I wish you continued success!

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Thank you, Andrey Stanislavovich. And our deepest gratitude to Aleksandr Dmitrievich.

Dear colleagues, the floor is given to Aleksandr Dmitriyevich Nekipelov, a prominent Russian economic scientist and Honorary Doctor of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

**A. D. NEKIPELOV:** – I join all congratulations on the beginning of the 20th International Likhachov Conference. It’s a great pleasure to take part in it, especially after a two-year (for me, even three-year) break.

I would like to briefly speak about the economic problems we have faced. These problems are outlined against the background of serious changes in the world economic order, which, it seems to me, became particularly evident after the global financial and economic crisis of 2007–2009. It marked a turning point. Globalization has created an increasingly homogeneous market space in which firms and individuals were the main agents, with the state receding into the background. The prospect, albeit remote, was creation of a world government. After the crisis, globalization began to roll back, and for a number of reasons, in countries that were proponents of reducing the role of the state, this role was especially manifest. This was the case because previously state institutions in these countries were left out, and the trends of world development acted to their benefit.

For Russia, of course, the situation is now aggravated by large-scale sanctions. We faced a whole set of serious economic shocks: we were pushed out of international technology chains, and that led to shocks on both the demand and supply sides. Actually, problems of this kind had already existed during the pandemic, but now they have become long-term. It is obvious that a long and difficult period of transformation of the Russian economy is ahead – changing the nature of cooperation with other countries and transforming the entire production structure.

Importantly, a feature of our economy which has always been seen as its weakness, can become the key to its sustainability. I am talking about the fuel and raw materials orientation of Russia’s economy. In this situation, the availability of almost the entire spectrum of natural resources and a fairly high level of agricultural development are of great importance. It seems that the countries that imposed sanctions on Russia miscalculated this circumstance.

Of course, there are problems associated with the changing location of economic resources. Some of these problems can be solved naturally by the market – in this sense, e.g., actions aimed at stimulating small-scale production are absolutely justified. Some changes may occur under the influence of relatively small adjustments in the functioning of the economic system, and in this case, too, the market mechanism is likely to work effectively. However, serious strategic decisions will be necessary to restore our position

in many technological areas. The state will have to play an important role in the redistribution of resources.

A separate group of issues, which I will omit now, has to do with the changes that have taken place in the monetary and financial sphere. I want to mention only one thing. We have to keep a very close eye on the current account of the country’s balance of payments. In the first quarter of 2022, the current account surplus was \$58.2 billion, two and a half times higher than in the first quarter last year. Now the situation with settlements in currencies of unfriendly states is unstable, and the funds in the accounts of not only the Central Bank, but also private structures may be in danger. We need to take this into account.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Today outstanding Russian diplomat Sergei Ivanovich Kislyak is participating in the Conference for the first time. He was Russia’s ambassador to the United States for a little less than ten years and witnessed, for example, the transition from B. Obama to D. Trump, and many other book-worthy events. He is now first deputy chairman of the Federation Council Committee on International Affairs.

**S. I. KISLYAK:** – The very first hours of the Conference prove the high intellectual level of the discussion that is unfolding in this forum: twenty years of experience have an impact. The Likhachov Conference already has a deep tradition, and of course, will develop further, continuing to help us better understand the events taking place in the country and the world. It makes me very happy to see so many young faces in the audience. It is not easy for the young people to understand the current situation and how it will develop; the fact that science helps them to do this is invaluable.

Returning to the topic of our meeting, I would like to say that I will have to be a dissident for a while: I do not fully agree with our basic thesis that there is a global conflict going on. There are many conflicts on the planet, each of them affecting the development of the world order to a greater or lesser extent. The objective reality is that the world is changing. In recent decades, new centers of economic power have emerged, which means the emergence of new centers of political and, in the long term, military power. It would seem that the important world players – Russia, Europe, and the United States – agree with this. However, in fact, Russia accepts the objective reality as it is, while the U.S. does not.

Americans see themselves as exclusive people who should lead the rest of us and, moreover, have the right of dominance to promote their own interests – economic, military and political. Hence the American thesis that the world now rests not only on international law but also on international rules. These rules have been shaped over the past decades by the United States and its allies in their quest for world domination.

Nevertheless, Americans cannot ignore the fact China is growing stronger. This is the biggest challenge to the U.S. at the moment, including the military aspect.

Russia also challenges U.S. security, although they consider this challenge to be short-term. Over the past decades, the concept of containment of Russia has been created, and this definition has evolved from “restraining” and “holding back” to “detention.” All of these words translate almost

identically into Russian, but have different operative meanings. In the case of Russia, containment over the past decade or so has included three components.

The first component is military-political containment. It is realized by deploying forces near our borders and encouraging anti-Russian sentiment in the countries around us. Ukraine in this sense is the most striking, but not the solitary example. The second component is economic containment. The sanctions policy against Russia is not just a response to Russia's determination to defend its interests; it is part of a policy (now brought to the extreme) of containing Russia's development so that it does not become a serious competitor to the United States. The third component, which we often forget, is the psychological impact on our citizens, aimed at destabilizing the country from within. Never throughout the entire history of our confrontation with the United States, not even during the Cold War, efforts to hack our mentality from within have reached such an intensity, such a scale of funding and coordination with allied nations. The consequences of this impact will be felt by us for years to come, and this must be taken into account when building models of economic development and shaping approaches to the relationship between international and domestic law.

If you look at what our Western colleagues are saying about relations with Russia, you can see that they are mainly interested in what will happen when the military conflict in Ukraine is over. I'm sure it will end on our terms, but really, what is to be expected then? There seems to be a general consensus among Western political scientists that the era of the peace dividends is over and will never resume, or at least not for the foreseeable future. This economic, political, or even propaganda category characterizes the state's ability to divert the funds that went to military purposes during conflicts to domestic economic development. Consequently, from now on, the West will build its economy on the premises of military and political pressure. Can we withstand it? In my opinion, yes, but this point must necessarily be taken into account.

Western scientists disagree in their estimates of what the world will be like after the special operation. The range of opinions is very wide: from a tense Cold War to an enlightened society in which everyone understands that it is necessary to consider the interests of others, to develop consensus solutions, and to strive for peaceful coexistence.

I believe this optimistic theory is realistic, but its realization will require enormous effort and a great deal of time.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Sergey Ivanovich, we hope that this will not be your last visit to the University. I ask our guest from Belarus, its Deputy Minister for Information and prominent sociologist Igor Ivanovich Buzovsky, to take the podium.

**I. I. BUZOVSKY:** – The representatives of Belarus feel that we have been given tremendous trust to let us speak at the Likhachov Conference at such a difficult time. In my report I quoted a classic: “When face to face, there is no face to see. The big things, to be seen, require distance.” Recent events in the Republic of Belarus confirm this. There is a concept of “emotional pacifism” – compassion and concern felt for reasons that seem unreasonable and incomprehensible to most people. What happened in

the Republic of Belarus can be repeated in any post-Soviet country.

We witnessed scary events. No one could have imagined that such a thing was possible in the year of the 75th anniversary of the Great Victory: in the main square of the country, mad (there is no other word for it) people covered the stele “Minsk – Hero-City” with a flag, which is associated with the betrayal committed during that war, and proclaimed slogans about truth and justice, causing common delight.

These events clearly demonstrated the trends taking place in our society. In fact, it is struck by schizophrenia: the ideals, meanings, and values that help understand what is “good” and what is “bad” are lost. We have lost the strategy of development, the vision of where we are going. The results of opinion polls conducted by Belarusian sociologists before the 2020 presidential election are revealing. It turned out that the vast majority of the population prefers a market development strategy, but at the same time points to the need to preserve the benefits and social privileges. This imbalance in value priorities leads to further value transformations, which is one of the problems of the current stage of development of the Republic of Belarus.

International studies have revealed that the residents of the Republic of Belarus consider such values as health and family as a priority. It would seem that nothing is wrong with that. But is such a trend really positive? The foregrounding of these values leads us away from global approaches to society's development strategy. The results of studies show that individualism and egoism are characteristic of Belarusians. Why aren't we talking about patriotism and collectivism, which were priorities before? Today, as we can see, the situation is just the opposite.

I would like to make one point to everyone in the room. We declare that we adhere to certain values: Christian, family values. But have we articulated them? Is there a list of such values that could become a reference point for each of us, unite not only the inhabitants of one country, but perhaps the entire global community? Either because of a misunderstanding of its importance, or because of a desire to promote tolerance of certain views, we still do not have a clear list of values that would unite the society.

The Chinese society has developed such a list. At one of the Congresses of the Chinese Communist Party, values were clearly defined and subsequently spelled out not only in political documents, but also in state orders for books, films, etc. I believe we also need to begin to form such a set of values as soon as possible.

Aleksandr Sergeevich, I would like to invite you to the Day of Belarusian Written Language, which is celebrated on the first Sunday of September. For this holiday, we plan to create a set of books that would detail one of those values that unite the society: justice. I invite you to join me in a discussion about the relevance of this value. By the way, the event will be held on the border of three countries – Russia, Ukraine and Belarus.

I wish fruitful work to all the participants of the plenary session!

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Igor Ivanovich, we are pleased to accept your invitation on behalf of the University. I give the floor to Mikhail Solomonovich Gusman, First Deputy General Director of the TASS News Agency, Doctor of

Political Science, Professor, Honored Journalist of Russia, Honored Cultural Worker of Russia.

**M. S. GUSMAN:** – First of all, there are two things that make me very happy. The first is that the word “pandemic” has been mentioned only a few times in the past two hours. The second is that the work of the Likhachov Conference resumed, and we finally met again.

On September 1, 2022, TASS will be 118 years old. For all these years, the agency’s staff has gathered every morning for a planning meeting. In November 2019, these planners began to talk more and more about the disturbing news coming from our office in Beijing.

However, we could not imagine what expected the world in the very near future, including the scale of the information chaos in which it would find itself. Mankind was clinging to the screens of TVs and computers. It was a huge challenge for the information workers: we had an increased responsibility for the reliability and accuracy of the data related to the disaster that befell the planet. It seems to me that journalists from TASS, Russia’s oldest and, in my opinion, still leading agency, and their colleagues around the world have handled this challenge.

We remember that there were all kinds of versions of the origin of the coronavirus, all kinds of predictions about the situation, and opinions changed as new information emerged. The importance of digital media has grown dramatically, and they are now the undisputed market leaders. We can no longer imagine the print media without the digital version.

New threats have also emerged, especially the gigantic volume of fake information and cyber attacks. These threats intimidate any public institution, but especially information structures.

Here’s an example. TASS is one of the state institutions most well-protected from cyberattacks, as far as civilian organizations are concerned. Before the pandemic, there were powerful cyber attacks about once every two months, then they became more frequent, and now there are attempts to break into our systems almost every week. We are going through a very difficult period. Of course, the problems I mentioned are experienced not only by TASS and not only in our country, but they are especially relevant for us due to the fact that Russia has been involved in information warfare for many years now. With the start of the special operation, the number of information attacks on our country has increased many times over.

Response to these challenges must be highly professional. My words will sound trite, but I believe that the only response in this situation should be to place accurate, verified, objective and balanced information in the Russian media. Only the truth can be a weapon to win the information war.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I give the floor to Georgy Borisovich Kleiner, Deputy Scientific Director of the Central Institute of Economics and Mathematics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

**G. B. KLEINER:** – I would like to speak about spiritual aspects, which, in my opinion, play a defining role in the society today. Now the world is fractured, it is falling apart. Consolidation in the form of a collective West or other alli-

ances is temporary. The current international situation can be compared to a kaleidoscope: a small movement changes the whole picture.

What, in these circumstances, can serve as factors for strengthening the interaction between states, companies, and other entities? In my opinion, there are four such factors. Under the vaults of this wonderful hall, where the Likhachov Conference is being held for the twentieth time, ideas are swirling that should consolidate us. Political scientists, sociologists, economists – we are all members of the same scientific community. The idea of consolidation, in my view, must be based on four pillars – the interaction of the intellect, the interaction of the soul, the interaction of culture, and the interaction of influence. These types of interactions must strategically shape the structure of the future world.

What is intelligence? We say that it is necessary to come to a society of knowledge. Knowledge is important, but it is the result of the activity of the intellect; it is the intellect that produces, stores and develops it.

The second factor is the soul. The intellect creates the structure of the world, and the soul brings emotion, humanity, spirituality into it. We are at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, and it seems to me that it is on a humanitarian basis that spiritual interaction between countries in today’s fracturing world should be built.

The third factor is culture. Culture in this case refers to that which unites the past, the present, and the future, marking the trajectory of social development.

So, soul, intellect, culture, influence (or inspiration) are the factors that can prevent world disunity. Note that these are social factors, and they could, in my opinion, play a role that other kinds of factors, such as economic ones, could not. Each of these areas of public interaction should have leaders recognized by all. Intellectual leaders, spiritual leaders, cultural leaders, and leaders of influence must participate in governance on an equal footing with the formal structures of countries and corporations.

Thus, the four-pillar leadership structure, complementary to the formal governance structure, is, in my view, the only possible basis for peace consolidation in modern conditions.

This is the tenth time I’ve spoken at the Likhachov Conference, and I can say that the ideas that were proposed in this room were mainly aimed at integration and joint forward movement of the humanity.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Let me give the floor to our guest from Switzerland, a man of amazing courage who not only took a principled position on the Russian question, but publicly stated this position. I ask Mr. Guy Mettan, President of the Union of Chambers of Commerce Switzerland–Russia and CIS Countries, Executive Director of the Swiss Press Club (Geneva), to come to the podium.

**M. V. ZAKHAROVA:** – As Mr. Guy Mettan walks to the podium, I want to say that he has become one of the most quoted public figures and journalists of recent times by the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I sincerely recommend everyone to read his seminal work “The West vs Russia: a thousand year long war. The History of Russophobia from Charlemagne to the Ukrainian Crisis.” The book is

dedicated to the culture of “cancelling” of our country, the history of this phenomenon: after all, it did not arise today, but centuries ago. The publication has been translated into Russian and is available in the original. You will really enjoy reading it.

**G. METTAN:** – Dear friends, I am very glad to be here today. I would like to thank Rector A. Zapesotsky for the invitation. It was very important for me to get to this meeting. I have come a long way from Switzerland. Until February 24, Switzerland was a three-hour flight away from Russia. Three months had passed, and now it takes twelve hours of flight to reach Russia. Thanks to European governments, Russia is now as far from Switzerland as Australia is. This is what European progress and efficiency have led to.

Let me speak about words, because words, as you know, are very important. Words can save and create, but they can also kill and destroy. That’s why they are so meaningful. You know from history books that in every dictatorship words have been manipulated. For example, at the time of the Nazi Germany, Hitler and Goebbels tried to manipulate the vocabulary of the German language. They formed new words and changed the meaning of the old ones. Jewish philologist Victor Klemperer was able to survive the Holocaust and wrote two important books. Over the 12 years of the Third Reich, he analyzed every change in the vocabulary of the German language made under Nazi pressure. Goebbels, the propaganda minister, said, “We don’t want to convince people of the rightness of our ideas. We want to reduce the vocabulary of the language so that it reflects only our ideas.”

On the other hand, the writer George Orwell, in his famous novel 1984, describes the new language of the dictatorship and how the Ministry of Truth and the Thought Police were able to shape the new vocabulary of the English language.

Basically, now there is somewhat of a soft dictatorship in the countries of the West. This soft dictatorship invents a new language which I termed the soft language. The soft language is trying to “sweeten” everything, make former concepts nice and sleek. On the one hand, it is highly technocratic, its speakers using and abusing words such as “cost-effectiveness,” “profitability,” “tough measures,” and “competitiveness.” On the other hand, this language is highly emotional: it is full of words like “discrimination,” “discrimination based on sexual orientation,” “gender discrimination,” “racial discrimination,” “human rights,” “democracy,” etc. Its speakers overuse words like “LGBT,” etc.

In conclusion, I would like to quote Confucius. Confucius has two very meaningful phrases. “When words lose their meaning, people lose their freedom.” And he also said, “If names are wrong, words have no basis. If words have no basis, then deeds cannot be accomplished. If deeds cannot be accomplished <...> people do not know how to behave.”

This is why the first thing the government must do is restore true meanings in the world. I would be grateful to you if you could help restore the meaning of my words to my European colleagues.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – After the break we will have a very promising continuation: a discussion between charismatic personalities who know how to argue and have a good understanding of the subject. I thank you all.