

## Plenary Session DIALOGUES AND CONFLICTS OF CULTURES IN THE CHANGING WORLD

---

May 25, 2023

A. P. Petrov Theatre and Concert Hall, SPbUHSS

### CHAIRPERSONS:

- V. A. CHERESHNEV *Deputy President of the RAS, member of the Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Chief Researcher of the Institute of Immunology and Physiology of the Ural Branch of the RAS (Ekaterinburg), Dr. Sc. (Medicine), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*
- O. ROQUEPLO *Professor of Sorbonne University (Paris, France), Dr. Sc. (History), Dr. Sc. (Political Sciences)*
- M. SANAEI *Senior Advisor to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Iran, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Russian Federation (2013–2019), Ph. D. in Political Sciences*
- M. V. SHMAKOV *Member of the State Council of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, Chairman of the Trustee Council of SPbUHSS, 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, Chairman of the Executive Committee of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress*

### SPEAKERS:

- I. I. BUZOVSKY *Deputy Minister of Information of the Republic of Belarus (Minsk), Ph. D. in Sociology*
- Ye. G. DRAPEKO *First Deputy Chairman of the Committee on Culture of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Deputy to the State Duma of the Russian Federation, Ph. D. in Sociology, Honored Artist of the RSFSR*
- N. K. GARBOVSKY *Director of the Higher School of Translation and Interpreting (Faculty) at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Academician-Secretary of the Department of Education and Culture at the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Philology), Professor*
- Al. A. GROMYKO *Director of the Institute of Europe of the RAS (Moscow), Corresponding Member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Political Studies), Professor of the RAS*
- A. A. GUSEINOV *Director of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS (Moscow), Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*
- 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*
- A. D. KHLUTKOV *Director of the North-West Institute of Management of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (St. Petersburg), Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor*
- A. S. MAKSIMOV *Chairman of the Committee on Science and Higher Education of the Government of St. Petersburg, Ph. D. in Engineering*
- V. K. MAMONTOV *Chairman of the board of directors of the newspaper “Komsomolskaya Pravda” (Moscow), Director General of the radio station “Govorit Moskva”, director of the Foundation for the Support of Network Initiatives “Smart Internet”*
- M. V. ZAKHAROVA *Director of the Information and Press Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia (Moscow), Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation, Ph. D. in History*

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Dear colleagues, we open the Plenary Session of the 21st International Likhachov Scientific Conference. I ask Olivier Roqueplo, Professor at Sorbonne University (France), Doctor of Historical Sciences, Doctor of Political Sciences, to come to the Presidium. Mr. Roqueplo has presented a very interesting and incredibly philosophical report at the Conference. Another member of the Presidium is Mehdi Sanaei, a longtime friend of our University. We know him since those years when he was our colleague in academic activities, and also as an outstanding diplomat who served for several years as Iran's Ambassador to the Russian Federation and worked to strengthen our ties with Iranian universities. Mr. Sanai is the author of a number of research papers that we have included in the scientific circulation of our University. I also invite Valery Aleksandrovich Chereshnev, Honorary Doctor of our University, Deputy President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Scientific Director of the Institute of Immunology and Physiology of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Medical Sciences, Professor, to take a place in the Presidium. The Honorary Doctor of Saint Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences (SPbUHSS) is a personified symbol of our University's ideals; this is how we present these remarkable people to the students. And, finally, Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov, a member of the State Council, Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions (FITU) of Russia. Notably, FITU of Russia is the largest public organization in our country, uniting 20 million members of trade unions. Mikhail Viktorovich is also Vice-President of the International Trade Union Confederation, Vice-President of the All-European Council of Trade Unions, Chairman of the Board of Trustees and Honorary Professor of our University.

By tradition, I would like to say a few words on behalf of the Organizing Committee of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference, especially because today there are many new participants, including students, in this room. Our forum was initiated by the University in 1993 at the suggestion of Academician Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov. On May 19, 1993, he was elected the first Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS. As to our joint work with Dmitry Sergeevich, it began about six months before that date; in the course of this work, he made many proposals which we were happy to implement. It was his idea to hold Science Days at the University, and on May 24, 1993, on the Day of Slavic Written Language and Culture, the first conference took place. Let me remind you that the Old Slavonic alphabet was created by Cyril and Methodius, outstanding enlighteners, saints of the Orthodox and Catholic churches. We thought it would be right to lay the foundation for a new tradition of Science Days on this date. A year earlier, our University was consecrated by the Russian Orthodox Church. Therefore, since that date, May 24, we have been counting down the recent history of our University as a higher education institution. Established in 1926 by Russian trade unions from the workers' associations of Petersburg, for many years this educational institution was called the Higher Trade Union School of Culture.

After that, we continued to work together with Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov. One of the most important results of our joint work was "Declaration of Cultural Rights", which I have every reason to call a document of global historical

significance. After Dmitry Sergeevich passed away, Daniil Aleksandrovich Granin and I addressed Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin with a request to issue the Edict on perpetuating the memory of Academician Likhachov. The Edict was prepared and issued in three days, testifying high appreciation and special attitude of the President of Russia to Likhachov's personality and significance of his legacy. Thus, in 2001, when the Edict was issued, the Days of Science received a new status – International Likhachov Scientific Conference. Since then, the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Russian Academy of Education have joined in organizing and conducting the Conference, and over 10 years ago, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation began supporting the Conference. Together we have brought the Likhachov Conference to the present level. Currently, it is the largest forum of world-class humanitarian science.

Unfortunately, after the start of the special military operation in Ukraine, the opportunities for international scientific contacts decreased. In Western countries, scientists are under incredible pressure to stop any cooperation with Russia. Of course, our communication continues at the personal level, but foreign colleagues cannot freely declare it, and visiting Russia has become problematic for them. Today, scientists from about ten countries participate in our work. Many others could not come because of logistic problems, among them Hans Köchler, a professor from Vienna and a public figure, colleagues from Serbia and a number of other countries. However, they submitted their papers, which are posted at the "D. S. Likhachov Square" website among the 150 papers by scientists from Russia and foreign countries published there at the moment.

Today, despite everything, our participants are outstanding thinkers who are interested in issues of the dialogue of cultures. Alas, nowadays the dialogue of cultures is often drowned out by the sounds of gunshots. After all, when scientists are not allowed to work, guns come into play. But this time will pass, and in the course of our discussions we will consider how events will develop at the subsequent stages and, perhaps, formulate some forecasts. The panel discussion will be dedicated to prospects of the multipolarity structure which is, apparently, our future. And now, on behalf of the Organizing Committee, I congratulate all those present, thank you for participating in the Likhachov Scientific Conference, and wish you interesting and fruitful work.

Our forum opens with the speech by Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov.

**M. V. SHMAKOV:** – Good afternoon, dear colleagues. I congratulate you on the opening of the 21st Likhachov Conference at the Saint Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences. The Conference is dedicated to topical issues related to dialogues and conflicts of cultures, and the reality that has affected us personally today, in particular the difficulties with logistics mentioned by Aleksandr Sergeevich, because of which many invited scientists could not come to participate in our work, indicates that we are currently undergoing the stage of conflicts. The special military operation conducted by the Russian Federation exposes the essence of this stage, unlike the quieter periods when problems are hidden behind various euphemisms. Conflicts have become the main part of all interactions, on the platform of which every country, every per-

son, every scientific school stands, but thanks to the tolerance and respect to the interlocutor, they do not always escalate as much as today.

The attitude to this new situation has been formulated in the new concept adopted by our country, which states that Russia is a civilization country that does not adapt to any other civilizations, although it is interested in developing the cooperation with them. This is how Russia will defend its civilizational values. Unfortunately, in recent times, it is no longer possible to support any pan-European values, because, from my point of view, we have split up in the main position – in views concerning the human being, family, future of the family, country, and the humanity. And if the future develops as it is anticipated in today's philosophy and practice of the Western civilization, then we are not on the same track with the West. They say that our civilization is more conservative, but I would choose another word: it is more traditional. But this is our civilization and our value – in fact, the ultimate purpose of human existence. Let's not argue about who created the man, how humanity evolved, and other philosophical questions. Be that as it may, these values are primarily aimed at developing the human race, including its spiritual development. Material well-being is important, but we do not put it in the first place.

Today, in framework of the Conference, we will have an interesting, complex, frank and sharp dialogue. Without this internal and civilizational cleansing from alien layers, it may be difficult for us to move forward. Among other things, it exposes those growths that have formed in our country's history, politics, and economy. But, since our Conference is international, to my mind, we should not focus only on domestic problems. We are aware of them and know how to solve them. It is not always possible, but the main thing on this path is not to give up and continue doing what we consider necessary and significant. We still have a lot of important things to do inside the country; however, we also have to develop the dialogue between all cultures, working out arguments to protect values of our civilization. All previous Likhachov Conferences were inevitably dedicated to these problems, and the current one will not be an exception, albeit held in the new reality of international politics. Once again, I congratulate all participants on the opening of the 21st Likhachov Conference and wish them interesting creative discussions.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – The floor is given to Academician Valery Aleksandrovich Chereshevnev.

**V. A. CHERESHNEV:** – We often hear that science is integral part of culture, and it really is. In February, we will celebrate the 300th anniversary of the Russian Academy of Sciences. 300 years is a rather respectable age. Let me remind you that at the time our academy was established, three scientific academies had already been operating in Europe – in England, France and Germany. The Russian Academy of Sciences became the fourth one, and the American National Academy appeared much later – only in 1863. Mikhail Vasilyevich Lomonosov was certainly right when he wrote, “Science is clear cognition of the truth, enlightenment of the mind, pure amusement of life, praise of youth, support of old age, builder of cities, regiments, fortress of success in misfortune, ornament in happiness, faith-

ful and inseparable companion everywhere.” Lomonosov was a worthy successor of Peter the Great, who founded our academy on February 8, 1724 here, in Saint Petersburg. And now it has been decided to establish the Saint Petersburg Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences and return to it the building on the Universitetskaya Embankment, which was once specially built for the Academy by architect Giacomo Quarenghi.

Americans are very proud that last year a woman, a truly outstanding scientist, geophysicist Marcia McNutt, was elected president of the US National Academy of Sciences for the second time. However, the Russian Academy of Sciences was headed by Ekaterina Romanovna Dashkova as early as in the 18th century, then Sofia Kovalevskaya, a mathematician, was a Corresponding Member of the Academy, and Praskovia Uvarova, a historian and archaeologist, was an academician. That is, in Russia, back in the 18–19th centuries, an understanding existed that women's contribution to science could be huge. It is no coincidence that Nikolai Ivanovich Pirogov, in his letter on the role of women in a society, argued that women's activities should not be limited to housekeeping, since they have the powerful potential that allows them to perform other, even more essential social functions. And various sciences should become the important journey for Russian women.

The Academy's prestige was very high, and not without reason. This was greatly facilitated by academicians' activities. So, during the Crimean War, Nikolai Ivanovich Pirogov performed about 10 thousand operations. His authority was so high that one day soldiers brought him the body of their murdered comrade and separately his head, torn off by a cannonball, and asked, “Sew it on, you can do everything.” This was, of course, impossible; however, this episode shows how strong was the faith in this wonderful physician, a great surgeon, a member of the Academy, four-times winner of the Demidov Prize. Though, on the other hand, by this occasion, one can judge the depressing level of the people's education.

In 1897, in Moscow, the International Medical Congress was held, and it was visited by Rudolf Virchow, an authoritative figure of German medicine, who taught famous Russian doctors, such as I. M. Sechenov, S. P. Botkin, I. P. Pavlov, V. V. Pashutin, and others. Virchow got acquainted with the state of Russian medicine and on the last day of the convention, addressing foreign guests, said, “You should learn from Russians.” And Aleksandr II, who ascended the throne after Nicholas I, appealed to doctors and teachers to improve medicine and education in Russia, bringing these areas to perfection they achieved in France and Germany, and promised to provide them with all possible assistance, including financial. Botkin and Sechenov, who were trained in Germany, returned to Russia. In 1861, in his speech to the government, Botkin noted that the Russian people are unusually energetic and active, and Sechenov, when reading a lecture to students of the Military Medical Academy about the doctor's profession, urged them to work with full dedication and always remember that their education is paid for by the money taken from Russian destitute peasants, to whom they are deeply indebted. Students, who mostly belonged to different social classes, understood this and were ready to work for the good of Russia.

Virchow was right in many ways. In 1904, the Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences Ivan Petro-

vich Pavlov became the first Nobel laureate in Russia, and three years later he was elected an academician.

Nikolai Ivanovich Pirogov was awarded the title of Honorary Citizen of the City of Moscow. When asked why he, so famous and respected, remained a physician in ordinary, he replied that the ranks were not important to him. He loved Russia very much, and the main thing he worked for was the honor of his Motherland.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Dear colleagues, Maria Vladimirovna Zakharova, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation, Director of the Information and Press Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, will now address you.

**M. V. ZAKHAROVA:** – The topic of today’s discussion “Dialogues and Conflicts of Cultures” suggests various opinions. This does not mean that there can be only two of them, but one way or another we have two poles designated. On the one hand, there is a “positive” phenomenon, the dialogue of cultures, which is our common goal and hope that cultures can perform the constructive dialogue. On the other hand, there are conflicts of cultures that are certainly a negative thing. This is also a kind of a dialogue, but it is performed in a negative key.

In fact, in my opinion, the problem is elsewhere. It is not in opposing dialogue to conflict; in the end, both can be considered natural developments of various situations. Today we are witnessing a collision on a completely different level – one of culture and anti-culture, or lack of culture, which is a powerful destructive force.

Cultures have evolved over centuries. The humanity has already outlived many civilizations, their formation and decline, which took utterly diverse forms. Meanwhile, some civilizations disappeared irrevocably, new ones grew on the wreckage of the old ones. These processes took place in harmony with natural development of society and technology, because innovations emerge in every era. But nowadays, instead of actual development, we can see trivial, primitive PR campaigns.

Let’s take, for example, the global phenomenon of colonialism. The related problems are slave trade and racism which cause struggle between civilizations and cultures of the respective eras. This is a deep-rooted centuries-old story with its own tragedies, ups and downs. What is today’s understanding of this process, which obviously tends to re-surge? The campaign called #BLM – three letters with the hashtag sign. Sacred walking in the circle, writing posts, networking under the principle of either support or rejection, nobody knows. Just four characters.

Another topic is women’s role. We recall religious interpretations, try to substantiate political science concepts, study the feminism movement, approach the problem from the aspect of traditions – family and motherhood, from the point of view of law, etc. This global attempt to comprehend the problem over centuries is also the key to conflicts between cultures. But in the end, again, it all came down to #MeToo hashtag. Trivialization to the extreme.

And of course, the most obvious example is comprehension of life processes. The whole history of mankind is generally dedicated to this issue, the central thesis of which is logos and everything related to it – philosophy, science,

theology, sociology... What is the result of conceptual analysis of the world for hundreds of millions of people? It’s that fortune hunters who have learned to use modern communication tools tell hundreds of millions what the meaning of life is, without justifying their concepts. I have talked about this with public figures, scientists, and journalists. I liked one saying: on the journey of comprehending the philosophy of life, its goals and objectives for thousands of years, there have always been people whose opinions were relatable – spiritual leaders who inspired people. Today their replacement is mass media, which will inevitably become a conductor – not of culture, but of anti-culture. This does not mean that the choice is already predetermined. I am sure harmonization of processes is still possible. But, in my opinion, it is very important to look at what is happening today from this perspective: culture versus anti-culture.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – The floor is given to the outstanding Russian journalist, First Deputy Director General of TASS Mikhail Solomonovich Gusman, who created the amazing cycle of 400 interviews with leaders from all over the world.

**M. S. GUSMAN:** – First of all, I want to thank you, Aleksandr Sergeevich, and your colleagues for the invitation to take part in the International Likhachov Scientific Conference. The Conference has become a special institution in our Motherland: respected, interesting, increasingly attracting attention every year. For this, Aleksandr Sergeevich, I bow to you: at present, such meetings of intellectuals engaged in comprehending the modern world are extremely important.

Today, when I was presented with the book “Global Conflict and the Outlines of the New World Order”, published following the results of last year’s Conference, I thought that the title of this collection of works, presenting the reflections of outstanding scientists and professionals, is extremely fitting. Indeed, today we witness a global conflict in the world, and the best minds of mankind try to comprehend the outlines of the new world order.

Similar works (perhaps inferior in quality and depth of scientific comprehension) are currently being published all over the world. Numerous meetings are held for the purpose of comprehending the direction in which the world is moving. Major international institutions are concerned about this issue, first of all the United Nations, the reform of which is now being discussed more openly, e. g. by the UN Secretary-General A. Guterres.

Returning to the topic of interviews with world leaders, I’d like to note that out of nine UN Secretaries-General, I had the honor to interview the last six, including the current one. All of them, starting with J. Perez de Cuellar (who held the post of UN Secretary-General from 1982 to 1991), said that the UN needs to be reformed. But, unfortunately, the things aren’t moving. I believe that in the framework of the new world order, we cannot do without the reform of the United Nations, modern rethinking of this largest international organization and development of new approaches.

In the 1960s, the Non-Aligned Movement, the international organization uniting 120 states under the umbrella of non-participation in military blocs, was created. It does not have such an institutional structure as the UN has. Nev-

ertheless, great politicians stood at its origins: Gamal Abdel Nasser, Josip Broz Tito, Kwame Nkrumah, Sirimavo Bandaranaike, and others. The Non-Aligned Movement was an extremely important political organization that united the third world countries, but then its relevance declined. Today, in the new conditions, especially during the pandemic, significance of this Movement has increased again. More and more attention is paid to its activities, initiatives, ideas, and proposals.

Azerbaijan's chairmanship in the Non-Aligned Movement is coming to its end, and will pass to Uganda. I talked to Museveni, President of Uganda, about prospects of this organization. On behalf of the entire African continent, he said, in particular, that Uganda has great hopes for Africa's ability to create a more just world order, and called for attention to be paid to the countries that need it.

In August 2023, in South Africa, the BRICS Summit will be held. Today, this organization unites such countries as Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa. Another 16 countries want to join the BRICS in search of creating new formats and applying new approaches to creation of the world order. Now, in Moscow, the summit of the Eurasian Economic Union takes place, which also attracts attention of the entire world, although the union was established on the base of several CIS countries. What is being discussed in Moscow today, will be heard all over the world. The list of significant international organizations with Russia's participation can be continued, in particular, with the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, etc.

The times we live in are difficult and alarming, as the world is shaken by tectonic changes. And we should not become mere observers, but contribute to making the world more just, open, and honest, so that tragic events do not occur in it, and its development moves toward well-being and happiness. That's what we want.

Meetings like the Likhachov Conference are a small, but very important brick in the foundation of the building that we must construct together.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – The floor is given to the wonderful actress who played in the movie “And the Dawns Are Quiet Here...”, the brilliant professor of our University, Yelena Grigorievna Drapeko.

**Ye. G. DRAPEKO:** – Today the topic of “Dialogues and Conflicts of Cultures in the Changing World”, which is raised by the current Likhachov Conference, is more important than ever. The question arises why the law on culture has not yet been adopted in the Russian Federation. We have discussed and removed four revisions of this law. Currently, the old law is in force, which was adopted in 1992, and is older than the Russian Constitution.

The law is a social contract, which does not exist in Russia yet. We are in a dialogue about the fact that the Russian Federation has its own traditional values, and about how the Russian culture coexists with other great cultures of the world. Basically, the law should reflect these aspects. Important state documents – the Fundamentals of the State Cultural Policy and the Strategy for Implementing the Policy – have been adopted in Russia; however, the question of what is traditional for Russian culture has not yet been answered. This question should rather be asked to philosophers: axiology is a branch of philosophy that should clarify

what is meant by these terms. Today we are witnessing the attempt to destroy traditional values that we must protect.

The modern world is entangled with oil and gas pipelines, shrouded in the financial, dollar-based Bretton Woods system. Everything is beginning to collapse, and we are watching where the fractures are. And to my amazement, these fractures exactly mirror the system of values – specifically, their hierarchy – since the values themselves are probably universal for all people.

In 2005, I read the wonderful book by Professor N. A. Benediktov of Nizhny Novgorod University titled “Russian Shrines. Essays on Russian Axiology”. Having analyzed the Western European and Russian value systems, the author came to the conclusion that Russians became unwieldy people, incomprehensible to Europeans, as early as in the pre-Christian era. Back then, our identity had formed.

Benediktov analyzed Russian heroic tales (bylinas) and epic poems, as well as the Western European “The Song of Roland”, “The Poem of My Cid”, and “The Song of the Nibelungs”. Comparing these value systems, he showed that we are different. We cannot imagine Ilya Muromets who goes to fight for a bag of gold. In Russian bylinas, there is no theme of enrichment. And in “The Song of My Cid”, the main character asks before his death to show him the bag, for which he gave his life. The Nibelungs died when they found the treasure. The Russian epic hero went out to fight for the offended, the miserable, the widows and for the Russian land. Nowadays, the Constitution of the Russian Federation states that the highest value is human life. In our system of values, our cultural code, there are concepts that are more precious than human life – these are such sanctuaries as the Motherland and honor. To die for the truth is honor for a Russian epic hero, but stupidity for an oriental person.

Therefore, the study of ourselves is extremely important today. This requires comprehending why we are like this, what separates and unites us with other cultural nations. Eight hundred years ago, Aleksandr Nevsky made the right choice between the West and the East, choosing the system of values. In particular, he said, “The Tatar-Mongols take money, though they leave us the right to our own faith and organization. And the Latins who come to our land, first of all, want to change our faith.” And choosing between money and faith, great Aleksandr Nevsky chose faith, that is, preservation of our identity.

To my mind, it would be useful for Russian scientists, philosophers, and culture experts to analyze value systems in different cultures, for the purpose of understanding why Russians are attracted to Iran, what we have in common with India rather than with Germany, etc.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I would like to invite to the microphone the outstanding Russian scientist, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS Abdu salam Abdulk erimovich Guseinov. The honorary doctor is a personified symbol that we offer to young people as a model. What can the life story of this person teach the young? Abdu salam Abdulk erimovich was born in a small Dagestan village where there was no electricity. His father was the outstanding Dagestani thinker and educator. After graduating from the Faculty of Philosophy of Moscow State University, A. A. Guseinov joined the Russian Academy of Sciences and became a world-famous scientist, Director of the Institute of Philosophy of the Rus-

sian Academy of Sciences. What conclusion can be drawn from his biography? Live like Abdusalam Abdulkherimovich and choose your own destiny, even if there are many difficulties on your way.

**A. A. GUSEINOV:** – This year the Likhachov Conference is titled “Dialogues and Conflicts of Cultures in the Changing World”. The emergence of this theme indicates that the world is not just changing, but changing catastrophically. It is not just about conflicts, but about confrontation, not about dialogue, but about struggle. The Conference focuses on representation of the modern era.

One of the era’s reflections in the public consciousness is the increased interest in ideology, the belief that some common ideology is needed, and the Constitution should be changed to allow to establish a state ideology, etc.

This is a big and complex topic, but I would like to consider it in a certain focus. What is the relation between philosophy and ideology, and what can the society expect from philosophy in terms of ideology? I will not dwell on general considerations, but will take as a basis a real experiment that our country has conducted, and outline its meaning. I mean “the philosophical steamer”, which has become a category of our culture. In 1922, by the decision of the Main Political Directorate, with participation and support of the Politburo, higher authorities and statesmen, a group of scientists and cultural figures were sent abroad.

This experiment lasted for 65 years. What was its meaning? Representatives of all philosophical schools, except for supporters of Marxist-Leninist philosophy that was elevated to the rank of state ideology, the only one enshrined in the Constitution, etc., was expelled. In 1988, the Politburo made a decision that meant withdrawal from the monopoly of Marxism and removal of the ban on these philosophers and their works. The course of history proved that the result of this experiment was negative, and it was decided to abandon the monopoly of Marxist philosophy, and later to renounce it altogether.

Whenever an ideology is elevated to the rank of the only correct one, nothing good will come of this, either for the ideology or for the philosophy; both will be destroyed. This may be considered the main learning from “the philosophical steamer”.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – The floor is given to the popular personality in the world of science and higher education in Saint Petersburg, Chairman of the Committee for Science and Higher Education of the Saint Petersburg Government Andrey Stanislavovich Maksimov.

**A. S. MAKSIMOV:** – Dear Aleksandr Sergeyeovich, I want to express my gratitude to you and the whole team for the opportunity to observe excellent organization of the forum for the 21st time, and, most importantly, listen to speeches of respected masters who will try to reveal the essence of serious problems.

Today we have gathered here to discuss conflicts arising at the crossroads of cultures. The discussion is based on historical knowledge. Knowing the history not only of our state, but also of the world, we will be able to draw the right conclusions.

In the 19th century, Anton Pavlovich Chekhov wrote, “There is no national science, as there is no national multi-

plication table; what is national, it is no longer science.” To my mind, this statement is worth reflecting upon.

Valery Aleksandrovich has set the discussion’s outline: the 300th anniversary of the Academy of Sciences is significant for Russia in general and for Saint Petersburg in particular, which is the cradle of science and professional education. Here on February 8, 1724, by the edict of Peter the Great, the Academy of Sciences, the University and the Academic Gymnasium were established. First, Valery Aleksandrovich stated the fact of the birth of an Academy of Sciences first in foreign countries, then in Russia. The historical fact is that in Russia, the Academy of Sciences and professional education appeared before the United States of America was founded.

Honorable Deputy Drapeko raised serious philosophical questions concerning Russian culture. It is the foundation on which our country is based.

In conclusion, I would like to quote the words of Golda Meir, the 4th Prime Minister of Israel, “If you want to build a country where her sons and daughters will return, if you want to build a country which they will leave only during the holiday season, if you want to build a country that will not have a sense of fear for the future, then take just two steps: 1) equate corruption to treason, and corrupt officials to traitors up to their 7th generation; 2) make 3 professions the most high-paid and respected: these are soldier, teacher and doctor. <...> And the most important thing is to work, work and work, because no one but you will protect you, no one will feed you except yourself. And only you need your country and no one else.” These words contain the motto for continuing the discussion.

I’d like to quote a poem by Fyodor Tyutchev,

You will not grasp her with your mind  
Or cover with a common label,  
For Russia is one of a kind –  
Believe in her, if you are able...

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I invite to the podium the remarkable Belarusian sociologist Igor Ivanovich Buzovsky. He is one of such patriots that any country is based on: our guest has been working to reinforce Belarus in various positions for many years.

**I. I. BUZOVSKY:** – It is great honor for me to represent the scientific community of the Republic of Belarus at the Likhachov Conference, and to join the discussion of the current reality affecting our destinies, because confusion in concepts leads to confusion among people.

At the last Likhachov Conference, reasoning about values, we talked, *inter alia*, about the role of values in social development, economics, and geopolitics. As a result, we saw the embodiment of these ideas in specific regulatory documents of the Russian Federation, in particular in the Edict of the President of the Russian Federation № 809 “On Approval of Fundamentals of State Policy for Preservation and Strengthening of Traditional Russian Spiritual and Moral Values”.

This is an important document, but I have not actually seen any subsequent steps to be taken after its adoption as part of its implementation. Creation of new documents stimulates the development of the regulatory framework and society as a whole, in particular in the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, since we move in the

same vein, but the key thing is that laws and edicts must be implemented. The reason for the current situation, perhaps, is not in the bad mechanism, but in misconceptions about ways of its possible implementation.

We can talk about negative consequences of the processes that we witness today, though it should be stated: for a long time, we have been struggling with meanings, ideas and concepts, but ultimately lost. Our loss was not due to the meanings and strategies we had chosen. It was because wrong tools had been selected. While we were fighting with meanings, the tools that prevail today in promoting ideas and meanings alien to ours had won.

Globality of ideas does not mean that they are bad. These ideas had won not with meanings, not with statement, not with beliefs, not with philosophy, not with sociology, not with humanitarian and cultural layers, but with tools. For a long time we have been ignoring concepts such as “social networks”, “the Internet”, and everything that penetrates not through consciousness and soul, but through a dripper that we have administered to ourselves, a tool that allows controlling us.

Until we realize that it is necessary to cooperate to work, first of all, on the tools, as well as ideas and meanings that have to be promoted, we will not obtain the result we are striving for. Being on a capillary feed of meanings that are alien to us, we will not be able to communicate to our society the thoughts and strategies that are important today.

Today, one of the key ideas is identifying the structures that could coordinate this process. Aleksandr Sergeevich, perhaps today, in the course of the discussion, it is necessary to assign platforms where the decisions taken in the field of politics and economics, which determine the society's development, can be assessed. The Likhachov Conference where like-minded people have been discussing topical issues during 21 forums may become such a platform. I sincerely hope that our forum will augment not only with ideas and thoughts, but also with particular results.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Igor Ivanovich, we will consider your proposal. The floor is given to the outstanding French philosopher, Professor of Sorbonne University Olivier Roqueplo.

**O. ROQUEPLO:** – Dear friends, colleagues, I will speak very briefly today. First, we must remember the words of great Dmitry Sergeevich. The infrastructure of society is not its economy, but culture. When culture is in danger, the whole society is in danger. Therefore, culture is worth appreciating: not only your own culture, but also your neighbors, and all other peoples. Unfortunately, for several decades, the new human species has been forming in Western Europe, which I call Homo Euramericanus. This is a man without memory, culture, or history. As a rule, (s)he represents the political and economic elite of the Western Europe. (S)he's very dangerous. First of all, for their own people. Now Homo Euramericanus has started his/her journey to the East, and has already appeared on your borders. Homo Euramericanus is everywhere in the European Union, it is the product of several years of americanization, as well as degradation of culture. This man has forgotten who (s)he is. (S)he does not respect the past, therefore, (s)he has no future. But the most important thing is that (s)he

does not allow others to have the future either. His/her appearance in Ukraine is not accidental. This Euro-American fights against all values of your society, our society, the European society. The Euro-American is a person of the European Union, an opponent of Europe. The European Union is a shadow of Europe, not Europe itself. Therefore, it is necessary to resist people like Homo Euramericanus, not only with weapons, although this is important, but also by cultural, social methods. And, in my opinion, in Russia you have people who are ready for this confrontation. Unfortunately, we have very few of them, and this explains why the number of people in the Western Europe who try to create the world that every one of us needs, is so small.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I invite to the podium Mr. Mehdi Sanaei, Senior Adviser to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

**M. SANAEI:** – I have already made a speech on “The Next World Order: the Need for Cultural Multilateralism”. The fact that the old world order has weakened is already unambiguous and, in my opinion, apparent for everyone. But what the new world order will be like and whether it will emerge in the near future is a big question. The mechanism based on liberalism has clearly weakened. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, the process of globalization has weakened even more significantly than before; now in various countries, people place a higher stake on nationalism and rely on local resources. It has already become politics; globalism is no longer a priority – enduring in tough times is what has become a priority. International organizations have weakened and do not perform their functions; this fact has also become clear. No one can deny that the West is losing hegemony not only in the field of economy, but also in the military sphere and partly in technology. And it is important that this is happening in the paradigm of civilization. There are different opinions about what the new world order will be like. Answer options: the new unipolar world, the restored old unipolar world, the new bipolar world, the multipolar world... My answer to this question is that we will not see any new world order in the near future; the current situation will be maintained in the coming years. Unfortunately, it may worsen, and there will be a lot of challenges. For preventing and counteracting them, it is crucial to abandon the context of realism and liberalism and start seeing the situation in terms of culture and civilizational multilateralism. There is no other way out. We will either observe growth in the number of conflicts in the world, or we should already recognize and accept that it is impossible to rule the world without cultural multilateralism. To my mind, for us and for the peoples of Eurasia, multicultural civilizational multilateralism should become a priority in the global sphere, and in matters of politics and economy we should pay more attention to regional cooperation and regional structures and platforms. Presently, this is an obvious trend: various regional platforms are being established, especially in the Middle East and South Asia. These platforms are very important, as are, in my opinion, the North-South International Economic Corridor to be established under recent agreement between Russian President Vladimir Putin and Iranian President Ebrahim Raisi, as well as the EurAsEC, the BRICS, and the Shanghai Organization. Improving efficiency of these platforms should be

come our regional priority, and as for the global one, it may be cultural and civilizational multilateralism.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I invite to the dialogue the outstanding Russian scientist, Director of the Higher School of Translation at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Academician-Secretary of the Department of Education and Culture of the Russian Academy of Education, Doctor of Philology, Professor Nikolai Konstantinovich Garbovsky.

**N. K. GARBOVSKY:** – Thank you very much, Alexander Sergeevich, for the invitation to take part in the Likhachov Conference. It's a great honor for me. I would like to say that the topic we are discussing today – intercultural dialogue, intercultural conflict – is, in its essence, a beautiful metaphor behind which there is certain reality. And this reality is intercultural and, above all, interlanguage communication. This is what enables the dialogue, and what sometimes leads us to cross-cultural conflicts. First of all, I would like to speak about language, which is probably the greatest value of the humanity. What do we see today? Language can be a tool of suppression if some part of the society is forbidden to speak it, and a kind of a tool of assimilation to another culture, when people can disown their language, because it is inherently Cyrillic, for instance, and shift to the Latin alphabet, for the purpose of ultimately declaring that the Moldovan language does not exist, and the whole of Moldova speaks Romanian. These are facts of cross-cultural conflicts based on language.

Maria Vladimirovna articulated a very interesting idea today: intercultural dialogue, intercultural conflict is only one side of the coin, and the other one is anti-culture. Now let's see what language this anti-culture is built on: the language of globalization, the language of the global world. What is the future of the linguistic picture of the world? We need to think about this to understand how to carry out the so-called language training of our schoolchildren and students today and, of course, tomorrow. We know that now our schools and universities have practically abandoned the study of foreign languages, except for English. This language policy has been implemented for about 40 years. Although in the Soviet Union, in the first post-war years, children equally studied various foreign languages. And today the question arises: how will interactions of languages and cultures be arranged in the society we currently think about, and in relation of which some of our predictions are made? Will English retain its status as the language of the global world? History teaches us that in the 18–19th centuries there was a dominance of the French language, which later came to naught. We know that everywhere in the scientific world, and in Europe first of all, the Latin language prevailed, which also lost its significance at a certain period. And one can foresee that, probably, the lingua franca, the function of which is now performed by the English language, may also undergo significant changes due to the fact that today we are facing the phenomenon of so-called anti-culture, and this confrontation seems rather important to me. And is it possible to think in this language if we consider it the language of anti-culture? These are questions about culture and, above all, surely, about education.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – The floor is given to Vladimir Konstantinovich Mamontov, Chairman of the Board of Di-

rectors of the newspaper “Komsomolskaya Pravda”, General Director of the radio station “Govorit Moskva”.

**V. K. MAMONTOV:** – First of all, I would like to thank you for the invitation to take part in the discussion which develops in such an interesting way. The world changes very quickly and alarmingly, and we need such discussions to understand how to live on, what these events mean for Russia, and what practical steps should be taken with the understanding that we have lived a significant part of our lives in search for the dialogue. I want to remind you that not so long ago, we did not just try to establish a dialogue as an opportunity to talk to someone in Europe and so on. We suggested building a kind of common economic and perhaps even civilizational area from Lisbon to Vladivostok. Didn't we suggest that? Didn't we wish that with all our hearts? Moreover, we were going to sell, as one of my colleagues said, “our dear oil” and gas? Of course, we wanted, in a certain sense, to pick up some ideological and cultural banners from the aging Europe. And why not? Konstantin Bogomolov, a very interesting and peculiar person, at whose performances you do not always keep the peace of mind, now writes articles. Pay your attention to them, they are just about this: yes, we may be more Europeans in our proposals and views of the future than the inhabitants of the old Europe themselves. Maybe we could pick her up, like the bull did pick her in her young age, and pull her out into fresh civilizational winds? No, Europe does not want to join the dialogue.

During my life, I have taken part in many dialogues of different cultures, their participants speaking well, and telling each other something. And then it was time to answer for one's words, and that's what it all boiled down to. Well, what kind of a dialogue can we discuss now? Maria Vladimirovna said – between culture and anti-culture. I totally agree with her: it's one between hypocrisy and honesty. When the conversation became honest, it turned out that there was no dialogue. But the situation really didn't start yesterday. What was the point of Vladimir Putin's Munich speech? “Let's honestly talk about politics, in truth. Why are you always dragging new missiles to our borders?” “Iran is there, it radiates gigantic danger. Therefore, we will bring our missiles closer to your borders.” Our president said about this right there, in Munich, “Guys, where is the logic here? We can't help but react to this. We will live in truth, realistically assessing actual threats and not what you say about them.”

Let's recall the famous Minsk Agreements. Our Belarusian colleagues and we were overjoyed that Minsk had fulfilled some kind of a peacekeeping mission. Aleksandr Grigorievich Lukashenko who took part in this process was very proud and repeatedly spoke on this occasion. And what became of the Minsk Agreements? The same people who signed the Minsk Agreements, in a while, tell us quite calmly, looking us in the eye: “Well, we actually signed the Agreements to give Ukraine the opportunity to gather its strength.” Only not to Ukraine, I would say, but to those forces in Ukraine that are ruling it now.

If we communicate, we will do this earnestly and honestly. To tell the truth, I don't quite understand so far what kind of multipolarity we deal with. Now “the Atlantists” – let's call them so, – have been trying to carve out their piece of pie, and we want to squeeze this kind of multipolarity out



of them. I read such beautiful texts about pockets of resistance: these people do not want to live like that, and those ones can't stand it either. That's it; the red light is already on. All in all, I am for the pockets of resistance.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – Aleksey Anatolievich Gromyko, Director of the Institute of Europe at the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Political Sciences.

**Al. A. GROMYKO:** – I thank you for inviting me to the Likhachov Conference once again, and I am happy to be in such great company again. I would like to outline what I am going to dwell on at the next session, and draw your attention to the following questions: what kind of a world do we live in and what kind of a world will it be in the coming years? What will the world of the 21st century be like in general? Some of those present, depending on their age, will live in this world for another 10–20 years, and some are likely to witness this century in its entirety. And it seems to me that now we live at the moment when new things can already be foreseen, predicted, forecast. We don't know much yet, but some trends have already emerged. Moreover, they emerged not in 2022 or 2023. For about 30 years, at first subtly, and then more and more obviously, the world had been moving towards the events that we have been witnessing for the last few years. Of course, the world increasingly becomes polycentric, but to say this means to say very little, because questions immediately arise: what kind of polycentrism is it? What is its model and internal structure? What is our country's place in it? It is clear that polycentrism is the framework, within which the struggle for the right to dictate rules and standards in politics, economics, the social field, and the system of values is now underway. It is clear that the process of de-globalization takes place. This does not mean that the global world will collapse – this is unlikely, but the new bipolarity, with China and the United States as its poles, has been discussed for several years. Many categories, and the new bipolarity among them, are taken from the Cold War history and an attempt to extend them to our time is being made. This is a really important theme. But I would be careful in talking about it. It may be right to call this new bipolarity “quasi-bipolarity” or “soft bipolarity”, because, despite the continuing strong position of the United States and the ongoing build-up of power by China, the world is unlikely to be split into two camps again. And the strategic decoupling between the United States and China, which was talked about so much under Trump (and under Biden, this policy has become even more violent in some ways), if it ever happens, will be sporadic. Unlike the USA and the USSR, the USA and China are so interrelated and interdependent that this new bipolarity in the future will be quite different from what it was in the past. On the whole, Eurocentrism started to be forgotten not in the 21st century, but as early as after 1945, when Western Europe became overshadowed by the two giant superpowers – the USSR and the USA. The European Union tried several times to declare itself as a possible new global centre of power, both in the 1990s and at the beginning of the 21st century. Remember, for example, 2003, when the United States and a number of other countries invaded Iraq. In some ways, it succeeded, because the EU's single market is currently one of the three largest economic entities on the planet, but within

the European Union, there have already been many contradictions, and their number is only increasing. The EU's political subjectivity is now lower than even at the beginning of the 21st century. The Western-centric world with its core in the United States is trying to grab or cling to those competitive advantages which it has: they are diminishing but still exist. However, I do not see how the 21st century can give Western-centrism any chance to be revived.

However, despite the fact that much restructuring or re-assembling are underway, and attempts are made to create political geometry of various kinds, which might determine who will fight for leadership in the next 20–30 years, in any world, be it the 21st, 20th or 15th century, and even in the times of Ancient Greece or the Roman Empire, there are the tyranny of history and the tyranny of geography. Those states that had already existed in the 20th and 21st centuries will remain where they are throughout the 21st century, if they do not disintegrate. Accordingly, they will need to take care of how to observe the most important rule of their national security: to make sure that this state survives, is not captured and is not plunged into chaos. For achieving this goal, these countries and centres of power will not only have to compete fiercely with each other, but also find some kind of *modus vivendi*.

The main document of international law – the UN Charter – begins with the words, “We the peoples of the united nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind...” I hope that in the 21st century, common sense will prevail, and Europe will not become the source of world war for the third time in history.

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I would like to give the floor to Andrey Dragomirovich Khlutkov, Director of the North-West Institute of Management of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Doctor of Economics.

**A. D. KHLUTKOV:** – The Likhachov Conference has always been an important event in the cultural and scientific life of Saint Petersburg and the entire Russia. The more difficult challenges our country faced, the more relevant was the agenda of our event, which became traditional thanks to Saint Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences and its Rector, Aleksandr Sergeyevich Zapesotsky.

The year of 2023 has shown us that the nature of the multipolarity debate is changing. Proving today that the world is multipolar is as meaningless as claiming that the Earth is a geoid. In 2023, the idea of a unipolar world is as absurd as the idea of the flat Earth resting on three elephants and a giant turtle.

The problem is not in proving that the world is multipolar, but in understanding what Russia should do in the multipolar world, and what place it should take. Outside the narrow circle of professionals, the unique event – emergence of the new Concept of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation – was not given due attention. This document declared for the first time that we are not only a state, but also a civilization. In his speech, Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov briefly touched upon this issue which I see as fundamental in our today's discussion.

So, Clause 4 of this document reads, “More than a thousand years of experience of independent statehood,

the cultural heritage of the previous era, deep historical ties with traditional European culture and other cultures of Eurasia, the ability developed over many centuries to ensure harmonious coexistence of various peoples, ethnic, religious and linguistic groups on the common territory, determine the special position of Russia as an authentic state-civilization.”

Even S. Huntington, the author of the concept of the ethnocultural division of civilizations, recognized existence of the Slavic-Orthodox civilization with Russia as its core. However, the brilliant American scientist’s theoretical construct is not the state’s constituent foundation; however, the document adopted on March 31 this year is. This new approach is worth evaluating and commenting.

Here are its three main program theses. Firstly, the civilizational approach to Russia is justified, legitimate, necessary and based on the fact that Russia is not a nation-state, but a civilization. The criteria of exclusivity that are poorly applicable for a nation-state, are natural for a civilization. A civilization differs from a country in its complexity and self-sufficiency. A nation-state may adhere to another state or a block of states, this is a natural phenomenon. Any civilization, as a rule, is self-sufficient in economic, political and ideological terms.

Secondly. Were we a civilization as the USSR? As the Russian Empire? Are we a civilization now? We answer all these questions in the affirmative. We are a civilization because the church near Smolensk, the datsan in Kalmykia, the synagogue, the Tatar mosque and the Aleksander Nevsky Lavra in Saint Petersburg are originally ours, own, not imported.

And thirdly. The American expert on China, Lucian Pye, wrote, “China is a civilization, masquerading as a na-

tion state, obliged by its political and economic weakness at the end of the 19th century to adapt to European norms.” In 1991, we also went the Chinese way in this sense, but, due to aggressiveness of the West, all masks have now been thrown off, and today everyone knows everything. We know that the world is multipolar, and Russia is a civilization. The West knows that we know that it is our real opponent.

Why did this happen? Because our civilization, like the Chinese civilization and the Latin American one, is unique, but does not claim to be exceptional. This is its fundamental difference from the Euro-Atlantic one. And this is also the key to our victory and the reason for inevitable problems of our opponents.

At the end of my speech, I would like to emphasize that culture, science and education constitute the most important channel that leaves the chance for dialogue in almost any situation, in any conflict. We need to know this and be sure to use it.

I wish the participants of the Likhachov Conference new achievements, interesting discussions and constructive dialogues!

**A. S. ZAPESOTSKY:** – I will only reluctantly note: using the term “civilization”, the Russian discussion has embarked on the unscientific path, which, alas, will become obvious in the near future, since this topic has been very well elaborated in cultural studies. Unfortunately, the term “civilization” came to us through four Western European languages from more ancient languages and carries completely different meanings, sometimes diametrically opposite. But, of course, the discussion itself will be very interesting; of this I have no doubt.