

RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF EDUCATION
ST. PETERSBURG INTELLIGENTSIA CONGRESS

ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

under the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES & CIVILIZATIONS IN THE GLOBAL WORLD

The 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference
May 24–25, 2007



The Conference is held in accordance with the Decree of President of Russia V. V. Putin
'On perpetuating the memory of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov'
No. 587, dated from May 23, 2001

This is the Fifteenth Conference (initially named 'The Days of Science in SPbUHSS')
and the Seventh in the status of the International Likhachov Conference

**St. Petersburg
2007**

ББК 72
Д44

Scientific editor

Professor **A. S. Zapesotsky**, Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, Chairman of the Executive Committee of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Honoured Scientist of the Russian Federation

Editor of the English language edition

Professor **S. R. Abramov**, Dr. Sc. (Philology), English Chair of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences

Recommended to be published by the editorial board of SPbUHSS
Minutes No. 17, 29.06.07

Promoters and participants of the Conference
express profound gratitude to the company Xerox Eurasia
for the support of this publication

Dialogue of Cultures and Civilizations in the Global World:
The 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference,
May 24–25, 2007. — SPb.: SPbUHSS Publishers, 2007. —
78 p.

ISBN 978-5-7621-0392-3

This book contains proceedings of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference held on May 24–25, 2007, at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, in accordance with the Decree of President of Russia V.V. Putin ‘On perpetuating the memory of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov’. In papers and speeches presented at the plenary session, round table and eight workshops, famous Russian and foreign scientists, political and public figures, authorities on practical activities from many countries of the world analyze fundamental matters of the contemporary global society, typical features of culture and civilizations dialogue, major trends in the spheres of education, the humanities and cultures. The conference was supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. This edition is intended for the academic community, specialists in different areas of social and humanitarian knowledge, as well as higher education students and post-graduates.

ББК 72

CONTENTS

ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE	6
DECREE OF PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION 'ON PERPETUATING THE MEMORY OF DMITRY SERGEYEVICH LIKHACHOV'	8
ADDRESSES OF V. V. PUTIN, PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE	9
GREETINGS TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE	10
Plenary session <i>DIALOGUE OF CULTURES & CIVILIZATIONS</i> <i>IN THE GLOBAL WORLD</i>	
PRESIDIUM OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE	15
HEADS OF SECTIONS	17
PRESENTATIONS, SPEECHES, GREETING MESSAGES	18
A. S. ZAPESOTSKY, Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, Chairman of the Executive Committee of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Honoured Scientist of the Russian Federation GREETING MESSAGE FROM THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE TO THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE	18
D. A. GRANIN, Writer, member of the Executive Committee of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Doctor <i>honoris causa</i> of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Honoured Citizen of St. Petersburg, Hero of Socialist Labour THOUGHTS ON CONSCIENCE	20
M. B. PIOTROVSKY, Chairman of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Director of the State Hermitage, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND CIVILIZATIONS IN THE GLOBAL WORLD	23
A. A. KOKOSHIN, Chairman of the Committee on CIS issues and relations with compatriots of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Director of Institute of Issues of International Security of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dean of the Department of World Policy, Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences CULTURE AND NATIONAL-CIVILIZATION IDENTITY OF THE MODERN GREAT POWER	26

L. JINGJIE, President of Chinese Association of Research of Russia, Eastern Europe and Middle Asia, member of the National Political Consultative Committee of Chinese People's Republic, academician of the Chinese Academy of Social Studies ADOPTION OF THE WESTERN CULTURE: NO BIAS EITHER TO THE 'LEFT' OR TO THE 'RIGHT' CAN BE ALLOWED	28
M. M. JOSHI, Member of Parliament of India, Doctor DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND CIVILISATIONS IN THE GLOBAL WORLD	31
Y. S. VASILYEV, President of St. Petersburg Polytechnic University, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, member of the Presidium of All-Russia Council of Presidents of Universities and member of the Presidium of St. Petersburg Council of Rectors of Universities, Dr. Sc. (Engineering), professor GREETING MESSAGE TO THE CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS	33
A. O. CHUBARYAN, Director of Institute of General History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, President of State University of the Humanities, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURE STUDIES AS MEANS FOR THE DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND CIVILIZATIONS	33
N. AL-ATTAR, Vice-President of the Syrian Arab Republic, Doctor THE DIALOGUE OF CIVILIZATIONS: MUTUAL AID AND PARTNERSHIP	34
A. V. SALTANOV, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Special Representative of President of the Russian Federation on the Middle-East Issues ISSUES OF INTERCIVILIZATIONAL CONTACTS IN THE DIALOGUE OF CULTURES	36
A. A. GUSEYNOV, Director of Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences WHAT ARE WE TALKING ABOUT WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THE DIALOGUE OF CIVILIZATIONS?	39
R. X. KHOKHAR, Special Representative of the Prime Minister of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan MISPERCEPTIONS ABOUT ISLAM: CAUSES & REMEDIES	43
G. A. YAGODIN, Professor of Russian Chemical-Engineering University named after D. I. Mendeleev (Moscow), academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Chemistry) EDUCATION AT THE MODERN STAGE	44
V. V. POPOV, Ambassador at large of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Director of the Centre for Partnership of Civilizations of the Scientific-Coordination Council on International Researches of Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation ON PARTNERSHIP OF CIVILIZATIONS	45
G. M. REZNIK, President of the Lawyer's Chamber of Moscow, Chair of Law at the Academic Law University of Institute of State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences, member of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation, M. A. (Law), Honoured Lawyer of the Russian Federation CULTURE AND LAW IN THE MODERN GLOBALIZING WORLD	48
A. A. LIKHANOV, Writer, Chairman of the Russian Children Foundation, academician of the Russian Academy of Education PRECEPTS OF DMITRY SERGEYEVICH LIKHACHOV IN ACTION (A greeting message for the Conference participants)	50

V. P. KAZARIN, First Deputy Chairman of Sevastopol City Administration, Dr. Sc. (Philology), Professor GLOBALIZATION AS OBLIGATORY ELEMENT OF HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF CIVILIZATION <i>A greeting message to the Conference participants</i>	51
F. A. ASADULLIN, Head of the Scientific Department of the Council of Muftis of Russia, Sheikh ISLAMIC-CHRISTIAN DIALOGUE FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF RUSSIA (Experience elicitation)	52
V. V. NAUMKIN, Head of the Department of Regional Problems of the World Politics of Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov, representative of the Russian Federation in the High Level Group of the UN Project <i>Alliance of Civilizations</i> , Dr. Sc. (History), Professor ROLE OF 'THE ALLIANCE OF CIVILIZATIONS' IN THE GLOBAL DIALOGUE SETUP	53
O. T. BOGOMOLOV, Honorary Director of Institute of International Economics and Political Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences CULTURE AND ECONOMY: EDGES OF CONJUGACY	54
S. L. SHIPTON, OBE, KFO, Coordinator of the Three Faiths Forum (Muslim-Christian-Jewish Trialogue) DIALOGUE OF CULTURES & CIVILISATIONS IN THE GLOBAL WORLD	56
D. V. YATSKEVICH, 11-year pupil at School No. 411 ' <i>Harmony</i> ' at the Petrodvoretsky district of St. Petersburg, winner of the All-Russian contest of creative works of senior students <i>D. S. Likhachov's Ideas and Modern Times</i> D. S. LIKHACHOV'S IDEAS AND MODERN TIMES	59
Round Table THE DIALOGUE OF CULTURES & CIVILIZATIONS IN THE GLOBAL WORLD	61
INDEX OF NAMES	77

ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

The International Scientific Conference at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences first took place in May, 1993. It was timed to the Days of Slavonic Letters and Culture. It was initiated by Academician Dmitry Sergeyeovich Likhachov and the university professors V. E. Triodin, R. S. Milonov and A. S. Zapesotsky. Since then the Conference has been held every year. D. S. Likhachov made a speech there twice – he read his papers ‘Declaration of the Rights of Culture and Its International Importance’ (1996) and ‘Great Culture Is Conciliatory by Nature’ (1997).

After D. S. Likhachov’s death the writer D. A. Granin and Professor A. S. Zapesotsky suggested renaming the conference into the International Likhachov Scientific Conference. This was done by the Decree of President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin ‘On perpetuating the memory of Dmitry Sergeyeovich Likhachov’ No. 587, May 23, 2001.

The co-founders of the Conference are the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Russian Academy of Education, St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress (registered officially by A. S. Zapesotsky on the instructions of D. S. Likhachov and D. A. Granin in 1999; among the founders you can also find J. I. Alferov, A. P. Petrov, M. B. Piotrovsky, K. Y. Lavrov. The Congress was founded to assist the potential of the intelligentsia to be realized, to strengthen the civil society and protect the values of the democracy, to provide a continual dialogue between the society and the power, and also to consolidate all the population classes in order to reach public consent).

In 2007 the Likhachov Conference has enjoyed the support of Russia’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Traditionally, the most universal debatable problems of the present time are put on the agenda of the Conference. In 2001 and 2002 the theme of the Likhachov Conference was ‘The World of Academician Likhachov’s Humanitarian Culture’, in 2003 the theme was ‘Education under the Conditions of Formation of a New Type of Culture’, in 2004 – ‘Education in the Process of Humanization of the Modern World’, in 2005 – ‘Culture and the Global Challenges of the World Development’, in 2006 – ‘Humanitarian Problems of Modern Civilization’, in 2007 – ‘The Dialogue of Cultures and Civilizations in the Modern World’.

Every year the Likhachov Conference gets a wider range and becomes more and more imposing. Greatest Russian and foreign scientists, figures of culture and art, public and political leaders take part in the Conference. The following academicians and corresponding members of the Russian Academy of Sciences have taken part in the Conference in recent years: A. G. Arbatov, N. P. Bekhtereva, O. T. Bogomolov, V. N. Bolshakova, A. V. Brushlinsky, R. S. Ganelin, A. A. Guseynov, N. I. Yeliseeva, T. I. Zaslavskaya, N. V. Karlov, A. A. Kokoshin, I. I. Lukinov, V. A. Martynov, S. V. Medvedev, N. N. Moiseyev, A. D. Neki pelov, A. M. Panchenko, N. Y. Petrakov, N. A. Plate, B.V. Rauschenbach, Y. A. Ryzhov, N. N. Skatov, V. S. Stepin, Z. T. Toschenko, A. M. Finkelstein, A. O. Chubaryan, V. L. Yanin, R. G. Yanovsky and others. The academicians and corresponding members of the Russian Academy of Education who have taken part in the Conference are the following: S. A. Amonashvili, V. I. Andreev, A. G. Asmolov, V. K. Balsevitch, A. P. Beliayeva, M. N. Berulava, I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada, A. A. Bodalev, E. V. Bondarevskaya, G. A. Bordovsky, A. P. Valitskaya, G. N. Volkov, Y. N. Gladky, Y. S. Davydov, A. V. Darinsky, A. N. Dzhurinsky, E. D. Dneprov, S. F. Yegorov, V. G. Kinelyov,

V. A. Kobylansky, I. S. Kon, A. S. Kondratiev, V. G. Kostomarov, M. N. Kuzmin, N. V. Kuzmina, O. Y. Lebedev, V. T. Lisovsky, A. A. Likhanov, V. G. Matanzman, G. V. Mukhametzianova, N. D. Nikandrov, A. A. Orlov, A. A. Rean, Y. A. Saurov, Y. V. Senko, N. A. Terentieva, A. V. Usova, Y. U. Fokht-Babushkin, A. V. Khutorskoy, G. A. Yagodin, Y. A. Yamburg, W. Mitter (Germany). Such public and state figures as A. A. Akayev, O. G. Dmitriyeva, A. A. Sobchak, Y. S. Stroyev, M. V. Shmakov, V. A. Yakovlev have also participated in the Conference. Among the figures of culture and art who have participated in the Conference are the following: M. K. Anikushin, A. A. Voznesensky, I. O. Gorbachev, D. A. Granin, N. M. Dudinskaya, Z. Y. Korogodsky, K. Y. Lavrov, A. P. Petrov, M. M. Plisetskaya, M. L. Rostropovich, E. A. Ryazanov, G. V. Sviridov.

Three times, in 2001, 2004 and 2006, the organizers and participants of the Conference were greeted by President of Russia V. V. Putin.

Since 2005 the Conference has been financially supported by the 'Xerox-Eurasia' company.

Every year proceedings are published as a result of the International Conference. The copies of the proceedings are present in all major libraries of Russia, CIS countries, scientific and educational centres of many states of the world. The proceedings of the Conference are also available on a special scientific website 'Likhachov Square' at www.Lihachev.ru.

**DECREE
OF PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION
'ON PERPETUATING THE MEMORY
OF DMITRY SERGEYEVICH LIKHACHOV'**

Given D. S. Likhachov's outstanding contribution to the development of the home science and culture I enact:

1. the Government of the Russian Federation should:
 - establish two personal grants in honour of D. S. Likhachov at the rate of 400 roubles each for university students from the year 2001 and to define the procedure of conferring them;
 - work out the project of D. S. Likhachov's gravestone on a competitive basis together with the Government of St. Petersburg;
 - consider the issue of making a film devoted to D. S. Likhachov's life and activities.
2. the Government of St. Petersburg should:
 - name one of the streets in St. Petersburg after D. S. Likhachov;
 - consider the issue of placing a memorial plate on the building of the Institute of Russian Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Pushkin's House);
 - guarantee the work on setting up D. S. Likhachov's gravestone in prescribed manner.
3. According to the suggestion from the Russian Academy of Sciences the Likhachov Memorial Prizes of the Russian Academy of Sciences should be established for Russian and foreign scientists for their outstanding contribution to the research of literature and culture of ancient Russia, and the collected writings of the late Academician should be published.
4. **According to the suggestion from St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress the International Likhachov Scientific Conference should be annually held on the Day of the Slavonic Letters and Culture.**

VLADIMIR PUTIN
President of the Russian Federation
Moscow, the Kremlin, May 23, 2001

ADDRESSES OF V. V. PUTIN, PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

I should first like to welcome the participants of the International scientific conference 'The world of culture of the Academician D. S. Likhachov'. The most prominent scientists and political leaders come together to discuss at this conference the most important issues of the scientific, moral and spiritual legacy of the remarkable Russian scientist D. S. Likhachov. I strongly believe that this tradition will be followed up in the future and the most distinguished successors will develop Likhachov's humanistic ideas and put them into practice while creating the Universal Home for all people of the 21st century.

I should like to express my hope that the Likhachov scientific conferences will be held in all regions of this country as well as in St. Petersburg, and we will feel part of this remarkable tradition.

I wish you a fruitful discussion and a good partnership that will bring many useful results.

V. Putin

President of the Russian Federation
May 21, 2001



I should like to welcome the guests, participants, and the organization that is holding this remarkable event, the International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

The most influential and outstanding representatives of intellectual elite – scientists, artists, political figures – participate in this conference to keep up with the tradition. It affords me deep satisfaction to see this forum acquire an international standing. I note with pleasure that its agenda contains the most significant and topical issues of our time. This year you are discussing one of the fundamental problems – impact of education on humanistic process in the society.

The fact that this forum is organized regularly is a great tribute to the memory of D. S. Likhachov, an outstanding scientist, citizen and patriot. His spiritual legacy, scientific works dedicated to the problems of intellectual and moral development of younger generations, has great significance. I wish you a fruitful discussion.

V. Putin

President of the Russian Federation
May 20, 2004



I should like to welcome the guests, participants, and the organization that is holding the 6th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

I note with satisfaction that for many years this forum has been carrying out a very noble and important mission of preserving, analyzing and popularizing Likhachov's scientific works. The International Likhachov Scientific Conference has become a very important forum where people can exchange ideas and discuss the topical issues of the present time. Likhachov's spiritual legacy is an integral part of our science, of the science all over the world. And we are proud to see Likhachov's 100th anniversary, this memorable event, being celebrated on a great scale in Russia and abroad. I wish a successful discussion to all the participants and guests of the conference.

V. Putin

President of the Russian Federation
May 25, 2006

GREETINGS TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

TO THE ORGANIZERS, PARTICIPANTS AND GUESTS OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

I greet the organizers, participants and guests of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Your authoritative forum, having gathered the elite of the Russian and world intelligentsia, well-known scientists and artists, has become an important tradition in this country's spiritual life. Its interesting reports and at times sharp discussions invariably cause great interest and wide public acclaim.

This year you have chosen to discuss such a basic problem as the dialogue of cultures and civilizations in the modern world; you are bound to share experience, to consider promising joint projects in the humanitarian sphere. I am sure the suggestions and recommendations elaborated within your work will assist careful preservation of our cultural heritage; they will contribute to the development of D. S. Likhachov's ideas that haven't lost its significance and topicality with the years.

I send you best wishes of success.

S. SOBYANIN

Head of Administration of President of the Russian Federation

TO THE ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE, PARTICIPANTS AND GUESTS OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

The Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences congratulates the participants of the traditional 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. We are sure that like in the previous years sharp discussions, competent analyses of the present-day pressing problems will be there, new scientific contacts will start, the humanitarian thought will get further development.

This year the theme of the Conference is 'The Dialogue of Cultures and Civilizations in the Global World'; it develops creatively the trends of scientific and public work of our great contemporary D. S. Likhachov, to which he devoted the last years of his life. The end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century, accompanied by numerous losses, have vividly shown that outside culture all science, technology and civilization lose their sense and turn into the source of danger to the humanity. You, the participants of the Conference, are trying to answer numerous questions which progress raises before culture, and even though you may fail to find the final answers, you are sure to make a serious step in this direction. In this connection it is difficult to overestimate the significance of this traditional Scientific Conference that is devoted to the most urgent problems today.

I wish all the participants of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference successful work for the benefit of education and culture in Russia.

Y. OSIPOV

President of the Russian Academy of Science

**TO CHAIRMAN OF ST. PETERSBURG INTELLIGENTSIA CONGRESS,
CHAIRMAN OF THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV
SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE, PRESIDENT OF ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY
OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, PROFESSOR A. S. ZAPESOTSKY**

**Dear Alexander Sergeevich,
Dear friends and participants,**

All my colleagues and I greet you and congratulate you on the opening of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov was not only a scholar. With all the time changes we understand more and more clearly that he was a true citizen and scientist, not just only a philologist. We can say so because scientific works, even the greatest ones, lose their importance in the course of time, while culture, in its broad meaning, undoubtedly remains, although the problem of cultural objects preservation is rather difficult. The heritage of D. S. Likhachov is the very basis and the moral support that creates preconditions for the salvation of culture.

Nowadays the representatives of culture, intelligentsia, face the necessity to create a dialogue of cultures and civilizations in the global world, to find the place of Russia in the context of geopolitical questions of the epoch, to define the dialectics of cultures and cultural conflicts. A large number of such problems are to be analyzed by the participants of the conference, which prove their importance and scientific level. It is worth mentioning that a work of two sections ('Higher Education: Issues of Identity Development in the Context of Globalization' and 'Cultural Basis of Educational Standards at School Today'), which are directly connected with the problem of education, take place.

Once more I would like to greet you on behalf of the Russian Academy of Education and wish all the best in our work.

N. D. NIKANDROV

President of the Russian Academy of Education

**TO THE PARTICIPANTS AND GUESTS
OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE**

Dear friends,

I greet the participants of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation.

Holding the Conference at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences has already become a tradition, which proves the tendency and readiness of the Russian society to assimilate Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov's spiritual and intellectual heritage.

With the name of this outstanding scholar the whole historical epoch of democratic changes of all sides of the Russian society is connected. In the period of great changes D. S. Likhachov gave the society high moral standards, making his personal contribution to the Russian and world culture.

It is pleasant to realize that the great humanist's experience based on universal human values retains its importance.

This year the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation supports the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. On the one hand this fact proves the international acknowledgement of D. S. Likhachov and his work as well as a scientific importance of the Conference named after him. On the other hand, this forum can be viewed as an additional resource of international cooperation, a unity of scientific and political representatives from different countries and continents on the basis of deep ideas of our great contemporary, a unity in the name of humanism and peace on the whole planet.

I deeply wish the organizers and participants of the Conference health, prosperity and prolific scientific discussions.

S. V. LAVROV

Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

**TO CHAIRMAN OF THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE
OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE,
PRESIDENT OF SPBUHSS, PROFESSOR ALEXANDER S. ZAPESOTSKY**

Dear Alexander Sergeevich,

Dear members of the Organizing Committee,

Dear participants of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference,

On behalf of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia let me greet and congratulate you on the opening of this large scientific forum that is being held for the 7th time.

FITUR is proud of its University that has become one of the leading institutions of higher education in the country and has accepted a difficult and important task of giving scientific and instructional support to the Russian trade union's activity.

Nowadays trade unions play an important role in the process of social and economic changes in this country, with their proper means solving the tasks of turning Russia into a strong, democratic, socially oriented state. The scientists of the University of the Humanities and Social Sciences considerably help to understand the role, place and peculiarities of participation of trade unions in this process.

Organization of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference in your University is not only objective regularity, as Dmitry Likhachov was your first Honourable Doctor, but also the public recognition of the scientific and moral priority of SPbUHSS in the development of the research area on such a scale. To a large extent it is caused by the fact that many ideas of Likhachov were supported and developed here.

Let me wish you successful and effective work!

M. V. SHMAKOV

Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia

**TO THE PARTICIPANTS AND GUESTS
OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE**

Dear participants and guests of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference,

On behalf of the Department of Education and Science of the Russian Federation let me congratulate you on the opening of the large scientific forum!

Nowadays we turn again and again to the heritage of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov and discover that he foresaw many difficulties that face national education and science in the 21st century. It is very important that you creatively and with all the responsibility fulfil the decree of President of the Russian Federation V. Putin 'On perpetuating the memory of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov', develop the potential of the Conference, expand its frames and attract the best national and foreign scientists, politicians, cultural workers.

I wish luck to all of you who arrange and participate in this international forum!

A. A. FURSENKO

Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation

TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

Greetings to the participants of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference 'Dialogue of Cultures and Civilizations in the Global World' that was arranged to fulfil the decree of President of the Russian Federation 'On perpetuating the memory of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov'.

It is difficult to overestimate the scale of the humanitarian heritage of Academician D. Likhachov. To all the participants of the Conference I wish fruitful work and success in the development of the world's communication and cultural space.

N. I. BULAYEV

Chairman of the Committee on Education and Science of the State Duma
of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation

**TO CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF ST. PETERSBURG INTELLIGENTSIA
CONGRESS, PRESIDENT OF ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL
SCIENCES, PROFESSOR ALEXANDER S. ZAPESOTSKY**

Dear Alexander Sergeevich,

I highly appreciate and accept your invitation to the annual Likhachov Scientific Conference devoted to commemorate the academician Dmitry S. Likhachov. I esteem and admire this prominent scholar and his priceless cultural heritage, he being a genuine patriot of Russia and its culture.

I will be delighted to present the report 'Culture and national civilizational identity of contemporary Russia' based on a number of ideas, speculations, judgements and assessments made by the academician Dmitry S. Likhachov.

A. A. KOKOSHIN

Chairman of the Committee on CIS issues and relations with compatriots
of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation

**GREETING ADDRESS TO THE PARTICIPANTS AND GUESTS
OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE**

Dear Alexander Sergeevich,

Dear guests and participants of the Conference,

On behalf of the Russian Federal Agency of State Property Control I am glad to welcome you and congratulate you on the opening of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. Holding annual conferences of this sort plays a significant role nowadays.

The prominent philologist Dmitry S. Likhachov's contribution to the progress of the Russian national science and culture, to the spiritual and intellectual development of the nation, to education of younger generation cannot be overestimated.

By holding the present conference that attracted renowned figures from different countries and cities, not only do we pay tribute of respect to the honoured Russian scholar, but also have an opportunity of further developing his humanistic ideas. We can pay our own contribution to keeping and multiplying unique cultural traditions of St. Petersburg and Russia.

I wish all participants of the conference success, fruitful work and interesting meetings.

V. L. NAZAROV

Director of the Russian Federal Agency of State Property Control

**TO PRESIDENT OF ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY OF THE HUMANITIES
AND SOCIAL SCIENCES ALEXANDER S. ZAPESOTSKY, TO THE PARTICIPANTS AND GUESTS
OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE**

Dear Alexander Sergeevich,

Dear guests and participants of the Conference,

On behalf of the Federal Agency of Education allow me to congratulate you on the opening of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. For 7 years now the Conference has gathered distinguished figures of science, education, culture and politics. The issues of the conference are up-to-date, they cover problems of modern society such as patriotism and civic duty.

Your University together with the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Russian Academy of Education take part in organizing the conference, which is a good example of effective cooperation of academic science and education. It can also serve as an example of effective use of the potential in different ways to organize scientific activity.

Allow me to wish good luck to those who organized and take part in the conference. I do hope that the up-to-date issues from the agenda of the conference sections will be fully and thoroughly discussed and analyzed.

E. Y. BUTKO

Acting Director of the Russian Federal Agency of Education

**TO CHAIRMAN OF ST. PETERSBURG INTELLIGENTSIA CONGRESS, HONOURED SCIENTIST
OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION, CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE RUSSIAN ACADEMY
OF EDUCATION, PRESIDENT OF ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY OF THE HUMANITIES
AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, PROFESSOR A. S. ZAPESOTSKY**

Dear Alexander Sergeevich,

We congratulate you and all the participants of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress on the opening of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, where I have been one of the regular participants.

It was a great honour and an important event in my life to have two or three meetings with Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov. When we met last we discussed a plan of setting up new monuments in St. Petersburg. The early Russian history and comparatively recent events that took place in our city and Russia are all connected with the modern age by the name of Likhachov and his works. I believe that the directions which were outlined by Likhachov in the cultural and moral spheres define the general course of development of modern democratic Russia.

I would also like to congratulate new Honorary Professors of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Alexander Chubarian and Albert Likhanov.

Yours sincerely,

V. E. CHUROV

Chairman of the Central Election Committee of Russia

**TO CHAIRMAN OF THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV
SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE, PRESIDENT OF ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY OF THE HUMANITIES AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES, PROFESSOR A. S. ZAPESOTSKY, AND TO THE PARTICIPANTS
OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE**

Dear Alexander Sergeevich,

Dear friends,

I greet all the participants of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference on behalf of the Legislative Assembly deputies of St. Petersburg!

St. Petersburg Parliament pays much attention to the development of science, culture and education in our city. Likhachov Scientific Conferences that are held on the basis of your University occupy a special place in the cultural space of our city. This event does not only contribute to the popularizing and developing of the ideas suggested by our great contemporary, St. Petersburg citizen of honour, academician Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov, but it also strengthens the image of St. Petersburg as an internationally acknowledged centre of science.

It has been 7 years now since Dmitry Sergeevich passed away. But while we live, we check our actions with a civil and moral model, that is, Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov. Likhachov Scientific Conferences are an extra opportunity to assess the modern age in the context of his ideas. They are a valuable contribution to hold D. S. Likhachov in remembrance and at the same time a considerable step to carry out his behests and to accumulate intellectual potential of the humanity, which will enable people to solve the problems Likhachov was so concerned with.

I wish all the participants and organizers of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference successful and fruitful work.

V. A. TULPANOV

Chairman of St. Petersburg Legislative Assembly

Plenary session

**DIALOGUE OF CULTURES & CIVILIZATIONS
IN THE GLOBAL WORLD**

May 25, 2007

**PRESIDIUM
OF THE 7th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE**

- N. AL-ATTAR** Vice-President of the Syrian Arab Republic, Doctor
- F. A. ASADULLIN** Head of the Scientific Department of the Council of Muftis of Russia, Sheikh
- E. V. BODAREVSKAYA** Vice-Chairperson of the South Department of the Russian Academy of Education, academician of the Russian Academy of Education
- A. O. CHUBARYAN** Director of Institute of General History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, President of State University of the Humanities, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- Y. S. DAVYDOV** President of Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Honoured Worker of the Higher Education of Russia
- P. DUTKEVITCH** Director of Institute of European and Russian Studies (EURUS) at Carleton University (Ottawa, Canada), Professor
- B. Y. EIFMAN** Director of St. Petersburg State Academic Ballet Company, Honorary Actor of Russia
- D. A. GRANIN** writer, member of the Executive Committee of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Honoured Citizen of St. Petersburg, Hero of Socialist Labour
- L. JINGJIE** President of Chinese Association of Research of Russia, Eastern Europe and Middle Asia, member of the National Political Consultative Committee of Chinese People's Republic, academician of the Chinese Academy of Social Studies
- M. M. JOSHI** Member of Parliament of India, Doctor
- V. P. KAZARIN** First Deputy Chairman of Sevastopol City Administration, Dr. Sc. (Philology), Professor
- R. X. KHOKHAR** Special Representative of the Prime Minister of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan
- A. A. KOKOSHIN** Chairman of the Committee on CIS issues and relations with compatriots of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation; Director of Institute of Issues of International Security of the Russian Academy of Sciences; Dean of the Department of World Policy, Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences
- I. S. KON** Head Researcher of Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Education

- A. A. LIKHANOV** Writer, Chairman of the Russian Children Foundation, academician of the Russian Academy of Education
- S. Z. MAHMOOD** President of the Interconfessional Coalition for Peace (India), Doctor
- W. MITTER** Professor of the German Institute of International Researches in the field of Education (Germany), foreign member of the Russian Academy of Education
- V. V. NAUMKIN** Head of the Department of Regional Problems of the World Politics of Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov, representative of the Russian Federation in the High Level Group of the UN Project *Alliance of Civilizations*, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- A. E. PETROV** Scientific Secretary of the Department of History and Philology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Deputy Chairman of the Coordination Council on the issues of young people at the Presidential Council on science, technology and education, M. A. (History)
- M. B. PIOTROVSKY** Chairman of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Director of the State Hermitage, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- V. V. POPOV** Ambassador at large of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Director of the Centre for Partnership of Civilizations of the Scientific-Coordination Council on International Researches of Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation)
- G. M. REZNIK** President of the Lawyer's Chamber of Moscow, Chair of Law at the Academic Law University of Institute of State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences, member of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation, M. A. (Law), Honoured Lawyer of the Russian Federation
- E. P. ROMANOV** Scientific Secretary of the Urals Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences
- A. V. SALTANOV** Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Special Representative of President of the Russian Federation on the Middle-East Issues
- L. A. SANKIN** Vice-Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, First Vice-President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Professor
- Y. V. SENKO** Chair of Methods of Teaching at Altay State University, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Pedagogics), Professor
- N. N. SKATOV** Adviser of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences
- Z. T. TOSCHENKO** Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Sotsiologicheskiye Issledovaniya (Social Studies)*, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education
- Y. S. VASILYEV** President of St. Petersburg Polytechnic University, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Engineering), Professor
- G. N. VOLKOV** Head of Laboratory of Ethnopedagogic Innovations at Kalmyk State University, academician of the Russian Academy of Education
- G. A. YAGODIN** Professor of Russian Chemical-Engineering University named after D. I. Mendeleev, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Chemistry).
- S. F. YEGOROV** Head of the Department of Institute of Theory and History of Pedagogics of the Russian Academy of Education, academician of the Russian Academy of Education

- A. S. ZAPESOTSKY** Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, Chairman of the Executive Committee of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Honoured Scientist of the Russian Federation

HEADS OF SECTIONS

- A. V. AGOSHKOV** Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Voprosy Kulturologii (Issues of Cultural Studies)*, senior researcher in Institute of Social and Political Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, PhD.
- V. G. ALEKSANDROVA** Professor of Department of Global Processes of Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov, Head of Laboratory of Teaching Methods 'Integration of Science and Art at School', Dr. Sc. (Pedagogics)
- A. G. ASMOLOV** Chair of Personal Psychology at Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Psychology), Professor
- Y. S. DAVYDOV** President of Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Honoured Worker of the Higher Education of Russia
- B. S. ILIZAROV** Chief Researcher at Institute of Social and Political Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- Y. M. KOLOSOV** Professor of International Law Department of Moscow State Institute of Foreign Relations (University of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation), member of Standing Chamber of the Arbitration Tribunal in the Hague, member of the UN Commission on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Dr. Sc. (Law), Honoured Worker of Science of the Russian Federation
- O. E. LEBEDEV** Chair of Theory of Educational Systems Development at St. Petersburg State Academy of Postgraduate Teacher's Training, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education
- M. A. MANUILSKY** Deputy Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Chelovek (The Man)*
- K. S. PIGROV** Chair of Social Philosophy and Philosophy of History at St. Petersburg State University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor
- O. F. RUSAKOVA** Head of Department of Philosophy of Institute of Philosophy and Law (the Urals Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences), Dr. Sc. (Political Science), Professor
- Y. V. SENKO** Chair of Methods of Teaching at Altay State University, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Pedagogics), Professor
- Y. I. SVETOV** journalist, political scientist
- ZH. T. TOSHCHENKO** Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Sotsiologicheskiye Issledovaniya (Social Studies)*, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education
- Y. V. YAKOVETS** President of Pitirim Sorokin & Nikolai Kondratieff International Institute, Vice-President of N. Kondratieff International Foundation, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor

PRESENTATIONS, SPEECHES, GREETING MESSAGES

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY,

Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, Chairman of the Executive Committee of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Honoured Scientist of the Russian Federation

**GREETING MESSAGE FROM THE ORGANIZING COMMITTEE
TO THE 7TH INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE**

International scientific conferences on modern humanitarian issues have been held at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences since 1993 annually in May. They were launched due to the initiative of the Doctor *honoris causa* of our University academician Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov and the group of the University professors, and initially were called the Days of Science at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. The name of academician Likhachov set the highest level for conducting conferences, where leading scientists and well-known public figures of our days have participated since the very beginning.

Today we are opening the 15th meeting of the most famous world humanitarian scientists and public figures, who meet at the banks of the Neva River at our forum, which is traditionally assigned to the Days of Slavonic Letters and Culture.

In 2001, a famous writer Daniel Granin and I appealed to President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin with a request to support our initiative to officially assign the status of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference to this event. It appeared to be logical. Dmitry Likhachov was not only the initiator, but also one of the ideologues of this conference, and many times he was one of the speakers there. Mr. Putin supported the idea. Since then in accordance with the corresponding Decree of President of Russia, our Conference has had a status of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

I'm glad to say that this Conference is held with participation of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Russian Academy of Education and St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress as the founding members. This is a long-time tradition. We formally established St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress on suggestion of Dmitry Likhachov and Daniel Granin in 1996.

Since those days, it has been permanently chaired by the Director of the State Hermitage Mikhail Borisovich Piotrovsky, and Chairman of the Congress Executive Committee and Chairman of the Conference Organizing Committee was your humble servant.

It seems to me quite of importance that this year the Conference is for the first time held under the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. I should note that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation conducted real and significant work to support the Conference. We are very much obliged to the Ministry for this assistance which made possible for the most valuable foreign thinkers of our days to participate in our Conference along with the Russian scientists.

I'd like especially to thank Xerox Corporation for their financial support of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference since 2001. Also I'd like to thank representatives of 18 federal and municipal mass media agencies, who provide informational support for the International Likhachov Scientific Conference. The logos of these agencies are presented in our session hall, so that the participants and guests can see those, who support scientific research and meeting of scientists on humanitarian issues. We are indeed grateful to our friends for this support.

Due to our joint efforts, the most prominent scientists from all over Russia have been gathering within the walls of our University for 15 years now. It is gratifying to know that more than 70 regions of the country are presented here, which is our long time tradition. I'm very glad that many of my colleagues participate in the Conference, – full and associate professors, who are professing at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. And I'm really pleased to see here our students, because they are our spiritual, moral

and scientific heirs, and it is very important for us to make this succession happen.

About a year ago our University created the website named 'Likhachov Square'. Hundreds and hundreds of scientific papers from the total of more than 1,300 works of Dmitry Likhachov have already been transcribed there. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the complete set of the works of academician Likhachov has not yet been published, and, naturally, it hinders scientific research with the Likhachov's heritage and makes more problematic for the young people to become familiar with his works. I should say that during the coming two years all the works by Likhachov are going to be transcribed on our website. It also hosts many of the works about Likhachov. And this year for the first time we conducted All-Russian contest of school compositions dedicated to Likhachov. We were presented with about 400 works from 38 regions of the country and even one foreign work from Lithuania. Our competent jury involved outstanding Russian writers, scientists, academicians and corresponding members of two academies – the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Russian Academy of Education, notable Russian journalists. The jury was strict and objective in assessing all the works presented, and announced 6 winners, who came here today from different localities of the country. If young people show their interest in academician Likhachov, if they make research on him, participate in this Likhachov Conference and in celebration of the Days of Slavonic Letters and Culture, it means that Russia does have a humanitarian future.

Today the main topic of our Conference is the dialogue of cultures and civilizations in the global world. We all know how important this issue is for the humanity. Problems of small states being under severe pressure of the large powers; problems of giant countries having formidable hardships in respect of resources and development; problems of the leading countries, which would like to remain leaders, but lose their leading functions year by year and month by month; problems of saturation of the world with guns and weapons, attempts to resolve various issues to someone's advantage by force; terrorism, et cetera. All these issues are to become today a subject-matter for the discussion at the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. We assume that the methodological key for resolution of modern global problems of the humanity is in acknowledgement of determining role of culture as a basis of the world social and economic development.

I would like to personally greet many of our friends, who are participating at our Conference and, first of all, the person who is one of the symbols for St. Petersburg. During many years this outstanding scientist was the Head of Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkinsky Dom), the heart of our philology, and currently he is an adviser to the Russian Academy of Sciences. This is our notable patriarch, Nikolay Nikolayevich Skatov. Another personified symbol of St. Petersburg intelligentsia in our hall is academician Yury Sergeevich Vasilyev, – a member of the Presidium of All-Russia Council of Presidents of Universities and member of the Presidium of St. Petersburg Council of Presidents of Universities and President of Polytechnic University.

Today we are going to recognize two wonderful compatriots, who will become doctors *honoris causa* of our University (I would like to remind you that the first Doctor *honoris causa* of our University was Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov). These are: academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, outstanding historian Alexander Oganovich Chubaryan and academician of the Russian Academy of Education, eminent Russian writer, Albert Anatolyevich Likhanov. After today's plenary session we will celebrate unveiling of the bronze bust of our Doctor *honoris causa*, notable Russian and world-known poet, Andrey Voznesensky. Regretfully, he was unable to join us due to some health-related issues. We are going to send him the video record of today's meeting.

I'm pleased to notice that the undertaking of Dmitry Likhachov continues in this University, in St. Petersburg, in the world.

We also have planned a range of round table sessions and several sections; therefore, I would like to draw attention of the section heads to some very interesting points.

One of them was expressed last year in the speech of Mikhail Borisovich Piotrovsky. It looks now like an ordinary thing to think about it, but it sounded quite critical and fresh a year ago. This is an idea that each of us lives in several cultures, and we have to learn to live in many cultures. It seems to me also to be very important, and, especially, regarding a matter of symbols in culture. These symbols, since the origins of the humanity, were understood as a 'friend or foe' sign. One tribe wore certain type of clothes, another tribe wore different. They used these symbolic signs either to discern 'friends', or to kill 'foes'. The modern culture and civilization retained this measurement almost in the original form, almost at the level of self-preservation instinct: the foreign symbol

is an enemy, means necessity to fight, to destroy.

We hear the word 'Koran', and within the Christian culture there are attempts to present it with the halo of foreignness, hostility. During the Soviet times we in Russia were drawn to believe that the Star of David is what we have to fight with and that this star is opposed to the red one. Other nations in their countries were taught that the red star is a danger, which they should be afraid of and to fight with.

If we wish to learn to live in peace with other cultures, first of all, we have to learn to perceive symbols of other cultures as original, valuable events, rather than signs of the world hostile to us.

I think globalization is a multifaceted and ambiguous process. For instance, Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov assumed that globalization will take place in culture as well. Moreover, globalization should be, first of all, exhibited in culture, and afterwards in economy and politics. Another thing is how it should happen. Economy cannot 'drag' culture – contrariwise, culture is to be in the vanguard, and economy should follow it. The main thing is to find specific mechanisms for the humanity, how to learn to live in several cultures simultaneously, and what can be the appearance of the global culture, not hostile to the national one. This topic seems very important.

Dear colleagues! Now I would like to say several words about greetings addressed to us, there are lots of them. Of course, I won't read and cite all of them. I would like just to note that in the history of our Conference we had

three greetings from President of Russia, Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin, and today we received the greeting from Head of the Presidential Administration, Sergey Sergeevich Sobyenin, and also the greeting from President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician Yury Sergeevich Osipov.

President of the Russian Academy of Education, Nikolay Dmitrievich Nikandrov, was present at the majority of our 15 conferences but, regretfully, he was unable to come here today. It is a rare case – at the same time with our conference, there is a meeting of presidents of all six state academies on our scientific strategic plans, therefore, Nikolay Dmitrievich Nikandrov sent us his greeting message. We have also received such messages from: Head of the Russian Trade Unions, Michail Shmakov, who is one of the chairpersons of the Custodian Council of our University; Minister of Education and Science of Russia, professor Fursenko; Chairman of the State Duma Committee on Education and Science, Nikolay Bulayev; professor of our University and these days Chairman of the Central Election Committee of Russia, Vladimir Churov; Head of the Federal Agency of Education, Evgeny Butko, who is temporarily executing this office since professor Balykhin, regretfully, is in hospital, and many others. Many greeting words were addressed to the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, – we'd like to sincerely thank all our friends for it.

In conclusion, I would like to wish to all of you successful and fruitful work at the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference!

D. A. GRANIN,

Writer, member of the Executive Committee of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress,
 Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences,
 Honoured Citizen of St. Petersburg, Hero of Socialist Labour

THOUGHTS ON CONSCIENCE

I can't remember any other conditions in our society with such rage of lewdness and impudence as now. In the Soviet times, low moral level could be justified with fear, ideology, repressions. Apparently, the current man shows us another attitude to shame and conscience. There are new requirements to them, the shame and conscience 'levels' are much lower, and it is perceived as normal.

For instance, mass shamelessness of officials for whom any laws are determined with the degree of bribability.

Or, oligarchs who misappropriated the national property – forests, mineral resources, land, houses – and gained billions. What for? They did not invent anything, discovered anything neither in science, nor economy, nor production, they did not give anything to the society; however, they became owners of enormous fortune, mainly, due to the right of conquerors, 'invaders'.

Or, deputies at all levels obtain their mandates through empty promises, lies and deception.

Cult of money and thievery has been established everywhere in our country.

Television on all channels do not concern about education and teaching, but advertising and ratings for the sake of their profits.

At the last years of his life, Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov persistently returned to the problem of conscience. With a deep regret he observed how it ceased to be a measure of morals, how Russia became a country without the shame and conscience.

After our great Russian philosopher, Vladimir Solovyov, Likhachov appears to be the only one, who was that much persistently concerned with the category of conscience.

Solovyov stated that conscience was the development of shame. There must be the shame, and without it the conscience is silent.

The shame was the first human feeling, which separated man from animals. One can say that the man is the animal with the shame, the Lord discovered the original sin of Adam and Eve, since they were ashamed of their nakedness. And he cast them away from the Paradise.

The man started to understand gradually what was 'proper for men and gods', and then the shame instinct transformed into the voice of conscience, that is, Adam and Eve were ashamed of what they did, and this was the shame, which made them to cover the nakedness with fig leaves, that was the first voice of conscience.

Likhachov managed to develop this statement, adding it with the role of memory. He showed how the memory formed the conscience. There is no conscience without the memory, it stores our sins, the memory of a family, culture, nation feeds the conscience and demands from it. It invokes conscious attitude to elders, friends, relatives. It recalls whether we lived, or dealt with our households right. Our late repentance is the work of the memory disturbing the conscience. The memory as a historical category is when after visiting in Hamburg the cemetery of the Russian soldiers killed at the First World War, all of a sudden, I realized that here, in Russia I never saw and do not know any cemetery with ashes of the Russian soldiers who died at that war.

And what are acts of vandalism at our cemeteries or in the Summer Garden – what is it? It testifies living without the memory.

Likhachov turned our attention to some features of the conscience.

'The conscience opposes external pressure, it protects man from external impacts!' And indeed sometimes only the conscience, the internal voice can 'reach out' to the man, and

it is much more effective than countless calls, propaganda of teachers, tutors and even parents.

'The action done as on the conscience is a free action'.

There is a question – why does a man need this conscience, since no one impedes with turning back on it, what is the use of it, if it does not bring any profit, does not provide us any advantages for – either career or pecuniary status. What exists owing to this conscience, which gnaws and torments, which is hard to get rid of or to give up? Where it, actually, appeared from? We know, indeed, that it comes from the depths of our soul and cannot be false. It never mistakes. The act as on the conscience never loses value or disappoints. But still – why do we need this useless feeling?

And when I said *the act as on the conscience*, I do remember some examples that wondered and impressed me for a long time.

On July 28, 1958, Mikhail Michaylovich Zoschenko passed away. The Party bosses did not allow to bury him at 'Literatorskiye Mostki' (the writer's cemetery). It seems like they thought that he was unworthy. They were always right. And they did not allow to bury him in the vicinity. Finally, they permitted to bury him in Sestroretsk, near the place where he lived at the 'dacha'.

The civil funeral rites were conducted at the House of Writers. Alexander Prokofyev, the 1st Secretary of the Union of Writers, was charged to lead it. He was charged to lead it briefly, without any politics, strictly following the schedule, without any criticism; lots of militia and KGB agents were brought there. All those who wanted to come to the farewell ceremony could not enter the hall with the coffin, people flooded the staircases leading there, and a large crowd stood outside. The coffin was placed into a small reception room. Radio equipment was not allowed to set up there. Nikolay Nikitin, Mikhail Slonimsky – they were friends of the deceased since the days of 'Serapion brothers' – said their words.

The ceremony was coming to an end when, suddenly pushing others aside, Leonid Borisov made his way to the coffin. He was an old writer, the author of the famous book about Alexander Grin, 'Magician from Gel-Gju', the person who never spoke at any meetings and, as one could see, rather loyal. Maybe that is why Alexander Prokofyev did not stop him, and, moreover, the funeral rites were proceeding without any complications, no one said a word about persecution of Zoschenko, the Central Committee decrees, as if there were no tragedy in his life, as if it was a happy life of a popular stories author.

Borisov cried: 'Misha, my dear, forgive us, fools, we did not protect you, we gave you to murderers, we are guilty, guilty'.

His anguished, fine voice lifted up, pierced everybody and rolled down, people transmitted his words to one another, the crowd stirred at the street.

Alexander Prokofyev did not dare to disturb the ceremony ritual at the presence of the deceased. Leonid Borisov moved away weeping.

I went home along with Alexey Ivanovich Panteleyev, and he said: 'Thank God, at least, someone was weary, there appeared someone to save our dignity, but what about us...'

What was that? Borisov stood near Panteleyev and did not plan to speak, but something broke through and he was unable to handle it, it was a feeling that never reasoned, subconscious one, unable to choose. It was conscience.

To be unscrupulous today means for many: to be 'like others', 'otherwise it's impossible to survive', 'nothing you can do, this is our society'.

Of course, one can think that our society inherited the Soviet moral when none repented participating in repressions, when informers or squealers were rewarded.

But what the conscience has to do with that? It is related to a personality, it's owned by a soul, to the only one and unique, the one that speaks with that amazing voice that judges us. There is no collective conscience.

Chekhov has a short story *Student*. It's small, just three pages. Chekhov himself considered it as one of the best of his works.

At the Great Friday the student of ecclesiastical academy being hungry and cold went home thinking that there were around the same poverty, holed stray roofs, ignorance, boredom and even in thousand years life would not improve. At the vegetable garden there were two peasant women near the fire. The student sat to them to warm and told them a story as apostle Peter three times repudiated Christ; then he could not stand it and cried. And listening to him, these moved women cried as well. They cried because something that happened in the soul of Peter was close to them, these were shame and sorrow of the apostle. The student, after leaving them, suddenly felt some joy stirred his soul. He thought how the past 'is connected with the present through continuous chain of events: if one touches one end, another will shake'.

The conscience is one of the most mysterious human feelings.

The conscience appears to be often threatening to its host. Not without reason they say in Georgia: 'My enemy is my conscience'. This

is a feeling that has no choice, it cannot be smart, dumb, and cautious. These categories are not for it. Why is it given to the man? It is not clear.

There are people who managed to throw off, to get rid of the conscience, its absence does not bother them, and they feel themselves even more comfortable without it, while nothing gnaws at them.

Likhachov considered the conscience as 'a mysterious phenomenon'.

And in fact it's really hard to find a rational explanation for it. This feeling is irrational, this is the strong side of the conscience, and this is when it is feeble facing cold reasons of the egoism. I never succeeded in explaining why humans need it, whether it is necessary, but a man without the conscience is something terrible.

In that respect one of the best verses by Pushkin is *Remembrance*, created in 1828. These are its last lines:

And Memory before my wakeful eyes
With noiseless hand unwinds her lengthy scroll;
Then, as with loathing I peruse the years,
I tremble, and I curse my natal day,
Wail bitterly, and bitterly shed tears,
But cannot wash the woeful script away.

There is nothing harder than to refuse any self-vindications. The conscience requirements, its judgment and sentence are executed in secret. Nothing hinders the accused that judges himself to avoid the sentence. Pushkin rejects any indulgence for himself, even tears of redemption do not help. We will never know what he punished himself for, but this confession staggers with its courage.

Pushkin is studied at classes of literature, but the school students are never taught that the conscience for him, for Lermontov, Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky was real, that the man has a soul – it is also rather real thing, and one should care of its health, should try to understand what is going on with it.

Working on *Blokadnaya Kniga* ('The Siege Book'), the writer Adamovich and I were deeply impressed with the dairy of a schoolboy, Yury Ryabinkin. It showed the story of conscience-caused torments of the boy in terrible conditions of starving in the besieged Leningrad during World War Two. Each day he faced an unbearable problem – how to fetch home for his mother and sister a piece of bread given in the bakery, how to withstand the desire to eat. More and more often, the hunger overcame, Yura suffered and swore to himself renouncing that tomorrow it would never happen again. The hunger gnawed at him and the conscience did

as well. It was a deadly fight, which of them was going to be stronger. The hunger grew, the conscience got exhausted. Day by day. It's clear with the hunger, but the conscience – where it took strength from, what made it to come again over and over again – you can't do it, stop?..

The only thing that comes to my mind is that it is the divine spark bestowed to the man.

It is like the God representative, His judge, His surveillance, the one granted to the man from above that can either nurture or perish.

It never mistakes.

It has no problem of choice.

It never weighs, estimates, cares for profits.

Maybe, only the consent with conscience brings satisfaction at the outcome of our days.

M. B. PIOTROVSKY,

Chairman of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Director of the State Hermitage, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND CIVILIZATIONS IN THE GLOBAL WORLD

Dear fellow colleagues, today it is an honour for me to speak at this session and to start the discussion on the dialogue of cultures, while it is such an enormous topic entrusted to us by Dmitry Sergeyeovich Likhachov. This continuation has been already conducted absolutely in conditions of what was done by Dmitry Sergeyeovich. I think that my task today is to touch briefly some issues and, maybe, to express some provocative theses related to the problem of the culture dialogue.

As to my professional occupation, I appear to participate in the culture dialogue from both sides: on the one hand, I'm an orientalist, an arabist, on the other – the head of such universal museum as the Hermitage, which is a centre of true culture dialogue. Essentially, it is the main task for such cultural entities.

They talk a lot about the culture dialogue – conferences dedicated to this issue are held one after another, and everybody knows the term itself. It seemed to be enough... But actually we need to talk about that more and more, since the culture dialogue is a very important part of our modern life and somewhat an opportunity to compensate evil things in it. For instance, the main problem of the modern times – globalization in many of its aspects (political, economic, cultural, etc.) – is related with inability to set up the culture dialogue.

This is what the entire world curses. The harm caused by globalization (and it really inflicts harm) can be changed and compensated via the properly organized culture dialogue, because in such a way we can defend cultural particularities and there are obvious possibilities for balancing and harmonization.

To my mind, this dialogue has already passed through several different stages and, at that, in parallel to the culture dialogue, there is the

religion dialogue ongoing, and many similarities can be found there. The stage, when it seemed that everything is easy, is over – there is some set of common values shared by everybody and we need just to communicate to come to an agreement, and afterwards we will think and speak almost the same, and it will be good for everybody... But it will never come true.

The today's dialogue in its various forms is built on clear understanding that there are things, which different cultures will never agree to accept, and there are things, which can be accepted or agreed with, or, at least, to tolerate, because we all need to live together, in peace.

Simultaneously in different spheres – cultural, religious and others – there is a process of upbringing: cultural and religious institutions are bearing now to a large extent a similar function for nation education and laying the foundation for our future generations. It becomes clear that we can never diverge from dogmas, but it is necessary to say in a distinct and explicit manner where exactly we are different. I think that the agreement between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad on many of fundamental issues reached quite recently is an example of doubtless success of this religious dialogue.

Globalism has a range of symbols, or marks; the most well known and the most evident is likely to be McDonald's. Therefore the so-called 'antiglobalists' destroy and even blow up these fast food cafeterias all over the world. Another common globalism symbol is sushi bars also appearing around the world. It is also a responding invasion of another civilization, which opposes its culture to the others, and, firstly, to the Western one. However, this particular spread of the oriental culture and lifestyle did not cause any objections and protests. And it's

quite interesting, why?.. There are different ways to answer this question and it would be interesting to discuss it.

It seems to me that it is now time, when it is necessary to talk about the culture dialogue in regard to, first of all, Russia. Because, there is already a formed tradition, a Russian recipe for peaceful coexistence of different cultures within one multinational country, which can be useful for the entire world.

The culture dialogue is retaining, first of all, of the cultural heritage, and the Russian tradition can suggest what should be the basis to build unity and diversity of the countries of the world and what should be a stimulus for the generation development.

Protestant ethics is known to be a basis for development of capitalism, which can never develop without it, and while it does not exist in the most parts of the world, the so-called failures of the capitalistic development are evident there. And to my mind, instead of protestant ethics, such development stimulus for, at least, Russia, can be our cultural heritage, which is fully capable of becoming the basis of people upbringing with the help of culture and some improvements in our society.

And even the hostile cultural dialogue can be useful. Let's dwell, for instance, on the topic that is close to me and many of you here in this hall of the so-called Islamic factor. It's not a secret that this topic is quite painful for use, however, how much more the world knows now about the Islam as a result of all these horrors and talks about the Islamic threat ...

Quite recently prior to becoming a president, Dr. Nicolas Sarkozy was reprehended that in one of his interviews he was confused and could not answer the question, what type of organization is Al-Qaeda, – Sunni or Shiite. Well, in return now everybody knows that there are Sunnis and Shiites. In fact, not everybody knows that there is no Al-Qaeda at all, but it is another issue.

Besides, it is of tremendous value to have high quality, adequate translations of important cultural terms, which divide civilizations. For instance, everybody knows the famous word *jihād* in its so-called 'military meaning', but its general cultural sense is unknown to the majority of Europeans. Therefore the word 'jihād' today is mostly associated with the crusade for the faith, but not with its most widely used meaning of a struggle for good for the sake of one's own ideals. Comparing these definitions makes it clear that even though having differences, diverse cultures have things to discuss.

I'm continuously trying to preach the thought, which many can't agree with, that the

word 'Islam' shall be translated as 'humility', and from that point of view, even with large differences between the Christianity and the Islam, some similarities can be found.

The Russian recipe for these complicated relationships seems to be quite well exhibited by particularly Muslim-Orthodox connections in Russia. With this respect, we can talk a lot about the period of the Golden Horde, when along with this great power there existed small, detached Russian principalities, which through military and non-military relations with it grew into the huge and united Russian state to be incorporated later the Golden Horde.

The Russian Empire has different examples of cultural and religious relations. When the city of Kazan celebrated 1000 year anniversary, our St. Petersburg wanted to present this city with the monument to Peter the First, but our Kazan friends said: 'You know, we don't want to have the monument to Peter the First. But to the Catherine! And we don't want Peter the First, as far as he made people to convert to the Orthodoxy'.

I should say that we felt hurt that time and, after all, when opening the branch of the Hermitage in Kazan, installed the monument to Peter the Great as a founder of our city. But looking attentively at the documents of the Peter's epoch and comparing what is described in them with what happened during the Catherine days, one can note considerable differences. For instance, under Peter the First it was prohibited to build mosques, Muslim landowners were forced to convert into Christianity, the more so that they owned Orthodox Christians as their serves. However, under Catherine there was developed the administration system that existed almost till our times: the whole set of various legal enactments that enabled to co-exist – though far from being ideal but still pretty well – various confessions, in this particular case – Islam and Christianity, within the framework of a single culture in Russia.

There is another and, as it seems to me, very important example which we should never forget – it is our national oriental studies. Russia always had a kind of three categories of people conducting oriental researches. One category was practical persons doing research basing on interests of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and 'dragomanity', if to use the language of the 19th century. Besides, Russia had oriental missionary works. For instance, in Kazan there was a school for such missionaries, where they published a vast amount of books related to the Islam analysis. Being expressly propagandistic, they were considerably targeted against the Islam. I should say that in the large, those were quite

interesting books. Recently an entire volume of various selections from such studies was published – ‘Islam in the Works of Russian Theologians’, though, actually, these were the works mostly not by theologians, but propagandists.

And the third part was the academic oriental studies. These were our remarkable St. Petersburg orientalist and academicians, who put out strength to reply with reviews to propagandistic and scientifically ill-based materials about the Islam; however, they sometimes wrote the works against the Islam in a very strong form, and that seemed to be quite striking for such scientists as Bartold, Rohsen and Krachkovsky. All aforesaid is also a very important tradition, which we do not forget: we still have three realms of development for the oriental studies.

One more important issue related to the culture dialogue is spreading nowadays of teaching religious subjects in schools. There are still lots of disputes on this matter. I do remember that several years ago Catholicos of all Armenians during his visit to St. Petersburg said that he found a wonderful thing: a new subject was introduced in Armenian schools – history of the Armenian Church.

It seems to me that the larger half of all arguments on this matter is related to terms, but not whether the history should be taught. One can teach everything applied to the subject name the word ‘history’, which smoothes a great deal of differences. It is a good example of a compromise in the dialogue of the cultures.

For instance, an Orthodox child does not have to know the basics of the Shariah and, maybe, a child from a Muslim or atheistic family does not need to know the basics of Orthodoxy. But both of them obligatory need to study major landmarks of historical, as well as religious development of various nations. For instance, everybody shall know what are the Council of Chalcedon, or the Council of Hundred Chapters, who are Mohammed and Jesus Christ, et cetera. There is a range of the most important events in the history of all religions that we should know living in the country where these religions exist. To my mind, such point of view on the issue would be useful.

Maybe, the main critic of Islam today is Pope Benedict the 16th. But recently I have read a wonderful article in ‘New Yorker’, where it was said basing on analysis of his speeches, that, actually, Pope Benedict wants not to fight the Islam, but rather to make the Catholicism as strong as Islam and to organize it in the similar fashion. And, in fact, all the pathos of his life is the task of the secular state submission to religious ideas and, actually, restoration of the medieval institution of the Papacy.

In this sense quite often the oriental culture with its set of values, where religion plays an important role, is subconsciously perceived by many at the West as an ideal of what the things shall be to make good for everybody.

Another notable aspect of the culture dialogue is how different civilizations look at each other, what are the emotional motives driving people at that. There are two examples, two persons personifying two points of view – the West at the East and the East at the West. For us it is somewhat a system of broken and distorting mirrors, where someone somehow sees someone. But at our days there are two indicative figures in this sense, who wrote manuscripts on this issue. One of them is Ariana Fallaci, renowned journalist being once the lefty, who prior to her death published three menacing books against Arabs and Islam. She told how Europe would become Eurabia, how terrible it is and how should we fight it, even in arms. And contrary to her, there is no less famous and very intelligent book ‘The Orientalism’ by Edward Said – the Palestinian who learned oriental studies in a critical way; it sets out the Western views about the East, which the author criticizes, since they are severely distorted, erroneous, etc. But both positions exhibit signs of fear. For instance, Edward Said explaining why all Western orientalist distort the essence of the Oriental culture said: ‘This is because they are scared – have been scared and are scared, that the Muslim East comes to Europe. This fear gives birth to counteraction’. And practically the same idea is expressed by Ariana Fallaci.

Actually, it is absolutely clear, though explanations are still necessary, that there are no serious grounds for such fears. That is, they are not more than they were in the time, when Turks came to Vienne. We shall deal somehow with these false fears, while all ideologies and disputes should be based on truth rather than fear. There is nothing to be afraid of – the God will sort out, who wins in fights, but human relationships shall be based on anything but fear.

And there is one important thing: the culture dialogue shall not be based on provocations and blowing up such fears. To some extent, it can be called as a sin of intelligentsia, which is capable of doing not much in this world, but it’s not one too many with such ‘putting fat in the fire’ needed to convert tiny conflicts into global ones, as it happened many times in our history.

We all have to learn to live without fear and provocations and, for that purpose, we need to develop a system of the dialogue of the cultures, which will help people of the future to live further – together and in peace.

I do hope that our never-ending talks and attempts to consider the differences of cultures are a very useful activity working for the good of future generations. Our Russian proverb 'Repeating 'halvah' does not create sweet taste in one's mouth' ('Fine words butter no parsnip'), to my mind, is wrong. I'm sure that in regard to the dialogue of

cultures and civilizations if we say 'halvah' many times and for a long time, once the 'mouth of the world' will sense the sweetness. Thus, to a large extent it depends on us only, if our life becomes sweet or bitter in the world, where there exist different cultures pretending to be a chosen one or, at least, to be supreme.

A. A. KOKOSHIN,

Chairman of the Committee on CIS issues and relations with compatriots of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation, Director of Institute of Issues of International Security of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dean of the Department of World Policy, Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences

CULTURE AND NATIONAL-CIVILIZATION IDENTITY OF THE MODERN GREAT POWER

Approaching this topic, I'm talking not like an art critic and culture expert, but as a historian and political scientist. Therefore, in advance I would like to ask for indulgent attitude to my unprofessional notes, assertions about art, art culture and culture in general. Several times I've read the work by Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov, *Unprofessionally on Art*, and I won't keep to myself that it inspired me to a large extent to discuss a set of issues on this matter.

I should admit that judging, assessing and selecting these or those names in the Russian artistic culture, I was guided largely with personal perception of writers and artists basing, naturally, on a range of works of our well-known scientists, specialists, whose appraisals, generally, correspond to my own.

And, clearly, first of all, it is related to diversified and multidisciplinary works by Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov. I would like immediately to state, that these works are not only a scientific and aesthetic heritage, but also a moral and conceptual one. We should remember about it, as the modern world of severe competition, domination of economic interests (which can be seen in all realms of our life including the world politics) presents the value of moral, ideological sets as tremendously important, and, regrettably, they are quite a rare phenomenon.

It is impossible to be a modern great power without clear cultural-civilization identity. But today the explicit cultural-civilization identity of a state is ever more seldom and, correspondingly, more costly in the globalizing world, where unification and standardization dominate more and more. All states including those of

medium rate, meaning 'regional', small ones struggle for their cultural-civilization identity.

Each country manages to implement its cultural-civilization identity in a different way. And such strife-competition has a deep practical sense – both political and economic. With the dominating trend to globalization associated with unification and standardization, the reverse side of a coin in this process is that in our days we extremely high appreciate peculiarity of one or another phenomenon, product, etc. Not without a reason the today's world of economics and business tributes that much of a value to a brand. To some extent, I think that this concept is applicable to a state. A country wishing to be competitive as to the current standards should have its own evident brand, and culture plays a crucial role in the provision of the one. Culture, however, is to be considered in a wider manner, not turning everything to only the artistic culture (here I'm in full agreement with the interpretation of culture given by Dmitry Likhachov in his works, and which corresponds to assortments made by other well known men of culture, like Yury Lotman, Olzhas Suleymenov, et cetera).

However, today I would like to draw your main attention to some aspects of the specifically artistic culture as a very important component of national identity and provision of a respected position for Russia as a modern great power.

Now several words on what I suggest to understand as a *modern* great power. I'm not accidentally stressing this word – *modern*. The modern great power is a country with an effective government and actually stable, dynamically developing civil society institutions,

modern political democracy system; the modern great power should possess an entire range of the world politics instruments of influence at the international arena: the ones called *the hard power*, which core is the country military potential, and *the soft power*, where culture is presented as a main tool. And today culture is becoming more and more important and purely operational factor of existence and development for the modern great power providing its competitiveness among other subjects of the world politics and economics.

If to mention a political class of Russia, naturally, it recognizes this fact. It is well known, how much attention was paid to culture in the address of President to the Federal Duma in 2007. Now the scientific, political community and artistic elite of Russia faces, among many others, the objective to transform those statements, which were clearly defined in President's address, into particular actions. It is quite evident today, that the state and society owe to our great Russian culture.

We have already started to discuss some of these issues with Alexander Sergeevich Zapesotsky and Mikhail Borisovich Piotrovsky. And basing on the results of our today meeting, we can state that we are going to take some specific steps to strengthen activity of the great Foundation – the entity which gathered us all together to support development of ideas of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov.

I can't avoid mentioning that talking about the cultural and civilization identity of Russia, as well as any other country, we, first of all, do think about high culture, but, however, we should take into account mass culture as well. Interaction of high and mass cultures, to my mind, is still not sufficiently studied, it is really multidimensional and far from being unambiguous. Naturally, today one can clearly notice a threat from the side of the mass commercial culture advancing to positions of traditional high culture formed in various regions of the world, including Europe.

During one of the previous Likhachov's conferences, Academician Mikhail Piotrovsky noted, that currently the Internet became a terrible dump. I can agree with that to a large extent, especially as the Dean of Moscow State University Department. When our students present their works being just 'scooped' from this dump, we as professors have to 'take measures'. However, at the same time, the Internet is a very important development factor in the modern economy, civilization; and it is quite valuable to strive, that in the space of the Internet and the mass culture, which is largely im-

plemented through television and also the Internet, the portion of the modern and traditional high culture grows continuously. And such efforts for increasing of the high culture influence on the mass culture should be one of the most important joint ventures for us. We have to define such objective and to shape it with some operational pattern.

What are the components of the national artistic culture of Russia being the most critical from the point of view of our culture and civilization identity? I would define seven of such critical components. First, this is the great Russian literature of the 19th century, which was continued and developed further by the authors of the Silver Age and following decades. Having been preparing to this event, I once again looked through lectures of Vladimir Nabokov on the Russian literature of the 19th century given in one of the American universities. I should say that this great writer just stroke out the entire Soviet literature with a single dash of a pen. And, I have to mention he was absolutely wrong. I think the Soviet period (1920–1930's and the following decades) provided the world with many outstanding writers and wonderful pieces starting from Mikhail Sholokhov's *Tikhii Don* (Quiet Flows the Don).

Talking about noticeable achievements of the Russian philology at the 2nd half of the 20th century (and beginning of the 21st century), one cannot avoid mentioning such names as Konstantin Paustovsky, Konstantin Simonov, Rasul Gamzatov, Vasily Belov, Victor Astafyev, Valentin Rasputin, Chingiz Aytmatov, Vasily Bykov, Daniel Granin, Ion Drutse, Nodar Dumbadze, Fazyl Iscander, etc.

Secondly, this is, of course, Russian painting and sculpture – both realism and avant-garde, started with the 'great three' of Repin-Surikov-Vasnetsov, sculptors Golubkina and Konenkov. Thirdly – architecture, and I mean not separate buildings, but complete architectural complexes, featured in different regions of Russia and, first of all, in St. Petersburg. This city is an outstanding creation from the point of view of integrity, seamless architecture solution for a large megalopolis. As you know, Likhachov talked about that a lot in a passionate way.

Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov turned his attention to small Russian towns as well. With his ideas about beauty of the Russian remote places I recently initiated a large meeting with participation of all major cultural and historical centres presented by small Russian towns including Rostov Velikiy, Suzdal, Tobolsk, Borovsk, Staraya Ladoga, etc. We together with the head of ROSKULTURA, Mikhail Shvidkoy,

held this meeting in Rostov Veliky, and as a tribute to remembrance of Dmitry Likhachov, we outlined a complete plan of action for revival and preservation of cultural and civilization heritage of the small Russian towns, especially wonderful architectural and natural landscapes surrounding them.

Fourth, it is the Russian classical music, renowned with the works by Glinka, Tchaikovsky, the 'Mighty Handful' composers, Scriabin, Rakhmaninov, Stravinsky, Prokofiev, Shostakovich, such performers as Richter, Oysttrakh, Gilels, Rostropovich, Gergiev...

Fifth, I'd like to mention our classical ballet. Dmitry Likhachov expressed a set of quite keen and important statements on this type of Russian art, which I do fully agree with. I think that the idea of saving and developing specifically classical Russian ballet is absolutely right. Naturally, one can argue that classical Russian ballet is, first of all, a dance looking like a fairy tale, that it is something festive and bright, but dance is the essence of ballet, rather than callisthenics, as Dmitry Likhachov correctly noted. Of course, ballet should develop, but we, with no doubts, should retain the look of our ballet, as it was mentioned by Dmitry Likhachov, whilst it is one of the most important components of our cultural and civilization identity.

Sixth, we have certain 'legal grounds' to include into the list of the main components of our cultural and civilization identity the Russian drama, which is associated, mostly, with such names as Stanislavsky, Nemirovich-Danchenko, Meyerhold, Okhlopkov. A lot in this respect has been done and is being done here, in St. Petersburg. In this connection, we can't but recall, for instance, the personalities of Georgy Tovstonogov, Kirill Lavrov who recently passed away, and among modern actors – Lev Dodin, whose works and theatre I'm likely to know best, because he visits Moscow quite often. And I'm honoured to be a member of the Board of Custodians of Lev Dodin's theatre.

Seventh, it is contribution of Russian creative personalities to the film art. The Russian cinema art is famous with such names as Pudovkin, Eisenstein, Romm, Chukhray, Gerasimov, Bondarchuk, Tarkovsky, Konchalovsky, Govorukhin, Mikhalkov, etc. Many of them are also well-known abroad – both to specialists and to the public at large.

In conclusion, I'd like to remind that Dmitry Likhachov several years ago said that modern Russia still does not have any concept of culture and cultural development. Now, I think, we have an opportunity not just to set forth such a concept, but also to contribute to the one. As many of those here, in my talk at the fringe of political science, history and culture studies I tried to bring forward a set of major parameters of our cultural and civilization identity playing, as I see it, an important role for provision of Russia with the great power status.

I do think that now we have both an opportunity and tremendous need in developing such concept. And it seems to me that we should start with our cultures – both highly artistic and mass ones. We shall, first of all, determine parameters of interaction of high and mass culture.

Our concept, to my mind, shall reflect world wide achievements, and widely known achievements of the Great Russia culture, and cultural achievements of other ethnoses living in the Russian Federation and neighbouring nations, the ones that previously were parts of the Soviet Union, and prior to that – the Russian Empire. All these issues together form a highly rich palette of the Russian national culture and 'the Russian world' that now is actively talked about, especially after the speech by President of Russia to the Federal Duma of the Russian Federation.

When developing the concept for our cultural and civilization identity, it is of importance to us to find a keen balance between retaining traditions and becoming modern. And also it has an applied sense for the destiny of our culture.

L. JINGJIE,

President of Chinese Association of Research of Russia, Eastern Europe and Middle Asia,
member of the National Political Consultative Committee of Chinese People's Republic,
academician of the Chinese Academy of Social Studies

ADOPTION OF THE WESTERN CULTURE: NO BIAS EITHER TO THE 'LEFT' OR TO THE 'RIGHT' CAN BE ALLOWED

In accordance with the traditional historical materialism, the human society is developing within the following pattern: primitive commu-

nism society, slaveholding, feudal, capitalistic and socialistic (communistic) society. When the capitalistic society reaches some stage in its

development, it is inevitably replaced by the socialistic (communistic) one. But when exactly does such replacement take place? According to K. Marx and F. Engels, 'the society has too big a civilization, has too many of vital resources and possesses too much of industry and trade. Productive forces in its disposal do not serve anymore to the development of bourgeois property relationships; contrariwise, they become excessively great for these relationships, the bourgeois relationships hinder their development <...> bourgeois relationships became too narrow to contain the riches they developed'. It means that only when the capitalist system can't contain developed material and spiritual wealth, it will be substituted with another social system, that is, the socialist one; at the same time, only when socialism develops higher labour performance and more advanced spiritual culture, it will be able and capable of substituting capitalism.

However, prior to the October revolution, Russia was far from being a developed capitalist country, as it was thought of by Marx and Engels. Though the capitalism in Russia of that time was somewhat developed, it, however, in general could be regarded as an agrarian country. And as to the range of countries that became socialistic after the Second World War, including China, none of them ever passed the stage of developed capitalism and even many of them were at the pre-capitalist stage.

Thus, revolutions in Russia, China and some other countries taking place in the 1st half of the 20th century did not correspond to the theory of Marx and Engels. But what should the communists do after taking power? As to the V. I. Lenin's opinion, first of all, it was necessary to seize the state power and then to develop material and cultural preconditions of socialism. Lenin even raised an issue on studying and adopting capitalistic values to the level of determining perspectives and destiny of socialism; he emphasized that 'to transform the total amount of the richest and historically inevitable and necessary for us reserve of culture, knowledge and technology accumulated by capitalism is to transform it all from a tool of capitalism into a tool of socialism'[†].

However, in regard with the capitalistic culture and the issue of association between socialism and capitalism, Russia, China and other socialistic states drifted from the stated

Lenin's concept and made a set of left-oriented mistakes in theoretical spheres, as well as with the specific political practice. These errors can be mainly classified as follows:

1. Thoughtless identification of contradictions between socialism and capitalism as an opposition and antagonism between countries with different social systems.

2. Consideration of trends in historical development of the human society related to final substitution of capitalism with socialism as a choiceless association between countries with different social systems: either winners or losers.

3. Simplification of the diverse world classification – both socialistic and capitalistic; confidence that only black or white may exist. Flat negation of the capitalistic civilization considering it as tremendous evil.

From dialectic point of view, a relationship between socialism and capitalism is a relationship between new and old where, it is impossible to be fully pro or contra, but joint existence of approval and disapproval is allowable. Socialism rejects only the part of capitalism that lost its vital power, transforms and adopts all of its viable aspects making the latter into organic component and basis of its own development. The new and the old is a unity of oppositions. But opposition does not mean antagonism. It is feckless to consider relations between socialistic and capitalistic countries as class struggle, as relations between life and death; it is a typical sign of metaphysics. Regretfully, such metaphysics for a long time played a decisive role in the world socialistic movement.

Obviously, external policy developed by the leaders of socialist countries in accordance with the given concept was unable to develop properly relationships with the capitalistic countries. For a long time communists were concerned with the fact, that extension of exchanges and cooperation with the capitalistic countries damages the state sovereignty and facilitates penetration of the western ideology. Therefore, for dozens of years all socialistic countries 'locked the doors' thoroughly and, in fact, refused of the policy of openness to the outer world. I don't mention the issue of consciously studying from the capitalism.

As it was demonstrated in real life, such policy brings forth limited freedom of action and is self-weakening. Eventually, the communists in the USSR and the Eastern Europe did not retain their own 'purity' and lost the governing party status. CCP chose a way of reforms and openness to the outer world, adopted the best from the human culture, including

* *Marx K., Engels F. The Works. 2nd ed. M., 1955. Vol. 4. P. 430.*

[†]*Lenin V. I. Complete works. 5th ed. M., 1962. Vol. 36. P. 382.*

cultural advancements of the developed western capitalistic countries. Thus, our country is developing rapidly, and CCP keeps the leading position.

The most important event at the end of the 20th century for the humanity development was the fall of the USSR and dramatic changes in the Eastern Europe. To a large extent it reminds the adoption process of the Western civilization. Therefore, one can say, that the break-up of the USSR and the changes in the Eastern Europe altered not only the world's political map, but also development of the world culture and civilization. A process of social transformations in these countries has not yet been completed. But today it is quite obvious, that a set of tremendous and irrevocable changes has taken place.

Firstly, there was a refusal from the 'model of the Soviet socialism', which was characterized by 'united party', 'united ideology' and 'united property'; it was acknowledged that it is necessary to learn from the developed Western capitalism; and the way of development was chosen.

Secondly, in the sphere of the political system, there was a transfer from the so-called 'totalitarianism' to the 'democratic republican form of government'. In some countries, evident traces of the old system are still present, but the form and the practical content of the 'democratic republican form of government' does not fully correspond one another.

Third, in the sphere of the economic system, there was a transfer from the united property and centralized planned economy to diversity of forms of property and market economy, though many of the countries are still far from reaching the latter.

Forth, in the sphere of culture and ideology, there was present a rejection of the leading position and role of Marxism-Leninism and, instead, implementation of pluralism in this sphere.

Fifth, in the sphere of external policy, there was a refusal from confrontation and, instead, seeking of cooperation with the West; some of the countries via participation in NATO and EU joined the West.

During the last decade of the 20th century, there were tremendous changes in these countries, and most of them had to pay enormously for that. For instance, in Russia, comparing 1998 and 1990, the GDP decreased by 50 %, and the standards of living of the population by 40 %, and clearly one could see weakened total strength of the state. Among 27 states only some of the countries in the

Eastern Europe entered the path of stable development fast, facing relatively less of hardships.

If to study further, one can notice that the countries, which earlier than others overcame the crisis and reached the path of stable development, have the following particular features: firstly, due to historical traditions and culture, they are similar to Western Europe; secondly, the reforms were conducted there to this or that extent without dramatic changes, as a result, some factors of the market economy appeared. Other countries, which still are overcoming the hardships, do not have such conditions. Obviously, it can explain the truth, which statesmen usually neglect: when adopting foreign values, one should take into account one's own conditions and realities.

The ability to learn from other countries and nations, to adopt and accept all achievements of the human civilization is a symbol and a source of continuous development of prosperity of any state. However, while learning from foreign countries, it is necessary to take into account our own traditions and culture. All foreign social systems and cultures appeared and developed in specific conditions; and even if they are perfect, they in none of the cases should be adopted in a mechanical way. Even 2000 years ago Chinese wise men used tangerines as an example: they can't be transplanted by force, otherwise fruits will be uneatable – so that people never utilize mechanical adoption. The matter is that in China sweet fruits tangerines usually grow to the south of the Hwang Ho River, but if they are planted to the north of the river, the fruits gain strong odour and are inedible. And the reason is that different banks of the river have different conditions. This story teaches us, that when adopting beneficial experience from abroad, it is not good to mechanically copy it and ignore our own, specific conditions, otherwise even previous advantages might disappear.

The humanity moves from yesterday to today and further, to the future. Yesterday, today and tomorrow are closely interrelated and cannot be divided arbitrarily. With regard to the historical culture, people may implement transformations, create, but it cannot be divided on separate fragments, or some parts of it eliminated. When someone wants to break and eliminate his own national historical culture, he will be severely punished. The 'culture revolution' in China is a vivid illustration for that. During the reforms in the USSR and the Eastern Europe one can find lots of such examples.

If one considers refusal of the socialist countries of capitalistic values as left-biased errors, then the diseases of 'democratic naivety' can be considered as right-biased mistakes. At some point in time this disease was spread in many countries. These 'patients' assume that the western democratic system implies prosperity, and after it is implemented, everything ought to get on like a house afire. For many years the theory is promoted, that 'certainly, democracy brings forth development', it became a kind of a law. However, they can't prove it in practice. According to the existing data, 62 % of the countries in the world declare, that they have a democratic system, but not too many of them attained true progress and prosperity. At the same time, there are absolutely different examples: many countries and regions, where the western democratic system is not installed, in a short period of time implemented industrialization and modernization, considerably diminishing a gap with the developed countries. Naturally, such comparison is given not to claim, that democracy is bad, or good for nothing. Quite the contrary, the true democracy is a common hope of the entire humanity. Without any doubts, sooner or later all countries in the world will follow the road of democratization in various forms. However, democracy, both as ideology and a system, is a product of development of economic foundation and productive forces of the society. Within the framework of a political system, democracy shall be developed on the corresponding economic basis, and appropriate political culture provides particular guarantees. This is the only way democracy can continue to exist and function effectively. The Western democratic political system corresponds to the existing economic foundation and culture. It is formed and developed during a long historical period. An attempt to adopt such system in one day, without proper economic basis and political culture, is not just a fantasy, but a gamble.

Since the end of the 1970's, China started to implement a policy of reforms and opened to the external world. Overcoming capitalism and its replacement are no more objectives of CCP – the latter is for diversity of the human civilization and mutual adoptions between socialism and capitalism.

Diversity of civilization in many countries is a main feature of the human society, and at the same time the driving force of the human civilization. One should respect the historical culture, social system and developmental models of all countries, and to accept diversity of the modern world. Different civilizations and social orders in the countries of the world shall co-exist for a long period of time, so that at the process of competence and comparison, they can obtain from one another what is useful for them and develop jointly, basing on what they have in common, while retaining the differences. During the last more than 20 years China achieved notable success, implementing the policy of reforms and openness – this is the result of adoptions from the Western capitalistic civilization and retaining its own cultural traditions and national particularities. Therefore, China calls its socialism as 'socialism with Chinese specificity'.

Entering the new age, the Russian elite again turned to the 'Russian idea'; then there emerged the discussion on 'sovereign democracy'. This discussion demonstrated that Russia adheres to values of the entire humanity and follows the path of democratization and market relations. Along with that, our great neighbour emphasizes that it is necessary to be based on one's own cultural traditions and national features, adopting achievements of the Western civilization. Russia should get rid of the left-wing errors made at the USSR period and of the right-wing ones of the 1990's. In short, adopting the achievements of the Western civilization, the less developed countries should not allow 'left-wing' or 'right-wing' biases.

M. M. JOSHI,

Member of Parliament of India, Doctor

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND CIVILISATIONS IN THE GLOBAL WORLD

The clash of civilisations and cultures has increasingly been recognised as a central issue of the contemporary humanity. This clash has for its setting the irreversible globalisation of the world. Civilisations and cultures can no more

grow in isolation from each other, and the angularities and the sharp edges of civilisations and cultures are now openly in battle with each other, and the Time Spirit demands that these battles are worked out in a new way, in the way

that is appropriate to the higher aims of civilisation. It is in that context that the method of dialogue must be accepted and practiced to its logical conclusion.

It may be pertinent to ask: What is civilisation? At the basic level, civilisation may be defined as a state of civil society governed, organised, educated, possessed of knowledge and appliances. It is an evolved state of society which also seeks to infuse knowledge in all aspects of life. And by culture we usually understand the entire way of life of a society; its values, practices, the way it defines the human relationships not only among the members of the society but also with the environment, the symbols it uses in its arts, literature and also the assumptions and beliefs which are commonly accepted by the society. The clash of civilisations and cultures, therefore, has its roots in differences of visions that aim at relating individuals and collectivities.

Many scholars have argued that some cultures resist economic progress and change while others promote it. In a competitive market economy this would generate cultural conflicts along with the clashes of economic interests. Further, in this concept, there would be certain cultures which are inherently antidevelopment. Such a society would face internal conflicts. Several studies indicate that the world today is far more poorer, far more unjust, far more violent, and far more divided than it was in the last decades of the twentieth century. The ethnic, religious and civilisational divides are continuing and every day a new conflict appears on the horizon and makes life miserable. Some studies have shown that cultural factors, deeply influenced by religion resist the adaptation of scientific methods. Conflict between scientific rationalism and religions adds another dimension to the already existing tensions.

After the end of the Cold War, it was thought that a new world-order would emerge and the World would become more peaceful and would move towards zero conflict situation. However, the globalised world is now tormented by extremism and exclusivism under the irrational pressure of fundamentalism. This shows that economic development and/or rise in trade and commerce brings peace is not valid. It has also now been argued that the genesis of religious fundamentalism lies in market fundamentalism. Moreover, religion is occupying more and more central space and is influencing political decisions both internationally and also within many countries. There is sufficient evidence to show that the space

occupied by the ideological battle during the Cold War has now been filled by the global religious revival. How can these conflicts be harmonised? Expectations of a peaceful world after the end of two catastrophic world wars during the last century and other conflicts proved to be a mirage. Neither violence nor affluence could create a peaceful, and democratic world. It is, therefore, imperative that the art and science of dialogue among cultures and civilisations becomes an instrument for sustainable peace in the world.

The techno-economic system which has produced mind boggling affluence and staggering heights of consumption is based on Cartesian-Newtonian mechanistic or reductionist world view. According to this approach the complex 'whole' can only be understood first by fragmenting or reducing it in to its basic building blocks – 'parts' – and then by exploring the laws regarding their interrelationship. The natural consequence of this paradigm has been separation of mind and body, that of the man and the ecosystem and ultimately between man and man. However, towards the middle of the twentieth century, particularly after the advent of Quantum Physics, scientists (physicists, biologists, psychologists) have increasingly realised that instead of 'parts' one should begin with the 'whole'. Holism thus seeks the unity in the complex matrix of the 'whole'. Scientists are now contending that there are reasons to believe that there is in the realm of the physical laws a hidden non-computational element and the phenomenon like consciousness should be inherent at least potentially in all material things.

On the other hand, in the realm of spirituality, there are new trends which have come to accept that the physical world is not an illusion created by physical senses, but a dynamic reality reflecting the operations of spiritual consciousness. These developments provide a meeting ground for science and spirituality and hence one can reach a point where the conflict between science and spirituality can be overcome. As a result, the conflict among religions and also cultures and civilisations can be harmonised quite convincingly through the route of science and spirituality and this route admits only one method: the method of a sincere and synthetic dialogue. The recent break through in information and communication technology offer both a challenge and an opportunity for holding a dialogue among civilisations and cultures in globalized world.

Y. S. VASILYEV,

President of St. Petersburg Polytechnic University, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, member of the Presidium of All-Russia Council of Presidents of Universities and member of the Presidium of St. Petersburg Council of Rectors of Universities, Dr. Sc. (Engineering), professor

GREETING MESSAGE TO THE CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov once was complimentary about the Polytechnic Institute, as it was called those days. Thus, to my mind, this academician promoted the necessity of training engineers in our country.

I think that international Likhachov scientific conferences held in the famous St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences play an important role not only for the humanitarian sphere, but also for the higher technical educational institutions. Therefore during last several years in the

higher technical educational institutions of our country and, first of all, of St. Petersburg, the range of humanitarian subjects gained a new momentum. And here materials of this conference, that Alexander Sergeyevich Zapesotsky kindly sends also to the higher educational institutions with technical profile comes in.

On behalf of the community of rectors of universities of our country, I would like to greet the Conference participants and to wish you fruitful work.

A. O. CHUBARYAN,

Director of Institute of General History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, President of State University of the Humanities, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor

DEVELOPMENT OF CULTURE STUDIES AS MEANS FOR THE DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND CIVILIZATIONS

First of all, I would like to join those who expressed their gratitude and satisfaction with our presence here, at the Likhachov Scientific Conference. But I would also like to add that the University itself, where the Conference is held, and its President have made a lot to provide that such controversial subject called 'culture studies' gained some support in Russia recently.

In our life, we see situations when initially quite pragmatic, as it seems, activity grows into an entire scientific field. This is what happened to the topic of the culture dialogue we are discussing.

Essentially, the problem of a dialogue is a problem of a method and means. When one says: 'Dialogue of civilizations and culture', it implies that the culture studies is somewhat a form and means. One can confidently say that now it is a fully developed scientific area, a subject that deals with the dialogue of cultures and civilizations. And it appeared from highly pragmatic basis. It was a kind of a reaction on the well-known theory of a gap between civilizations, which was in the clearest way expressed in the famous book and articles by Huntington. And many countries, if not all, reacted, that it

was not the gap, but the dialogue. This was the first impulse.

The second response came from the united, prosperous, flourishing Europe being proud that there were no complexities and hardships after the successful process of its integration, but suddenly faced quite serious problems within its member states.

For all new European leaders the problem of emigration is a focus at their election campaigns. The matter is not only how to build relationships with hundred thousands and millions of people living now in Europe, but the problem of adaptation of the new culture and civilization.

I should tell you that when Dr. Sarkozy let drop an inapt phrase, that France was going to be strictly against admittance of Turkey into the united Europe, the head of the German government objected, that half of these Turks already live in Europe and, first of all, in Germany.

Already there are special studies dedicated to how the Arabic culture adapts to the European. They consider there the French experience, the Turkish community in Germany, and that how in general Islam and oriental life style can

be assimilated in Europe and in the West further on. Eventually, searching for the solution to this purely pragmatic task resulted in that we are having today a new scientific subject.

I would like to dwell briefly on peculiarities of the dialogue of cultures and civilizations. Culture appears to be the most synthetic and integrated phenomenon in history and in the modern world. Culture absorbs almost everything, that was attained by the humanity, that is related to science, technology, intellect in general and with the past, the present and the future – the entire way or style of life. The concept of civilization in the Russian scientific tool set recently gained an important place. Initially it was just an antithesis to the formation method and Marxist ideology. But gradually it gained somewhat of a unique character. Nowadays more often, even without deep knowledge of the theme, they try to prove that in the human history everything can be explained via the civilization development.

Culture studies immediately after being formed became interdisciplinary; it included a great many of various subjects – from philosophy, history to psychology, anthropology. In the last years, such diffusiveness resulted in much discussion on what the culture studies is, whether this science exists as such, or it is just a part of other subjects. Therefore, I think that our task for the coming years is to thoroughly develop methodology and instruments for this subject. It has a great number of aspects: these

are the problems of a dialogue, tolerability, hostility, image of the other – a stranger, et cetera. Besides, one should take into account that each man has an inner dialogue with himself or herself. Our Institute has the Department of Cultural Anthropology, Historical Anthropology, and its activity is getting closer and closer to purely biological issues. In short, we are observing an important scientific process. It is necessary to develop actively culture studies and to identify all of its scientific components.

And the last. This subject immediately, and this happens hardly with every science, gained exceptional political and social urgency – both for our country and for the whole world. In Russia, one of the central tasks these days is the solution for the inner dialogue problem, taking into account that we are one of the multinational and multiconfessional countries.

Unlike Europe, where Islam came from outside, Russia has its own Islam, which originated there and which is the leading religion for the part of the Russian society. And it increases for us the necessity of the culture dialogue.

Nowadays in Russia the culture dialogue has gained a social importance and become a part of the concrete policy as an instrument in the system of relationships among political parties and public organizations. Therefore, the problem of the dialogue became the central node for solution of one of our tasks, that is, development of the civil society in Russia.

N. AL-ATTAR,

Vice-President of the Syrian Arab Republic, Doctor

THE DIALOGUE OF CIVILIZATIONS: MUTUAL AID AND PARTNERSHIP

The writer and thinker, Mircea Eliade, thinks that ‘contemporary man presents himself as a historical being formed by the whole history of the humanity’. This positions us in the midst of deep civilizational perspectives with which we restore our historical memory and enter a pattern of absolute existence. Then, we detach ourselves from the ‘illusion of the moment,’ according to Nietzsche, and try to build our universal awareness of the world, starting from a totalitarian perception, more genuine and human. This perception is almost as old as life itself. It stretches from the childhood of humanity to the beginning of the 21st century. It distances itself from the biases of the present and from the narrow limits of geography. It refuses

to be imprisoned by its limitations. This process has been alive since the shores of thought and life have met in an embrace that broke away from the dimensions of time and place.

In our urgent pursuit, it was wonderful to see the luminous lights and amazing depths of the unknown and unwritten history of the beginnings of humanity, through discoveries and scientific research which have attracted the intellectuals of the world, and to listen to the ancient Syrian poet, Meleager, of the ancient Syrian city of Gadara, saying in a mystic outburst of passion, ‘Don’t think me a stranger, all of us come from one country, the world.’

In our present day, activating epistemological dialogue between civilizations, building

relationships, enhancing cohesion, has become an extremely important task. It should even be the common human concern, if we understand civilization as a total act which lies at the heart of human society, and which brings together the distinguishing features of the nation, the total sum of its knowledge, values, creations and its ages old memory, its identity, originality, the meaning of its existence and its creative contribution to the cultures of the world.

It is the process through which human beings develop their spiritual, mental, physical and creative capacities and realize their greatest ambitions. It endows their life, values and future with new significance which constitutes their human substance and sheds away the ambiguities which disguise themselves as civilization and use its language with abhorrent banality.

It was wonderful for the Federal Republic of Russia, through the University of Social and Human Sciences, to host the 'dialogue of civilizations' conferences in the great and ancient city of St. Petersburg with their honest conceptions and their rejection of rigidity and extremism. These conferences constitute an appropriate response to the politicized and extremely reckless approach adopted by ideologues, such as Huntington, who think, as you know, that the relationship between civilizations is that of conflict. This is also associated with the theory of the end of history advocated by Fukuyama. Both of them advocate a wrong and misleading ideology of unipolarism which preaches relations based on hostility and conflict among peoples, and argues that the history of justice and enlightenment has ended. However, these two theories have been exposed, and the world has realized the dangers they pose. In return, there has been a call for a dialogue among civilizations in order to arrive at concepts reconciled to logic and the truth, and to put things in order. Civilizations, now and in the past, have always been in a state of interaction, in a state of give and take, and have always developed as a result of this interaction and exchange, each giving and adding to the contributions of the others to a process which has not condescended to the false logic of conflict.

The world around us, on this planet, is fed up with such theories which are riddled with hostility. It looks for a just alternative in the shape of dialogue which constitutes the call of conscience, the wish of a yearning soul and the will of intellect in order to achieve human communication that realizes a moral mission and builds the 'reason front', according to Eric Hobsbawm. We hope that the dialogue of civilizations which is conducted in our conference

and in other academic institutions will be able to restore the civilizational memory of the world, and to build an invincible front of the world's intellectuals who are concerned with drawing the features of a better future in which there are no attempts to cancel and isolate multicultural and multiracial peoples and which genuinely protects diversity and interaction and believes that any nation, no matter how small, has something to offer to the world.

If man is a flash of lightning on the glittering surface of life, he will undoubtedly leave an indelible mark on the immortal stones of time. The accumulation of these marks are worthy of our attention and of being part of our visions.

We must remember that removing barriers erected between peoples is one thing and removing peoples, their histories and creations is something else; We must remember too that removing barriers existing between civilizations and cultures is essential, while cancelling nation's civilizations and cultures and replacing them with a one faceted and one dimensional culture is not only rejected, but even very dangerous.

Allow me to point out here that our land, which swims over a sea of ancient and modern civilizations, which has pushed the boundaries of the past and broadened our knowledge of the history of man and the universe, was the greatest cradle of civilizations. Documented research, based on successive archaeological discoveries, shows that it saw the beginning of civic life and the oldest spot on which intellect created the principles of civilization and government. In that region, humanity knew its first discoveries; and from its shores extended the first bridges to communicate with the world and bring it peace, information, trade, gifts and sail to farthest horizons. Yet, it remained, under all circumstances, generous, proud, humane and noble, upholding moral values and all forms of cooperation and giving.

Civilization, in our conviction, should always be open and interactive. They don't cancel each other, nor are they cancelled by each other. No civilization cancels its predecessor, it rather enhances it by influencing it and being influenced by it. In the final analysis, a civilization is the property of all humanity; and its holy fire is ever showing the way and overcoming all borders and barriers.

I would like also to stress that we absolutely reject, on epistemological grounds, the theory of the clash of civilizations which leads to destruction rather than development, drives people apart rather than bring them closer and leads to reductionism instead of integration.

Ladies and gentlemen, We have talked at length about civilizations, and this is by no means wrong. But the question remains about the relationship between civilizations: is it a relationship of dialogue or integration, through which every civilization takes from its predecessors, assimilates and then creates a new addition, as the Arab civilization did when it carried, through Andalusia, the treasures of knowledge to Europe. Its role was not only that of translating Greek philosophy, for instance, it was rather an epistemological structure which learned from its predecessors, assimilated this knowledge and built on it.

Today's civilization, in the countries of the advanced world, is building on and adding to the achievements of its predecessors, which allows us to talk about a civilizational integration, partnership and participation which does not rob the present of its achievements and additions; yet it consults the foundation and roots of the building and what the past gave to the present.

Hence, your endeavours, my friends, to arrive at new and enriching conceptions are highly appreciated. They are efforts which aim at insuring deep human connectedness without which man's humanity cannot be realized.

This is by no means strange to you. Your country's civilization has long conducted a dialogue with the world's literary conscience through astonishing literary creations that have formed our memory from the first moment of our reading of the geniuses of Russian literature throughout the ages.

In the distance which isolates us from each other and which makes the globe orbits of dispute and misunderstanding, we shouldn't allow it to isolate us civilizationally and epistemologically. People should get closer to each other through knowledge which generates understanding, and could lead to a mutual clearer road.

We look forward, through honest cultural openness and exchange, to prospects of cooperation, where creation becomes an ambassador qualified to build the best foundations for Arab Russian relations, based on mutual understanding and respect and the civilizational trust we highly value. We applaud the role played by the University of Social and Human Sciences and we trust that it will succeed in accomplishing its mission and that it will achieve the progress it aspires for in a city which is the epitome of creativity, glory and civilization.

A. V. SALTANOV,

Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Special Representative of President of the Russian Federation on the Middle-East Issues

ISSUES OF INTERCIVILIZATIONAL CONTACTS IN THE DIALOGUE OF CULTURES

Relevance of our current meeting topic is undisputable. Ideological confrontation of the cold war era with its negative predictability is substituted with threats of considerably more dangerous intercivilizational break-up. Provoked by terrorists and objectively accompanying them with adherents of single-sided, including coercive, approaches to resolution of international problems, this approach is hard to control and regulate, while it is beyond the frame of interstate relations. Not only strive for unified approach and desire to eliminate cultural and civilization differences are dangerous, but the ideology of such policy itself being based on the confrontation predisposition of diversity of cultures and civilizations.

Admittance of this challenge appeared to be the driving motive for all those being present here and for many other forums, scientific symposia and political discussion, where prob-

lems of intercivilizational dimension of the modern international relationships are discussed. This is the way to a dialogue, and the dialogue is the way to an intercivilizational partnership. But this path is not easy, while it assumes some transformations of intracivilizational resources, their accumulation to fight extremism, xenophobia and other concomitant issues.

Talking about the cold war, it is likely to be a conflict within one civilization, and it cannot be allowed that the transformation, which is ongoing at the European continent, will create a new opposition or, as they commonly say now, new demarcation lines. And, uppermost, the matter in hand should be avoiding opposition of the integration process at the CIS space to the European construction process. As President of Russia noted in connection with the 50th annual anniversary of the European Union,

it is impossible to achieve complete unity of our continent until Russia, being the largest European state, becomes an integral part of the European process. And the issue seems to be not only political unity, but restoration of the European civilization integrity. Our civilization heritage, experience of international, inter-confessional coexistence and, largely, interaction, might mean a lot. This is all enrooted into our culture, which sources are within Christianity. Nevertheless, at the same time we are the country, which is unique concerning its multiconfessionality and, may the scientists excuse me, multicultural.

In the modern globalizing world, when the competition realm involves value marks and development models, the main purpose of the intercivilizational dialogue is to unite efforts of all the states, large and small, and to develop together principles of living for the world community. From our point of view, they should be built on common view of how to use reasonably those advantages of globalization and to minimize its negative effects. First of all, it is related to diminution of the space of social and economic degradation and overcoming poverty, basing on equal access for all to the following: globalization advantages; preservation of national identity and cultural and civilization diversity of the world; countering to global challenges and safety threats and stable development, including settlement of crisis and conflict situations; improvement of manageability of world processes and formation of a safer, just and democratic world order.

Naturally, here we can see opportunities and potential of Russia for contributing to promotion of these principles and developing the new world order on their basis. A significant step ahead on this way was the World summit of religious leaders held in Moscow last year. In December 2006, on our initiative the resolution of the UN General Assembly was adopted, emphasizing inadmissibility of restoration of any forms of racism, race discrimination and xenophobia. We joined the group of supporters of the UN-approved Spanish-Turkish initiative for the civilization alliance, and intend to facilitate actively its promotion. The UN Secretary General was presented with a report of the high-level group with Russian participation, formulating specific directions for our activities.

We think that now it is time for more active involvement of the civil society to these efforts. We are fully confident that the United Nations must lead the process for prevention of intercivilizational break-ups, as far as this process was born because of united international efforts

to fight against the common evil, the common threat. And the challenge of modern times also requires solidarity and unity. Certainly, in this respect, the UN should adapt to the modern realia, but the reforms are not the main issue, they shouldn't be an end in itself. The most important is that the UN, retaining its unique legitimacy, is to be able of more effective reacting on challenges of the 21st century to unite nations and countries.

Undoubtedly, the Group of Eight plays an important role in it, and Russia within the framework of its participation in the work of this group actively assists to the process, that promotion of the well-known initiative of the Big Eight on building up partnership with the countries of the Middle East and Northern African regions corresponds to stabilization of situation in the world. Stabilization of intercivilizational relations, no intrusion of recipes, but mutually respectful partnership, which should facilitate making bridges between civilizations, strengthening the dialogue of confessions and cultures, are the topmost important today. However, the initiative on reformation of this large and, regretfully, still very uneasy region shall originate from the countries in this region, taking into account its specifics, traditions and understanding how to setup better living. The international community and the Big Eight are only to render assistance to these efforts.

Naturally, it is hard to imagine that the reforms and promotion of democratic basis at this vast space can be implemented without settling one of the most important regional conflicts of our days, the Arab-Israel one.

In connection with it, since we are talking about intercivilizational relations, I would like to note the following. Recently more and more often, the idea is worded out, that what is going on at the Middle East is already a collision of Jewish-Christian and Islamic civilizations, though it does not fully square with reality, since the conflict roots are different. The main danger is that continued abeyant conflict started to gain intercivilizational consequences. Therefore, it is within the interests of the entire international community to help to the Middle East countries to develop peace agreements.

Undoubtedly, improvement of the intercivilizational relations is facilitated with such multifaceted configurations as CIS, EurAsEC, SCO, CSTO and the Organization of the Islamic Conference. By the way, recently I was present at the meeting of the ministries of foreign affairs within the framework of this conference, and I can say that the topic of intercivilizational

relations, the dialogue between Islam and other religions becomes one of the highest priorities at this forum. Leaders of majority of Muslim states understand, that this is the common challenge – both for secular societies and for Islamic religious figures.

Certainly, we can't perceive this global problem only within the framework of resolving contradictions or, to be more precise, via the dichotomy prism: Islam, Christianity, etc. The matter in hand should be on building up of interaction among all civilizations and cultures, rather than the Christian West and Muslim East. It is very important for us that, at the international arena, the current multi-view policy of uniting pattern gathers pace. It is important for us, since this approach is mainly determined with the following: in the issues of intercivilizational understanding, interests of internal and external policy and security of Russia are inseparably connected. Moreover, this issue contains challenges to the existence of Russia as a united state. Therefore, of course, the intercivilizational break-up is absolutely unacceptable for us.

We don't dispute our European choice, but we can't be unambiguously self determined taking side of this or that civilization. The outside observer role is also not appropriate for us. It seems that the historical mission of our country is strengthening of mutual understanding and tolerance at the cultural and civilization level. Now when globalization gains 'the Asian look', it is mostly important. In Russia there were created centers for Islamic and Arabic researches, Foundation for support to the Islamic culture, science and education, we have the strategic vision group 'Russia and the Islamic world', which third session was held recently in Istanbul.

After the globalization processes moved beyond the borders of the Western civilization, the competition also gained civilization dimension. It is necessary focusing on our competitive advantages to seek for the ways of agreement in resolving common problems. Indivisibility of security and prosperity in the modern world leaves us no other alternative, at least the reasonable one. But the attempts of reintroduction of ideology and militarization into international relationships constitute a serious hindrance. The Russian diplomacy successively opposes these dangerous trends. There are no doubts, and no doubts can be, that the cardinal way of development for civilizations is a democratic governing.

We shall admit that main principles of democracy are universal. Further, some questions

emerge. Are we prepared to accept those results of democratic development, which often do not correspond to our perception and, moreover, political aspirations? We can't exclude the situation – and such examples appeared recently – that as a result, I should stress it, of 'pure' democratic elections in some countries and regions, the power was gained by such parties, that, as per assessments of some of our partners, are carriers of extremist ideas. What shall we do in this case? How shall we interact with such reality? Shall we oppose it with coercive measures, cancelling the results of the democratic elections? Shall we never respect the democratic choice of this or that nation? Or there is another way – the way of constructive, positive influence through the dialogue? I think there are no doubts that the second way is more effective, while it does not result in further flares and, what is the most terrible, new bloodshed.

Each country comes to democracy at its own pace, in its own time, considering its history, culture, traditions. The same is true for Russia. Our country has built freedom and democracy, and at the scale of the Russian priorities the democratic values are not substituted with the economic growth or social well-being. But we are also for the process of democratization in the international relations, removal from them of imposing someone's will and double standards, when democratic slogans are used sometimes to cover intrusion into internal affairs of the other state.

Another important issue directly related to the democratization is a relation of the human right and freedoms and the security issues in conditions of the growing wave of extremism and terrorism. Where is the brink, beyond which we cannot and, maybe, should not limit the rights and freedoms? Although we know that there are countries with internal regulation in this space, that impose certain restraints. Certainly, it is a very serious issue, which must be resolved.

In conclusion, I should repeat that the urgent objective of today is to develop the dialogue leading to interaction, partnership in the intercivilizational dimension. And this should be a dialogue of Russia, the EEC and the USA. In our current world subjected to the globalization processes, both Europe and the United States and many other powers become more and more multinational and multiconfessional and come to a complicated situation when the 'melting-out tank' mechanism stops to function, and within the country the permanent population group with clear cultural and civilization features appear. Re-

gretfully, tension inside intercivilizational relations in the world is steadily increasing. This problem affects everybody, and it is impossible to ignore it. The solution with joint

efforts can become a true foundation for promotion of the intercivilizational dialogue, where Russia and our CIS partners can play an appreciable role.

A. A. GUSEYNOV,

Director of Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences

WHAT ARE WE TALKING ABOUT WHEN WE TALK ABOUT THE DIALOGUE OF CIVILIZATIONS?

When in our conversation we use the notion of civilization (culture), when we talk about interaction (dialogue, cooperation, competitiveness, conflict, etc.) of civilizations, then it should be taken into account that these are high level abstractions, generalized characteristics of many empirical objects. It is filled with exact content only within the framework and as a moment of particular systematized theories and doctrines as, for instance, Toynbee's, Spengler's, Morgan–Engels's. Beyond these limits it gains approximate, blur, metaphorical and, quite often, totally transformed sense. Civilization as culture (when the latter is talked about in a meaning equal to civilization) does not have any subjectivism, does not exist as an empirical object. It does not exist as something separate, as something that functions independently and can be rigorously fixed, is located within the framework of specific target-organized activity, in brief, as something that you can point at. It is a kind of conditional, ideally marked result compiled of actions of tremendous, virtually uncountable number of people as well as multiple, uncountable problems, forms of activities, events.

We are talking about the dialogue of civilizations, but I would like to ask you, where and how civilizations meet, where they face one another as civilizations. They meet in such capacity nowhere. And no one can call such a place. Ethnographers found that some, neighboring with one another archaic tribes were divided with territories that none of them owned. It was neutral, no man's land. There members of different tribes could contact each other and practice forms of behaviour, prohibited within their tribes. Modern civilizations cannot function as one whole, like ancient tribes, and there is no neutral ('no man's land') territory between them. They penetrate, flow from one into another in such manifold and deep ways, that it is impossible to draw separation lines between them.

The idea I would like to express is as follows: not civilizations, but people (individuals, nations, states) being part of different civilizations interact there. Moreover, as a rule, almost in 99.9 % they interact not owing to their civilization differences, but due to specific problems, which they are concerned with and which resolution they contact one another for. Taking into account these simple and self-explanatory statements, we can eliminate many problems and difficulties, which are seemingly irresolvable at the level of metaphysical images and logical formulas.

For instance, let us take such wheeze question, whether the East and the West can meet. Where should they go? They met a long time ago. Aren't there hundreds of millions of people travelling from the East to the West and backwards moved with different, quite good plans and interests?! Aren't European cities rich in oriental restaurants, and do oriental cities ignore the European cuisine? Aren't there millions, dozens, hundreds of millions of people of the East and the West who are married, thus forming family unions – the closest, most intimate unions existing among humans?! Do eastern and western countries refuse to trade with each other?! Are there many of the western languages, which 'The Arabian Nights' has not been translated into, and oriental languages which Homer's, Shakespeare's, Tolstoy's works have not been translated into? Which of the great spiritual leaders of the West during the last two centuries did not turn to the East at heart, and which of the great figures of the East did not get accustomed with the Western culture? Wasn't the 'West-Östliches Divan' a poetic peak for Goethe, and were not Confucius, Koran and other sources of oriental wisdom table-books for the later Tolstoy? Were not Mahatma Gandhi and Ho Chi Min students in Europe and, what is more important, haven't they studied the school of European intellectualism? Finally, are

there people, events, things, which we don't know where to relate, to the East or to the West? Where was Christianity born, in the West or in the East? Who owns Aristotle – the European West or the Muslim East?! Where to relate Russia – to the West or to the East?! And Judaism – is it the East or the West? One can ask thousands of such rhetorical questions. But even those asked are sufficient to see how farfetched, speculative, far from reality are the arguments trying to separate impassably or even to oppose the East and the West. They cannot be of that kind for they operate with abstractions of the East and the West, as if they designate empirical objects. And, as a result, these abstractions become phantoms. And the phantoms are phantoms; they are destined to scare us.

Civilizations (cultures) in their empiric reality are represented with many people and their unions, communities. There is a question, whether there are among them those who personify civilization in a specific way, have unquestionable or, at least, prior right to represent, to talk on its behalf? There are no such personalities, either separate individuals or their groups. First of all, there are no such individuals, because civilization is represented not only with a great deal of people, but also with very different people. They are different even in their understanding of the essence of their civilization and its interests. For instance, who today can speak on behalf of the Islamic civilization? Religious figures? But they represent different religious branches and understand its role in the modern world differently, and not in all cases can they rise above religion-motivated and often murderous enmity in the Muslim world itself. Not mentioning that the Islamic civilization today is not entirely religious. Political leaders, country leaders? But the Islamic world states quarrel with each other not less, than with the Western ones. Many of them are closer to the USA and European countries, than to their neighbours. Thinkers, philosophers? They never enjoyed unconditional authority, and in the modern world they have much less of the one than ever. Some Western politicians and mass media display the case in such a way, as if some of those cultivating terrorist movements in the Islam world do represent it. But, in fact, they are marginal, and in the Islamic world their position gives them no more rights to speak on its behalf, as ultranationalist, neo-fascist groups in the European countries have, when they speak on behalf of the latter.

In brief, there are no specific individuals or groups of individuals, out of whose mouths the

truth of civilization (culture) being either Islamic, European or any other is expressed. And when they do it and, regretfully, they do it too often, they reach beyond their competence and enter upon the path of irresponsible statements and demagogy. Naturally, one can claim, that each person, while he or she is related to this or that civilization, carries it in himself or herself and, therefore, has a right to talk on its behalf. But it exactly means that there is no one with a specific, prior right to do it. Besides, civilization identity is a kind of generic characteristics of individuals not existing separately from their particular, personal ones. Therefore, the right of everyone to speak for their civilization is not more than the right of all others to take these statements lightly.

Civilizations in their reality are represented not only with many and different people, but also they are represented with many and different problems. And they don't have (or almost do not have) problems, which are so-called pure embodiment of civilization peculiarities. Each of them has its own nature and, respectively, requires specific methods and solutions. Migration has its own trends and solution methods. Weapons of mass destruction are a problem resolved by other methods. Energy supply and consumption has its own specific ones. And none of these and of that kind of content problem is linked to the civilization peculiarity. None of them does unite or dissociate people as to criteria of general civilization, religious, ethnocultural properties. And it's totally wrong to assign those troubles, collisions appearing at the process of resolving specific problems, where representatives of specific civilization (cultures, religions, ethnic groups) are involved in to those differences, to conclude from them uplifting to the level of civilization opposition. A typical example for such substitution of the particular with the general are attempts to associate activity of Al-Qaeda and other similar terrorist organizations with Islam, to associate to such extent, that there are talks starting about particular cruelty of Islam, drawing conclusions on this terrorist activity from Islam. Such way of thinking is logically wrong, while it is clear that Muslims aren't obligatory terrorists, and terrorists aren't only Muslims. It is also false and socially destructive, since it obscures causes of terrorism and, thus, hinders its effective handling. These terrorists appeal to Islam depicting themselves as its warriors; in such case they abuse religion, use it as a cover, and when people fighting against the terrorism think in the similar fashion, it means that, in fact, they are close to the terrorists.

Diversity of communicative and objective situation of the modern man considered via a 'prism' of civilization and cultural difference is presented, at least, in two (or, maybe, only two) situations, that are directly related to these differences and are considerably determined by them. They deal with civilization and cultural symbols. First, there are names, objects, places, which have the sacral value and which within a particular culture and for its representatives are considered holy. Second, there are external forms of behaviour and everyday life, underlining civilization and cultural identity of individuals. These situations being widely known recently can be illustrated in the first case with the so-called cartoon scandal, and in the second – the case of shawls. These are situations, which people face exactly as representatives of particular civilizations, cultures and in regard to which one can talk about the civilization or culture incompatibility, if there is no solution acceptable for all parties. Actually, they do have a solution – such solution is hard, it requires some efforts, compromises, education, formation of culture of dialogue and tolerability but, nonetheless, such solution exists.

Conflicts related to holy symbols are resolved within the framework of properly built ethics of interpersonal relationships acceptable for all people, regardless of their cultural and civilization identity.

The civilization identity is a part of individual's core. It constitutes one of the most important elements of his or her personality. Religious-cultural, ethnonational symbols of civilization identity merge with the personal 'Ego' completely to such extent, that it is impossible to break them one from another without deformation of each of parts of this twofold complex. Something is considered to be holy, until there are people considering it holy. And these people are who they are, until they consider this thing holy and bear it in their hearts. Therefore, to insult a sacred object is to insult a man for whom this object is sacral. Muslims were filled with indignation seeing the cartoons with Prophet Mohammed, because they felt insulted. And the matter in hand is not their specific mentality. Similarly, Christians would take offence (and did take it!) several centuries ago, facing something alike in regard to their religious symbols. About 10 or 20 years ago many in Russia would have been revolted with what one of the literary men wrote about Pushkin without habitual and due respect to the poet; they would have been outraged, since they considered Pushkin a national symbol and to such an extent, as they consider him a symbol.

It is a normal and sound reaction of normal and sound persons against personal insults.

Problems, hardships, collisions appearing between the people in association and at the edge of their civilization differences (religious-cultural and ethnonational symbols – the most vivid indicator of such differences) could be successfully resolved, if we consider them mainly and firstly in regard to an aspect of person's moral dignity. Surely, the civilization identity symbols can be considered from gnoseological, sociological, political and other points of view. At that, it is necessary, first of all, to take into account that some people associate their personal dignity with it, and to reveal, dealing with them, such degree of deference and respect, that within the framework of ethical behavior correctness is expressed by one person, even when someone expresses disagreement with him or her over some points.

Collisions related to the civilization-associated external behaviour forms without such general and sacral profile, as religious and national symbols, are resolved somewhat differently.

A typical case of the kind is the so-called case of kerchiefs. The matter in hand was whether French schoolchildren are allowed to wear demonstrative marks of their confessional denomination (Muslim girl's kerchiefs, Christian's large crosses on the clothes, Jew's caps). The French society and legislation system answered: 'No'. And to my mind such a solution can be considered exemplary. Its sense is to delimit spheres of private and public life in the modern democratic society. To draw such border for many reasons with purely technical one as not the last becomes today harder, nevertheless, it exists as it is. And if one understands differences of the private and the public issues in their values, then it becomes even more important. A person may worship any gods and visit their shrines at the time and look as he or she considers appropriate and what is acceptable in the corresponding environment, but in a secular state civil institutions are non-confessional. Private spheres are the ones, where we live because we are different. The public space is an area, which we enter because we have something in common.

Currently public behavior in regard to appearance, manners, embellishments becomes more and more variable, individualized. A democratic society doesn't have these strict frames for regulation of what is considered decent and acceptable, as it was and is in traditional, class-based societies. Thus, internal mechanisms of mutual respect become more important, and one

of the most important among them is tolerance to people of other views and beliefs.

Tolerability is often interpreted mainly or even only as tolerance to other views, as acknowledgement of another person and a desire to understand this person. Certainly, such understanding reflects the essentials. But it hinged on a question, how far our tolerance can go and what to do in cases, when it faces a position negating the tolerance itself. This question, as far as I can see, has no answer; at least there is no answer at the level of common formula, generally accepted rule. It is hardly possible to appear ever. To escape such emerging difficulty, it is necessary from a positive formula of tolerance, 'be tolerant to heterodoxy (opinions, beliefs) in others', to transfer to its negative formula, 'do not impose others on our own heterodoxy (opinions, beliefs)'. Within such a formula, the issue of what are limits of being tolerant falls away, since it allows to accept tolerability as a categorical (absolute) principle of public behaviour. It means that opinions and beliefs are my own (personal, private) business. I do not impose them on others. And I enter public relations with others on the issues that unite us. Thus, I admit for the other the right to have his or her own opinions and beliefs including the ones, which are unacceptable for me and, from my point of view, false. In this case, I can and must be concerned with issues only, which he or she never brings his or her views and beliefs outside a threshold of his or her own 'home' (confessional, ethnic environment, etc.), so that they never hinder him or her and me to walk along common streets, to be citizens in one state, to live on a single planet.

Generally, I should note: universal moral principles imparted into positive formulas cannot be interpreted unambiguously as specific cases. Such a certainty and absoluteness is only possible when concerning universal prohibitions. Tolerability as a universal principle of behaviour is not an exclusion in this case. Let us take, for instance, the commandment to love neighbours. What should one do, how to behave, how to act in these or those situations, if one sincerely wishes to obey this commandment? The answer on this question is always specific and depends on a particular individual. And it is not a fact that the adequate answer will be found. How many children were spoilt, because they were loved blindly by their parents?! How many crimes were committed supposedly for the sake of love for the Motherland?! And a completely different story is when the same commandments are formulated as prohibitions: 'Do not kill',

'Do not use violence on others'. In this case, it is clear how to behave, which deeds to commit (better to say, which not) for a person, who strives to act in accordance with the given requirement. At least, within the framework of individual-responsible behaviour, it is clear what practical conclusions can be made on it. The same concerns tolerance. A positive formula is 'be tolerant to another person's views unacceptable for you'. But it is unclear, what and how to do in this respect and to what extent one should tolerate something from the other side, which from his or her own point of view is intolerable. And if one understands tolerance as a requirement not to impose one's own opinion on others, then uncertainty, ambiguity disappears.

The culture dialogue can't be understood as a localized and visible sum of actions, which in their entirety can be purposefully regulated. It also can't be locked on people, whose formal or informal status makes them speak on behalf of this or that culture (clergy, writers, ministries of culture, etc.), or diminish to events, directly discuss fate of culture, though, naturally, both positions of these people and these events are tremendously significant. In the modern world where people, countries and nations are inter-related every day and in many forms, the dialogue of cultures is a process, developing at all levels of human contacts and public activity in all spheres of life. And (that seems to be the most important) it follows laws of mass processes, which can be influenced consciously only via institutional and regulatory limitations. The essence of such limitations being mainly of ethical or legal origin is to outline a space for the dialogue of cultures. Being more specific, to set as general as possible such parameters, which provide an area of intercultural interaction with a cultural status. It is achieved, first of all and mainly, via small in number but categorical in power prohibitions. To make culture interaction develop with the dialogue pattern, ways of confrontation between them should be blocked. One can name here, at least, three interrelated bans, which are obvious and have unconditional, categorical sense.

The first prohibition blocking the culture confrontation should be refusal of the idea of culture-based confrontation. It means that cultural peculiarities and differences cannot be a justifying basis for any violent actions.

Moreover, basing on presumptions of culture equality, it is necessary to move beyond a scope of dialogue, to exclude comparisons totally from a public discourse and, especially, contrapositions of cultures based on value

criteria, to ban words, actions or any other symbolic and sign manifestations, which might be perceived in any culture as insulting. To introduce a topic into an agenda of the dialogue means to make it a problem, to impeach or to question it. Therefore, exaggerating in a sense but, at the same time, exposing core of the issue, one can say that the dialogue of cultures can cover all topics, except world-view and value basics of these very cultures.

Finally, another categorical ban is a necessary condition, giving green light to the dialogue of cultures – it is a refusal of absolute pretensions, of announcing one's own culture

more adequate or complete compared to other cultures, implementation of those higher ideas and values, which it targets to comprehend and achieve. They said 'modesty beautifies man'. It beautifies culture as well.

Prohibitions, obvious in their humanistic orientation and generally accepted in their flatness, can only create conditions for the dialogue of cultures. They just outline the most general frame, only within which the productive, each time specific and inexhaustibly diverse interaction of men and resolving of issues at the fringe of different civilizations and cultures might take place.

R. X. KHOKHAR,

Special Representative of the Prime Minister of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan

MISPERCEPTIONS ABOUT ISLAM: CAUSES & REMEDIES

The gulf between Islam and West is on the increase. Some argue that the conflict between Islam and the West is not a post-Cold war phenomenon as Huntington's 'Clash of Civilizations' theory imagines it has been going on since the early years of Muslim ascendancy in the 7th century.

Misperceptions about Islam: Causes and remedies is what will be the focus of my presentation. Elimination of misperceptions is a key imperative for sincere, constructive and result-oriented dialogues.

Koran is the Islam: everything is based on it. So long as Muslims adhere to its injunctions they would be able to bring progress and enlightenment to the world. When they deviated from its teachings the civilization that they had created began to crumble. It is said that civilizations are born and continue to grow only so long that they are able to meet the challenges of their times but decay when they fail to respond. Muslims were able to contribute to the intellectual ascent of man to the spirit of scientific inquiry.

Considering Islam three important facts are ignored:

1. Violence and aggression are contrary to the Koranic doctrine.
2. The Muslims themselves are among the victims of terrorism.
3. The Islamic world is not a unified monolith that can oppose the international community.

There is a perception in the West that Islam is an ideology that breeds terrorism and fanatic

warriors. Late last year Pope Benedict quoted the words of the 14th century Byzantine emperor Manuel the Second: 'Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new. And there you will find things only evil and inhumane.' This was the biggest misrepresentation of the true spirit of Islam.

No doubt that the imperialism and discriminative policy of the West also lead to reinforcing misperceptions about Islam and consequent rise of radical and militant Islam. The solution lies in highlighting the true message of Islam, in eliminating of discrimination and unjust policy of the West, and in educating and moral development of the Muslims.

The historical factor can be traced to the period of crusaders: battle between the Christian Europe and the Muslim Middle East. The traditions traced back to this period have poisoned the European minds against Islam. But apart from religion, there were political and economical reasons of this confrontation. Subsequent penetration of the Muslims in the medieval era deep into the Western Europe resulted in hostility between peoples.

But apart from hostility there is general ignorance about Islam. For example, people in the West do not understand the true meaning of the word 'jihad'. Due to mass media they understand it only as 'warfare', while in reality this word means 'striving, struggling' implying more spiritual aspect. This means the jihad is meant for discovering the truth. War is only permitted in Islam as defence or self-defence, or against oppression and injustice.

It isn't true that Islam was spread by sword. It was wide-spread predominantly due to its simplicity, lucidity and rationalism. Even now, Islam happens to be the fastest growing religion in many western countries. Actually there is no theocracy in Islam. The birth of Islam was a revolution against superstitions, injustice and oppression.

The foremost contemporary threat to global peace and security is terrorism, which knows no boundaries and no nation is immune from it. This provides sufficient reason for the Islamic world and the non-Islamic world to cooperate and build a peaceful world on the basis of commonalities, interdependence and cooperation.

The Muslims need to undertake genuine reforms and revert to the actual teaching of Islam. There is also need for the international community to stop stereotyping Muslims as extremists and understand the doctrinal emphasis of non-aggression and peaceful coexistence. If this is achieved then genuine cooperation between Islam and the West will replace the hostility that has endured for centuries.

We have no choice but to share this planet and to live in harmony. This is a necessity for us and for the future generations. Let us build the bridges of understanding and cooperation.

G. A. YAGODIN,

Professor of Russian Chemical-Engineering University named after D. I. Mendeleev (Moscow), academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Chemistry)

EDUCATION AT THE MODERN STAGE

Beginning of the third millennium coincides in time with transmit of the humanity to a new development form called as 'permanent development'.

Acceptance by a society of ideas for stable development is possible only via a system of training and education. This is a sphere of activity that is able to change people's mass consciousness, targeting it on retaining of natural and cultural values, ethical, humanistic attitude to life, search for compromises, where economic interests of production are in conflict with ecological interests of the society.

Currently the comprehensive schools successfully provide in classes knowledge of laws of nature and society, but there is actually no education on laws of compatibility, interactions of society and nature. As a result, an entire generation of children studies according to traditional (obsolete to-day) models of civilization development, which became non-perspective for the entire humanity. Meanwhile, ideas of stable development correspond to objective current challenges. They may decisively influence future of Russia, play an important role for determination of state priorities, perspectives and strategy of social and economic development of the country.

Understanding absolute necessity of ecological knowledge, developing and integrating them with other subjects, one should specifically emphasize that the modern school

education lacks dramatically the central part – *school course on Basics of Environment and Sustainable Development*.

Work and implementation of this subject into a general education system will facilitate since early childhood development of personal knowledge, skills and properties, that are required for bringing into life ideas for stable development, realization of his or her own role for future improvements, close interrelations among nature, economy and society.

This course shall systematize knowledge of the students in many other subjects (not only natural sciences, but also humanitarian), to set basics for scientific foundation, to facilitate development of behaviour norms, since without the knowledge no conscious practice is possible. And it is very important at the current stage of the society development to bring to every young person understanding of concepts on interaction of nature and society in the history of humanity and on perspectives for future environmentally aware development of the humanity.

In 2003 the Department of Education of Moscow opened experimental site *Environmental Education for Sustainable Development*, which is based in 27 schools of our city under my scientific guidance. It is planned to teach a course of Environmental Basics for 10-year students and Sustainable Development Basics for 11-year students, as well as to conduct

a vast extraschool program on school environmental monitoring, excursion and project works of schoolchildren. Working period of the experimental site is scheduled for five years, and its results will be utilized for a federal experimental web-site.

In the Chemical-Engineering University of Russia our first and second year students at all departments have a study course *Issues of Sustainable Development*. We have developed and conducted profound testing of a program for this course, as well as published methodical guidelines. The course is interdisciplinary and includes a range of subjects from various fields: chemistry, physics, philosophy, ethics, demography, sociology, biology, ecology, legislation, economics, etc. Significant role is dedicated to abilities to work in group, to make collective decisions and to implement them.

Active educational methods were introduced in the course. Also the game workshop was set up on training for team creation and working in them. We played the simulation game of D. Medouz, *World Fishery*, and watched series of movies, *Run to Save the Planet*. Compulsory constituent of the course for all students is participation in the network game, *Stratigem*.

The purpose of the course is to provide students with integral concept of the world to help to come closer to understanding of the world surrounding the man and complicated interactions there, to comprehend himself or herself as a part of this world, to give an idea on values and consequences of anthropogenic

influence on environment, to develop systematic thinking in the students.

Education for sustainable development has a complicated interdisciplinary character, requires concepts on global and regional processes with personal and group participation in problem solution. Methods allowing feeling personal involvement in the problem and adding to traditional educational methods are interactive (active) ones.

The active methods provides training in the process of communication of participants and include role and simulation (business) games, gaming techniques of team creation, working in small groups, games, exercises helping participants to better understand each other and to unite for resolving of complicated issues of stable development. Currently there have been developed original sets of games, adapted the best world patterns to conditions and educational tasks of our country. They are widely used in educational process of the Russian Chemical-Engineering University. Besides, many teachers at schools have been trained to use them at special seminars.

Education for sustainable development includes also general education for all citizens that largely determines their behaviour. Thus, education can be provided at the basis of educational facilities, which do have highly qualified personnel already.

To my mind, global education for sustainable development is a way allowing to prevent global crisis and helping the humanity to learn to live in harmony with our environment.

V. V. POPOV,

Ambassador at large of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation,
Director of the Centre for Partnership of Civilizations of the Scientific-Coordination
Council on International Researches of Moscow State Institute of International
Relations (University) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

ON PARTNERSHIP OF CIVILIZATIONS

Some political scientists state that now it is the 'Golden age' for the humanity. The world economy is on the ascent. The world enjoys this period of prosperity and flourishing not seen since the beginning of the 1970's. Due to breakthrough achievements in a field of technologies, first of all, information ones, there appeared unprecedented opportunities, including the ones bringing people closer to one another. Due to globalization processes, dramatically increasing mutual dependence of societies and countries,

and spread of television, the world is becoming to look like a small village. Some say that, in fact, the Internet and mobile communication emergence made the world one large home.

But this is just one side of a coin. At the same time, our world became the world of sharp inequalities, where few citizens of a 'prosperity pole' enjoy all the good of progress, prosperity and freedom; majority of others rolls down into a pit of poverty, sufferings and humiliation. Inequality of economic growth in some countries

and whole regions due to the growing integration into the world economy increases from year to year. And all these things happen along with serious shifts in disposition and distribution of powers among different civilizations.

During the last centuries starting from the Age of Great Geographical Discoveries, the world gradually became more and more 'europo-centric'. And by the 19th century several leading European countries became the main general geopolitical and economic centre determining the course of the world development, while the other 'peripheral' world got separated into zones of influence rolled around them. This small 'concern of powers', which included Russia, and in the 20th century the USA that joined it as well, became the centre of the world economy, politics and culture.

During almost entire 20th century, examples for another world and, first of all, for developing countries were, so to say, Anglo-Saxon, or American, and Soviet models of development. Achievements of the USA economic development after the 2nd World War were impressive, therefore, the USA had some grounds to claim, that if this or that country desires to have enhanced growth rates, it should follow the American way.

Doubtlessly, an important landmark of the 20th century history was the collapse of colonial system, when liberated countries of Asia and Africa started to search for their own ways of development and their place in the post-war world, separated onto two camps of severe cold war opposition. Its completion, as well as the Soviet model following break-up, again brought the Anglo-Saxon (American) model at the leading positions as seemingly better grounded, more viable and attractive. And the United States assumed a role of a world leader and a new order creator.

Now the situation is changing once again.

On the one hand, there appears another model of development, so-called Asian, which proved its effectiveness and successfulness in practice. The Asian tigers (Malaysia, Thailand, Singapore), India and China are among the leading countries for more than dozen years with the GDP growth rate of 9–10 % per annum (the developed countries of Europe have, in average, 3 %, India – more than 9 %, PRC – above 10 %). Some American political scientists try to explain this fact with these or those specific peculiarities of Asian nations, in particular, with supposedly 'incredible diligence' of Chinese people. Surely, it plays not the very least role. But the 'phenomenal' Chinese diligence is largely determined with civilization order in the Chinese society

with its set of values distinct from the Western perception of the world, society and a place of man in it. Thus, the Anglo-Saxon or American model of development appeared to be not the only one being capable of providing swift and steady development. The contest was confidently joined with other players destroying the Western monopoly on rapid economic growth.

On the other hand, more evident role at the international arena is played by a factor of complicated relationships of the West with Islamic world countries. To some extent, it can be considered as the 'civilization' opposition, and at this front the image is considerably less optimistic. Moreover, relationships of the West with the Islamic world have a trend to be more acute and, regretfully, there is still nothing to indicate any possibility for its principal changing in the future.

This opposition has a long history. It is the colonialism heritage accompanied with complete or partial loss of political independence, unequal exchange or direct plunder, destruction or transformation of traditional economic and social relationships, taking out of cultural values. It is also related to multiple problems of post-colonial development. These are territorial disputes, many of those, in particular, the Palestinian problem, due to specific sensitivity and wide international resonance outgrew a scale of their regions long time ago, and many other factors.

This opposition gained a new profile and absolutely different scale in the 21st century. The most clear dividing line became the events of September 11, 2001, in the USA resulting in military operation in Afghanistan and occupation of Iraq later.

For almost six years fighting terrorism became one of the main international slogans for all international relationships, but its results are not only reassuring, yet, contrariwise, becoming more and more dispiriting year after year. Recently published annual report of the US State Department noted, that in 2006 number of terrorism acts increased by 25 % comparing to 2005, and number of victims among civilian population increased by 40 %. In 2006 in the world there were 14,338 (in 2005 – 11,153) terrorism acts, resulting in death toll of 20,498 people (14,618 in 2005). At that, almost half of the terrorism acts against civilian objects (up to 45 %) happened in Iraq. There the number of such incidents doubled comparing with 2005, from 3,468 to 6,630.

Afghanistan is still a 'chronic hot spot'. From this central Asian country, which is for more than quarter of a century is consumed with civil war accompanied with foreign military

intervention, every day we receive reports on new terrorism acts and victims, including among the civilian population. In 2006, the number of terrorism acts there increased by 50 % – from 491 to 749. Mostly terrorism strikes the regions of the Middle East and South Asia, and, mainly, victims are Muslims – they represent half of all killed and wounded. Among the victims of 2006 there were 1800 killed and wounded children, which is higher by 80 % vs. the data of 2005.

Withdrawal of the American troops from Iraq is inevitable. It will be rather dramatic point in the history, taking into account influence and strength of the USA, both in the region and in the world. However, it seems to be advisable to listen to voices of those who warn – the withdrawal of Americans from Iraq can become not and not that much of a Washington's defeat, but a victory of extremism forces with all following negative consequences, first of all, for countries in the region. The Middle Age oriental wisdom states: 'Before entering a house think how to leave it'. In any case, it is time to think profoundly, how to leave the 'Iraqi home' that became so inhospitable, in a way that allows avoiding hopelessly uncontrollable situation in the country under governance of extremists, as well as in the entire region. Well, it is rather difficult to forecast, when the situation changes in the Middle East, which is one of the most 'sensitive' regions in the world, and how it can influence the Arab-Israel conflict, that for almost 60 years spoils atmosphere of international relationships.

In connection with that, we assume that creation of the Centre for Civilization Partnership in Moscow State University of Foreign Affairs, alma mater of the Russian diplomacy, is a response to the epoch challenge. New cold war between the West and the Islamic world – it doesn't matter who launches that war and what is the reason – is not in line with our interests. We cannot and will not take a position at any side of barricades. Our objective is to dismount them.

And Russia as no other country suits for this role, for we have large percentage of the Muslim population. Christians and Muslims in our country live next to one another for more than 1000 years. There were no religious wars in Russia. One third of our country is in Europe and two thirds are in Asia. We are Eurasia. Therefore, such poetic lines as those in the famous verse by Rudyard Kipling – 'Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet, Till Earth and Sky stand presently at God's great Judgment Seat' – can never be

composed at the Russian grounds. Contrariwise, great Russian philosopher, Nicolay Berdyaev, said that we are the East-West. And known to everybody Russian scientist and a person with encyclopedic knowledge, Dmitry Ivanovich Mendeleev, said that Russia shall be a peacemaker for the East and the West.

Therefore, an idea of a civilization partnership, from our point of view, shall become one of corner stones for the Russian Federation policy.

We assume as advisable to formulate principles of new public movement to comprise participation of politicians and public figures, representatives of business, scientists, culture persons, representatives of clergy and intelligentsia, young people – in short, all who care of the destiny of our world. We do hope that our famous guests being present in this hall also will contribute to the development of cooperation in this respect.

And, it is not accidental that we raise this matter right now and right here, at the International Likhachov Scientific Conference. Topic of the dialogue of cultures, civilizations is a continuation of activities launched by Dmitry Sergeevich and a next stage of what the academician entrusted us, who thought that care of culture in its integrity is a assignment for the whole world, since the development of culture is not just an advancement, but also a world-level selection of all the best created by the humanity.

Dmitry Sergeevich assumed that current stage of the human civilization development gave birth to necessity to develop and accept some general principles, making possible further retaining and development of culture as heritage of the entire humanity. His project 'Declaration of the Rights of Culture' formulated the basically novel approach to determination of a place and role of culture in life of a society. He understood culture as a main sense and value of the human existence, condition for continuing to live in intelligent way. Outside culture, existence of nations and states loses sense. A right for culture, in fact, is set in one row with a right for life. Globalization, which in its present form brings to the humanity both indubitable use and no less obvious evil, was understood by academician as a process moved, first of all, with not economic, but culture interests.

According to Likhachov, globalization should be implemented not only for the 'golden billion' of citizens of some countries, but for the entire humanity. It is necessary to develop a concept of globalization as a harmonic process

of the world culture development, keeping balance between cultures of large nations and small ethnoses, reaching for mutual enrichment and preserving uniqueness of every of them.

Culture of any country will inevitably be internationalized, but each nation shall surely have a culture space for originality. This is the very problem of balance. To search for the latter, it is necessary to lay foundation for another principal approach, which main task is to direct the organic and inevitable process along a proper path.

From its side, our Center for Civilization Partnership established under the aegis of Moscow State University of Foreign Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation also considers important to formulate general principles and statements of a new movement, aimed on facilitation of strengthening interrelationships among different civilizations and cultures, where the principal basis is to admit their equal value:

1. There are no and cannot be any 'higher' and 'lower' civilizations, as there cannot be any 'higher' and 'lower' cultures, races and nations. They all and each of them in its own unique way make a unique contribution to the world culture treasury.

2. All parties in the dialogue shall be considered as absolutely equal partners, who should listen to and hear each other and take interests of one another into account. Only upon observance of balance of parties' interests, it is possible to approach in a constructive manner all existing problems of international relationships.

3. The modern world doesn't allow resolving problems with coercive means only. Use of force can be only short term and conceals inside a hazard of new, more dangerous crises. It is impossible to impose and implement solutions of ethnoconfessional conflicts, prepared from outside. It appears to be advisable to return to the idea of Briand-Kellogg pact (1928), that denounces a method of starting wars to be used for settlement of international conflicts, de-

claring refusal of wars as a tool of international policy and admitting, that settlement or resolution of all disagreements and conflicts despite of their origin should be conducted via peaceful means only. In the meantime, the humanity failed to implement the idea – but today it turns to be possible.

4. In conditions of growing lack of resources, firstly, energetic ones and water also, as well as competitive activity becoming tougher and tougher continuously, it is necessary to strengthen already existing and, if necessary, to develop novel mechanisms for resolution of problems of this kind with economic, financial and contractual methods. Utilization of military forces in economy is absolutely not acceptable.

5. It is necessary to create global and regional centers for preventive diplomacy, dedicated to prevention of conflicts not waiting for new crises. Now this is the greatest possible objective that, regretfully, the modern diplomacy does not always handle successfully.

6. It is necessary to return to the idea of total disarmament with the nuclear disarmament being the first priority. The humanity already possesses such supplies of weapon, that are more than sufficient to destroy completely the yield of our Earth, and it is necessary to eventually abandon this dangerous path leading to collective suicide.

7. I consider necessary to make the yield of scientific and technological change, firstly, in a field of medicine and pharmacology available for all humans, and to provide free access to these civilization benefits without any exclusions.

8. We can't expect any mercies from nature after what we have done to it. It is a task to handle climate changes and global warming issues. We need to make our planet cleaner and more comfortable not only for the 'golden billion'.

We together have to develop our new world acceptable for all civilizations and to pass it to coming generations 'home and dry'.

G. M. REZNIK,

President of the Lawyer's Chamber of Moscow, Chair of Law at the Academic Law University of Institute of State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences, member of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation, M. A. (Law), Honoured Lawyer of the Russian Federation

CULTURE AND LAW IN THE MODERN GLOBALIZING WORLD

At the previous conference I was bold enough to present a report named *Human Rights within the Context of World Civilizations*.

Avoiding the argument, whether intelligentsia disappeared completely or some of its representatives survived, I would like to say

that there is none among reasonable persons who, to my mind, does not include an issue of what is going to happen to our country and the world into the scope of one's considerations. As a lawyer, I've got accustomed to use facts, trying to find, at least, something as a foundation for my mental schemes.

In our rapidly developing world, it is hard to make any prognoses, whilst we experience in several years what previous generations got through during a century. There are two interrelated issues that can be divided for methodical purposes, given the fact of the culture sciences conference here. These two issues are the following: culture development of Russia and the role of Russia in culture development in the world.

Considering the culture development in Russia, my mind is overwhelmed with some alarming notes. If one relies on history and, first of all, contemporary history, on the facts that our life and sociological studies expose, then it is impossible to stay calm.

We have a unique country. Certainly, every country can be considered as unique but, in fact, Russia is something special. Nothing can stay here: neither monarchy, nor socialism, nor liberalism went through. Here everything turns into its opposite. For instance, almost all lofty words in our times become almost abusive. Initially there appeared an abusive word, 'monarchist', then – 'communist', and then, respectively – 'liberal'. Now the word 'democracy' is actually transformed into abusive. It is rather interesting, but somewhat grief.

It seems to me that a drama of our country is that in Russia liberal values have been never in demand. What are the liberal values? Everybody is talking about it in somewhat abstract manner and, in fact, not understanding what happened to Russia in last years, meaning, what are the consequences of our freshly 'baked' pseudoliberalism. And a liberal is a freely thinking person. And liberal values are those listed in international legal enactments, inscribed in constitutions and laws of all countries. These values are: freedom of speech, press, gatherings, separation of powers, presumption of innocence, freedom of movement, independent court, et cetera. Can anyone in our country state, that he refuses these liberal values?..

But in our country, to my mind, all these values were distorted. The matter in hand is culture development in Russia. The representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation has talked about successes of the Anglo-Saxon world, where enormous

material values have been produced. Why did they manage to do it? Well, because they had the culture development there with the help of protestant ethics. And initially it was a nation of castaways and adventurers, extruded from Europe for various, including political intolerance. They came to the New World and created a new democratic country from a scratch. They were not less capable, than citizens of the great nation of China, as it was also mentioned in the talk of the representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation.

What happened here? We did not enjoy such culture development. As a result, today according to sociological studies 53 % of the population support slogan *Russia for the Russians*; 40 % are infected with xenophobia, that is, are afraid of non-Russians, newcomers; 81 % have expressed at this or that extent their hatred to businessmen; 53 % provided positive statements in regard to Stalin's image, and the worst curses of the overwhelming majority of those polled are related to the 1990's, the time of Yeltsin in power and liberal reforms. Why did it happen?

The matter in hand is that right now such cultural 'phenomena' are produced to a certain extent. We really entered the information age, we live in the mass culture society. Television and Internet form customs and tastes.

One should admit that today we have a very bad situation with schools. Those who were unable to enter any other higher education facilities come to the pedagogical ones. Moreover, those graduates of these institutions, who were unable to find a job anywhere else, get the one in schools.

It is hard to add anything else about television – it is all that obvious. And those working on television do not feel shy to confirm it, saying that our television is just a commercial enterprise. The director of one of TV channels gave the following answer on a role of television: 'Well, you know, a TV set is the same domestic device, as a fridge, nothing more'. It is not that sincere... In mass society television provides the strongest influence, forming people's consciousness.

The thesis that 'demand breeds supply' is irrelevant and false for a long time. We are living in times, when the supply forms the demand!.. Moreover, the supply imposes on us the needs, which a person never had before, artificially creating them!

This is all that brings forth an idea that, at first glance, seems to be paradoxical and even preposterous: today production of values and senses is not different from, for instance,

production of cars, sausages or any other product.

At the end, I would like to remind that Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov was not only an outstanding scientist, but also a great citizen. He understood perfectly well, that without influence of high culture, of intellectuals on the society nothing would move on. The truth is that none of us has a right and strength to make life a paradise on Earth. But the main task of humans is not let it to become hell. First of all, targeted state policy shall serve this purpose and the state should see its responsibility for formation of specific customs and tastes in people. How to achieve it? Actually, it is easy. For instance, let us stop talking about

the public television – it is necessary just to give people this public television.

And the last. To my mind, the humanity still has a common instrument able to regulate many controversies and to be protecting – this is the law uniform for everybody. And there is the only organ capable of supporting this law, able to reconcile in a tolerant way the most different interests and values – this is the United Nations. First of all, it is necessary to strengthen legal basis of living in our country and to support in all possible ways uniform legal basis in relationships between states and civilizations. And, in this case, the problem of the dialogue won't be that critical with the lapse of time.

A. A. LIKHANOV,

Writer, Chairman of the Russian Children Foundation,
academician of the Russian Academy of Education

PRECEPTS OF DMITRY SERGEYEVICH LIKHACHOV IN ACTION (A greeting message for the Conference participants)

One year ago at the previous Likhachov Scientific Conference in this hall, there were lots of teachers from various regions of the country. And that time listening to wide, kind and slightly bitter word of Daniel Granin about Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov, all of a sudden, I thought that until new generations of the Russian people read Likhachov's work and feel deeply, what he wrote, all our scientific gatherings and lofty words are useless. Therefore, these are teachers and books that are able to resolve this task...

Thus, the idea appeared to publish new, extraordinary book by Dmitry Likhachov, selecting from his works some prose verses – important thoughts, that the man can't live without. Soon we will publish with circulation of 100,000 copies a book called *Near to Heart*. It is symbolic, that not mentioning the author of this book, the publication was originated by residents of Leningrad/St. Petersburg. The publication ideologist was, surely, Alexander Sergeyevich Zapesotsky. The Children Fund I'm heading worked on compilation of the book. Daniel Alexandrovich Granin agreed to write an introduction to the book, and another representative of the St. Petersburg intelligentsia, professor from Pedagogical University named after A. I. Herzen, Tatyana Galaktionova, wrote methodical guidelines for professors for this

publication. Thus, this book being created gradually transformed into the textbook – the textbook on morals.

As you know, there is no such subject in the modern school curriculum. But when book *Near to Heart* was published, we turned to another St. Petersburg citizen – the Plenipotentiary of President of the Russian Federation in the Central Federal Region, Georgiy Sergeyevich Poltavchenko, who agreed to help us and wrote letters to all governors of this region. Soon with amazement and joy we received many of considerable applications for this book supply. Thus, the thoughts of Dmitry Sergeyevich spread along entire Russia.

I should admit that 73 branch offices of the Children's Fund also made a lot for this. For instance, in the Belgorod region this *textbook on morals* appeared in all schools and not as just one copy, as well as in all libraries. Besides, all schools of the Belgorod regions held Likhachov's classes, facilitated by teachers, who participated in the Conference last year. That was, actually, the aim of work of our Conference.

However, as I assume, the Kirov region became the 'champion of Russia' in this respect, where the governor not only bought majority of the books we published, but also exhibited significant activity in the field of culture. Besides, in his region they found nice, wide, smart

young woman, Elena Olegovna Galitskikh, who performed tremendous work in this respect: she gave trainings to the teachers on how to conduct the Likhachov's classes in school, and dozens and hundreds of teachers from the furthest schools asked her for assistance in these issues. So, in hundreds of schools in this region wonderful Likhachov's lessons were held. Children read Likhachov anew and wrote many of talented compositions in this topic. Certainly,

we gathered and published the best of them. And, as a sign of great respect and gratitude, I would like to present such book of children's compositions to Daniel Alexandrovich Granin.

I assume that no one doubts, that this is a sign of true enlightenment for the good of our great Russian culture, which Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov wrote about so much with such great love, calling us to save it for future generations.

V. P. KAZARIN,

First Deputy Chairman of Sevastopol City Administration,
Dr. Sc. (Philology), Professor

GLOBALIZATION AS OBLIGATORY ELEMENT OF HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF CIVILIZATION (A greeting message to the Conference participants)

Dear friends! I'd like to greet you on behalf of the Ukrainian delegates at this wonderful conference, that one can figuratively call 'a feast of communication'. Due to the International Likhachov Scientific Conference we can hear straight from high ranking persons the point of view of the key countries of our world: Russia, India, China, Pakistan, Syria, and others.

Maybe, the Ukrainian delegation is not the largest, but in return, I dare say, it is not the least influential at this forum since we have many friends among famous people of Russia. For instance, Governor of St. Petersburg, Valentina Matvienko, was born in our Zhitomir region, as well as many of other influential Russians.

It shows how still strong the 'Ukrainian lobby' in Russia is. I hope, it is a pledge that not very successful development of the Russian-Ukrainian relationships will finally get out of the crisis phase.

As a deputy of the Crimea parliament and as the First Vice-Governor of Sevastopol (at the territory of our peninsula we have two administrative units: Autonomous Republic of Crimea and Sevastopol), I'd like to greet all participants of the Conference on behalf of all my colleagues and all Crimea citizens.

And it is especially pleasant to speak here on the Day of Slavonic Letters and Culture, to which our cities, Sevastopol and Chersonese, are directly bound, since Cyril and Methodius at the land of Chersonese conceived the Slavonic alphabet.

I should admit that I was somewhat surprised, that we are talking about globalization and the problems it brought with as if it is something new, as if we faced them just right now. But this is not right.

Thinking about it, one can see that the globalization was always present – it was an obligatory element of historical development of our civilization. For instance, what was the Silk Route, which branch turned to the Crimea, as not one of the signs of globalization? Or what was creation of the greatest empires controlling many surrounding lands as not a globalization sign, and so on, and so forth.

Another thing is that at the current stage globalization with all its organizational, material, financial, informational and other types of resources gain such strength and value, that it actually threatens the very existence of the modern world culture.

Seeing the reality of the globalization threats, we start to talk about them a lot, forgetting that this event grew gradually, but not appeared only today, therefore, it has a very long history, that should be carefully studied. Realizing this fact, it seems to me, we can find additional keys for resolving any of global problems of the current times.

In this respect our experience, that allows the Crimea with all problems of multinational and multiconfessional land to be still not converted into one of multiple hot spots in our country, can be used as a kind of illustration and manual for resolution of such problems.

F. A. ASADULLIN,

Head of the Scientific Department of the Council of Muftis of Russia, Sheikh

ISLAMIC-CHRISTIAN DIALOGUE FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF RUSSIA (Experience elicitation)

Today lots of good words were said about Islam and the Arab-Muslim civilization. In general, I agree with those approaches, that were expressed here both by foreign participants of today's large event and the ideas that were said by our compatriots, famous experts in Arabic studies. And all I have to do is, generally supporting the tone set by the talk of Mikhail Borisovich Piotrovsky, to specify some points.

In fact, it is quite obvious and the course of our conference today confirms it, that the interest to Islam, at least, in the Russian society today, is more and more intelligent. The thinking part of our society strives for having their own concept on the religion, which is that much mentioned in mass media due to so many reasons. I can support the pathos of the Dr. Reznik's speech. Indeed, we need a state program for culture development of representative of various religions and nations. Today at the territory of Russia there live about 170 nations and various ethnoses. It is necessary to make these ethnoses to communicate. And today's Conference is a step in proper direction. We have a very good school of Russian Oriental studies established by outstanding arabists, Krachkovsky and Bertold. Today we have heard the talk of the corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Mikhail Borisovich Piotrovsky, and we will listen to the largest specialist on modern Islam, Vitaliy Vyacheslavovich Naumkin. And I know that Daniel Alexandrovich Granin, in the meantime, also studied at the Oriental Department and learned the Arabic language. In our country, we have a tremendous potential of tolerance and a task of representatives from both various confessional societies and Russian intelligentsia is to develop this potential, as well as, if possible, traditions of religious tolerance. I can see here a great number of young people, many students. Therefore, it is important in this audience to emphasize once again, that uniqueness of the Russian civilization is that when it was formed after the Christian-Slavic constituent an important role was given to the Islamic-Turkic tradition, which was simultaneously religious and cultural one. Until the moment, when Peter the First at the edge of the 17th and 18th centuries 'cut a window into Europe' and, thus, also via establishing of the Northern capital strengthened the link of Russia to the Western civilization, the Mos-

cow Rus, due to strong positions of the Tatar-horde elite, murzas and beys, was perceived by many at the West as Tatar Muscovy.

Russia did not need before and, moreover, does not need now to cut the window to the East. It is actually even today both an organic part of the global Eastern civilization and of the Arab-Muslim civilization in particular. Today, when the interest to consider the historic specific of Russia is being reborn in our society again, including via a 'prism' of its spiritual and historical tradition, I would like to stress once again, that this civilization and historical specifics are related also with the special context of the Islamic-Christian coexistence, the Islamic-Christian consensus, which was so brightly described by the Islamic intellectual, Ismail Gasprinsky, at the beginning of the last century. And today the matter in hand should be acknowledgement of the fact of coexistence of equally worthy religious doctrines, cultures, and cultural and historical types that are so intricately synthesized in the Russian history and civilization.

There are many of examples of what I'm talking about. One of the founders of Moscow along with Yury Dolgorukiy was the Volzhski Bulgarin, Stepan Kuchka, who accepted Christianity and was baptized. It was quite brightly written in *Novel on Beginning of Moscow* – the work that was dated vaguely as the end of the 16th – beginning of the 17th centuries. Recently historical data have been found, that one of liberators from the Polish invasion of 1612 was Nizhniy Novgorod Tatar, Kozma Minin, the son of Nizhniy Novgorod salt manufacturer, Mina Ankudinov. These facts known to many of representatives of the Russian intelligentsia are included into new textbooks on the Russian history.

Probably not so many people know that the author of a popular Russian song 'There Stood a Little Birch Tree in the Field' was a Tatar, professor of Kazan University Nigmat (Nikolai) Ibragimov (1778–1818). Such an unexpected mutual discourse of Turkic Islamic and Christian Slavic worlds made the Russian culture. The Western and Eastern origins joined in the Russian culture making a perfect duet. The main cultural symbol of Russia, Alexander Pushkin, who is called in Russia 'our everything', had, according to modern ethnological

researches, not only Afro-Russian roots, but Tatar blood as well (Musins + Sharafetdinovs).

The inheritance of our honored citizen and our contemporary? the biggest scientist of the twentieth century, Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov (this Conference is called after his name) gives a lot of information to understand the nature of Russian culture, history and even the whole civilization. Opposing the feature of all the Russian ethnoses, which is the high feeling of patriotism, to nationalism and chauvinism he said with bitterness that 'nations know too little about their neighbours' culture, have poor knowledge of history. And at the same time there are a lot of myths, false images and fakes in the historical science^{*}. The above-said can be applied to the contemporary agenda of interethnic and, broader, inter-confessional relations in Russia. While making analysis of the Past of Russia, which D. S. Likhachov estimated, mainly, in the frame of the European area, he put different accents with respect to entities of the Russian reality. He noted in one of his articles that 'the Russian land always was not only a thousand of towns and cities only, but also a thousand cultures'. And he illustrated this statement with example of the main remarkable sight of St. Petersburg – Nevsky Prospect. In the 19th century, Nevsky Prospect, or the prospect of religious tolerance, as the foreigners used to call it, was a site where different churches were located – the Dutch, Lutheran, Catholic, Armenian, and two Orthodox – Kazansky Cathedral and Sign of the Cross Church. It can be added, that long before opening Cathedral Mosque in St. Petersburg (1913), local Muslims, mostly Tatars, in order to observe Islam prescriptions, carried out in 18–19th centuries their festive divine services in rented premises in the corner between Nevsky and Mojka River,

or Nevsky and Fontanka River. This context, evidently, expands boundaries of understanding of religious tolerance both in regard to the Prospect and the City as a whole. Therefore, dialogue of different religions and cultures, Islam not excluded, proceeded from the moment of founding Peter-and-Paul Fortress, and Tatars had a direct relation to it. It will be not a big exaggeration to call Tatars a city-forming ethnosc: for example, the French aristocrat and traveler, marquis de Custin (1790–1857), who visited the capital of the Russian Empire in 1830s, called it in his diary 'the Greek city, improvised for Tatars'. V. G. Belinsky in his 'Physiology of St. Petersburg' (1845) wrote about the Asian entity of the metropolitan society. All this makes us remember the famous words by Chekhov, which he said either seriously or joking: 'our development is Asian, whereas our self-esteem is European'.

In conclusion, I'd like to say that in regard to interpretation of the perspectives of the Islamic-Christian dialogue in modern Russia, it is important to draw attention to challenges threatening today multinational Russian society. Regretfully, today under the flag of fighting international terrorism, there are attempts to separate the world society on the world of Islam and the world of Christianity. These external impulses sometimes, distressingly, collide with circumstances of our reality, damaging considerably international and interreligious relationships.

I think that in conditions of globalization, value of the interreligious dialogue will increase. This dialogue shall be conducted not only among representatives of the religiously-oriented intelligentsia, but also among secular scientists. Thank you for your attention.

V. V. NAUMKIN,

Head of the Department of Regional Problems of the World Politics of Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov, representative of the Russian Federation in the High Level Group of the UN Project *Alliance of Civilizations*, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor

ROLE OF 'THE ALLIANCE OF CIVILIZATIONS' IN THE GLOBAL DIALOGUE SETUP

In December 2006, the UN Secretary General was presented with a report prepared by the High Level Group he formed to formulate the concept and plan of action of the Alliance of

Civilizations. The report contains many ideas, which being implemented can be useful for the global dialogue setup. Authors of the report proceed on the idea of wide consensus of states, cultures and religions in regard to that all societies are interrelated, interdependent and

^{*} Likhachov D. S. Selected Writings. M., 2006. P. 140.

united in their strive for stability, prosperity and peace.

Tremendous danger for achievement of these purposes is attempts to bring the world into the 'civilization corrals'. Local societies are internally changeable and diverse, they are a site for debates, which are not less serious, than the debates among cultures. History of relationships among them is not just wars and conflicts, but also constructive interaction and peaceful coexistence.

Growing tension of relations between the West and the Islamic world is one of the most hazardous harbingers of intercivilizational break-up that can be still prevented. For that it is necessary, first of all, to resolve a range of political problems and, especially, the Arab-Israel conflict and the Iraqi crisis.

In the modern globalizing world, there are attempts to provide prosperity through refusal of culture identity and traditional life style.

'Victimization' feeling appearing in Islamic communities helps extremists to profit from fears and to involve people into violent acts.

Terrorism acts with participation of representatives of the Muslim communities facilitate appearance of inadequate concepts on that the Islamic religion is endogenously characteristic with violence. This evil concept, in turn, can beget an acute response.

In fact, any religion can play a crucial role for formation of the necessary positive relationships to other cultures, religions and life styles. Their diversity is a basic element of the human society and a progress driver.

Russia with its rich experience on coexistence and closest culture interaction can play the most significant role in formation of a new system of global multiculturalism. To establish the global dialogue, joint efforts of governments, corporations and civil society are required.

O. T. BOGOMOLOV,

Honorary Director of Institute of International Economics and Political Studies
of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences

CULTURE AND ECONOMY: EDGES OF CONJUGACY

The concept of culture involves many sides of development of the human society and is close in its content to the concept of civilization. In a wide sense of this word, 'culture' means experience accumulated by the humanity and every nation on creation of material and spiritual valuables, as well as preserved values and benefits, ennobling and elevating man, improving quality of his life.

One can say that the material culture is embodied, first, with economy, national riches of the country, its productive forces. The degree of the economy development reflects the degree of the material culture of the given nation. However, the main content of culture is represented with its spiritual, humanistic constituent. Achievements of human mind, scientific attainments, art masterpieces, richness of language and literature, moral and religious ideals determining people behaviour and relationships – this is what in the social consciousness is usually associated with the concept of culture and its degree estimation. Intellectual, spiritual culture of a nation today, as never before, is the main factor of social and economic progress. The modern society and economy are based on knowledge, on top culture achievements.

The nation culture can be fairly assessed through its outstanding representatives: writers, poets, artists, actors, scientists, philosophers-enlighteners, preachers, political essayists, inventors, et cetera. They form the society spiritual climate, enrich the culture with their creativity, determine its topmost achievements. The intellectual and artistic elite efforts provide progression of knowledge, technologies, development of arts, establishing of aesthetic and moral ideals, humanistic principles. Not accidentally Maxim Gorky called the writers as 'human soul engineers'. But in our days minds are falling under control of television and cinematography, they are subjected by the mass media.

Elite brings culture into masses. But here one should make a reservation. Those usually associated with the society intellectual elites, including the most influential part, political class, are quite diverse. By no means all of them can be considered as culture bearers. Vulgarity, ignorance, platitude, immorality, unscrupulousness also have their representatives in elite. Using their influence, they can corrupt human souls, impart false knowledge and deals, inculcate bad taste and behaviour norms. Both in culture and society, there is a clash of good

and evil, elevated and vile, innovation and reactionary attitude. Eventually, a fight of oppositions provides progressive development, but temporary move back can also happen. Changing of a social system basing on radical liberal reforms plunged the Russian society into the deep crisis, concomitant with degradation of the mass and elite culture.

Low culture is a serious hindrance for the economic development. Regretfully, it is usually underestimated. I would like to only point out to some lines of joint influence of two mentioned spheres of the social life. Analysis requires separate consideration of elite and mass culture. Both of them are interconnected, but affect the economy in different way. Increase of its effectiveness and competitiveness is mostly dependent on a status of mass culture, rather than the elite one. At least, it is related to the current value. In the strategic sense, the elite culture has the defining value.

Examples of low standards of culture for the majority of population are seen everywhere. At that, no counteraction to lack of culture results in its increase. Violation of law and elementary behaviour norms in groups and society, self-interests and egoism defying interests of others, unreliability, slovenliness, individualism neglecting any signs of human solidarity and mutual assistance – in brief, they all spoil social climate in the country and negatively influence labour and economic activity.

The more destructive consequences are results of mass spread of corruption, theft and fraud, that become the grave disease of economy. It suffers of hard drinking and drug abuse, petty tyranny of officials. Such other signs of the culture lack, like non-observance of hygiene and cleanliness rules, environment pollution, and barbaric attitude to the nature are also not that harmless. As a result, the economy suffers significantly, quality of life of our population worsens and its health is under threat. The country has to maintain enormous army of limbs of law and private guards, to inflate controlling bureaucratic structures. Considerable efforts and funds are to be spent to clean rubbish and trash in public accommodations.

No desire to observe traffic laws, yearning to get ahead of others in the car jam, to gain something at the expense of law-abiding drivers is a typical pattern in modern Russia. Its price is thousands of victims, many accidents. People lose time, not mentioning their property and health losses. Our country beats records in number of deaths on roads per thousand of cars. Economy suffers enormous losses caused by catastrophes, fires and other disasters, where

human factor, low professional culture, lack of discipline, negligence to one's own duties are to be blamed.

High level of crime and corruption in Russia indicates alarm status of the mass culture. Surely, it is a product of many unfavourable circumstances.

First of all, it is caused by destitution of large mass of population, as well as weakness of the state and its law-enforcing agencies. But one is also able to see, that along these hasty and ill-conceived reforms spiritual basics of the society were sapped, its culture and culture bearers were devalued. Moreover, television and press connive at the vilest tastes and interests; take violence and bandits, sex as prevailing topics for books and TV shows. In fact, the 'culture bearers' deliberately deprave our society. Fraudulent schemes of MMM, which tens of thousands of trustful people had suffered from, were even advertised on TV. The mass media agencies promote luxurious life of the upper class and Western consumption standards unaffordable to the most of the Russians. An ordinary person hardly making ends meet and burdened with multiple everyday problems feels like being humiliated. The society has been destined and is being destined on spiritual ennui. It also affects labour productivity. Fair and selfless labour appears to be unclaimed and not rewarded either in moral or material respect.

To the list of spiritual and moral flaws of the society, one should add lack of necessary political culture, civilian responsibility for the state of things in the country. Those who accepted the changes with inspiration and had great expectations of the reforms experienced disappointment and lost faith into reformers. Destitution of large stratum of population, concerns for survival did not leave to many people much of strength and time for social activity and thinking about politics. The mass media sources distracted them from the life mess, showing various action series, low-grade variety humour, music shows, sports programs. Their consciousness was manipulated by offering information suitable for authorities. These were the conditions, when formation of a civilian society with effective democracy was hard to achieve. Deficiency of the political culture transformed into a hindrance on the way for expressing of the creative potential of the nation, perfection of the social structure, complicated economy revival.

Critical role for counteraction to the mass culture decline is given to artistic intelligentsia, public politicians, public and religious figures,

business leaders. Ideally, they should be an example of having knowledge, culture of intelligent and responsible behaviour, careful attitude to national culture inheritance, moral values. Their role for identification of errors and inadvertences in politics and correction of their course, for retaining of national culture can be rather significant. Regretfully, the Russian elite, first of all, the political one was below the par. The level of its experience and knowledge evidently did not correspond to the scale of implemented transformations, and its moral standards retreated in the face of lust for power and rapid enrichment. Thus, false reference marks of behaviour for considerable part of the population were set. Spiritual values were shortly forgotten to please lucrative interests. The market needed mass and unpretentious demand, promising fast and notable profits.

The costly elite culture was found to be unclaimed, since it had a narrow circle of customers and its achievements did not promise any quick money. Therefore, by no means accidentally, literature, cinema, television stopped showing honest and fair workers, who became poor at once, as their main characters. They were replaced by knights of fortune – nouveaux riches, mobsters and fraudsters of various kinds, surrounded by their spongers. Teachers, doctors, scientists and other representatives of intelligentsia and former middle class turned into ‘new poor’. Their social status decreased, and the public attention proscenium was occupied by ‘new Russians’ with their expensive cars, luxurious apartments, out-town mansions and other attributes of ‘high’ social status. Fortunes of dubious origin became symbols of success of market reforms, making men in the street envious.

Commercialization of public relations affected the artistic intelligentsia, literature, cinema, music, theatre and fine arts. Many of culture votaries sacrificed their high ideals of good and everlasting to please unpretentious

demand of the mass audience for recreation, or, to be more exact, for distraction from depressive daily routine.

Schools were required to reduce hours for studying the Russian classical literature and language. The best samples of spiritual creativity of the nation became less and less in demand and lost their educational role.

Market freedom negates non-market laws of the culture development. There are more than enough of examples of antagonism of market and morals, market and culture. Not that many of positive facts can be opposed to them. Therefore, calls to restrain market egoism, uncontrollable pursuit for gains, to require social responsibility from businesspersons and officials become louder. In other words, the society waits from them not only to care of their own, but also public good.

Economy suffers from negative changes in people’s consciousness and behaviour. Rudeness, spite people face every day at home and outside can spoil the mood for a long time. Now they spoil social climate, reflect on work quality and performance. Until moral norms and principles are not a part of general culture, it is necessary to coerce into law-abiding, observing rules of communal life, utilizing authority of the powers, press and television. A role of the entire education system for development of culture and morals is of importance as well. But it seems that it is not a cause for concern for authors of outlined reforms in this field. Children at schools do not actually study principles of courtesy, household hygiene, behavior in public places and many other things – neither at the school desk, nor by the example of their teacher’s example. Not every family can, actually, compensate this disadvantage.

In general, if one talks not only about modernization of our economy and life for the sake of saving the nation and statehood, then mentally one should imply a raise of culture on civilized basis.

S. L. SHIPTON,

OBE, KFO, Coordinator of the Three Faiths Forum (Muslim-Christian-Jewish Dialogue)

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES & CIVILISATIONS IN THE GLOBAL WORLD

First may I thank the Russian Academy of Sciences and Russian Academy of Education for inviting me to participate in this, the 7th International Likhachov Scientific conference held here in the beautiful city of St. Petersburg.

The dialogue of cultures and civilisations is of extreme significance today in the global world of ours and dialogue is the keyword. Dialogue leads to mutual respect and understanding two of the most important factors essential in our

future and the future of those who will come after us.

Ten years ago Sir Sigmund Sternberg, Sheikh Dr. M. A. Zaki Badawi and the Reverend Dr. Marcus Braybrooke established a national organisation 'The Three Faiths Forum' and I was asked to become its Co-ordinator, at first being the only staff member involved. Let me say a word or two about our three Co-founders which I believe is important. Sir Sigmund Sternberg is a businessman, leading interfaith activist, winner of the Templeton prize in 1998, Patron of the International Council of Christian and Jews and President of the Reform Synagogue movement in the UK. The late Sheikh Dr. M. A. Zaki Badawi KBE was founder/principal of the Muslim College, expert on Islamic banking and International Muslim Advisor and the Revd. Dr. Marcus Braybrooke, prolific author, writer and public speaker on interfaith matters, former Director of the Council of Christian and Jews, President of the World Congress of Faiths and the recipient of the degree of Doctor of Divinity given by the Archbishop of Canterbury (this is not an honorary degree and is rarely given except in exceptional cases).

The Three Faiths Forum was set up to promote understanding and dialogue between the three Abrahamic faith traditions (Jewish, Christian and Muslim). An important development in its founding was winning the first recognition by the Charity Commissioners in September 2002 on the legitimacy of promoting religious harmony for the benefit of the public as a charitable purpose. The Forum is not primarily a religious organisation, but brings together people from the three communities. Its principal aims (as set out in its Trust Deed) are:

1. Educating Muslims, Christians and Jews to appreciate each other's distinctive beliefs and practices and their common ground;
2. Encouraging friendship, goodwill and understanding amongst people of the three Abrahamic and monotheistic faiths of Islam, Judaism and Christianity;
3. Promoting support for and public recognition of, the importance of groups where people of the Muslim, Christian and Jewish faiths meet and share common fundamental and ethical interests;
4. Promoting education and research leading to respect of religious difference between the three faiths on a basis of equality and understanding;
5. Promoting education and training of ministers of religion of the three faiths in their common roots, the understanding of their dif-

ferences and the encouragement of respect for each other on a basis of equality and understanding.

The forum operates at various levels. Its small staff includes a Project Director, and Education Officers who are funded through grants from the Government's Faith Communities Capacity Building Fund.

The forum has an Advisory Board composed of leading members of the three communities who meet regularly to discuss the work of the Forum and act as a think tank and body to report to.

The Three Faiths Forum enjoys the confidence of different levels of Government, as demonstrated by its close personal relationships with influential individuals; with government departments like the Foreign and Commonwealth Office who regularly send high-ranking overseas visitors to meet the TFF leadership; with the Diplomatic Corps in general, and ambassadors.

The work of the TFF is not limited to the UK alone, as it is constantly invited to be represented at interfaith meetings abroad.

Let me give you four examples:

4th Doha Conference on Religious Dialogue – Qatar, April 2006

Nine rabbis, including two from Israel and Rabbi Reuben Livingstone from Hampstead Garden Suburb Synagogue, were among the Muslim, Christian and Jewish participants in the Fourth Doha Conference on Religious Dialogue held in the Arab state of Qatar last week under the auspices of the Emir. The Three Faiths Forum was represented by its co-ordinator, Mr. Sidney Shipton.

The weeklong deliberations by religious leaders on 'the role of religion in building the human being' ended with a series of declarations including one commending the work already done in correcting the false images of religious communities conveyed in school books, in the cinema and in dramatic works.

The participants condemned those 'fanatics' who killed innocent civilians in the name of religion and, proclaiming the right of all human beings to choose their own religion, called for the wide dissemination of the 'religious values' of justice, tolerance and equality.

West-Islamic Dialogue in Geneva – August 2005

'Understanding the other and overcoming ignorance should be major objectives,' said Sidney L. Shipton OBE, Co-ordinator of the Three Faiths Forum (Muslim-Christian-Jewish dialogue), when he spoke at a brainstorming workshop held in Geneva organised by the World

Economic Forum. The workshop was chaired by Sherif El Diwany, of the World Economic Forum, who acted as moderator throughout the daylong discussion.

Professor Klaus Schwab, President of the WEF, who broke off from his holiday to attend what he considered 'a very important meeting' welcomed the 20 participants from the three Abrahamic faiths including several young Muslim Leaders from Denmark, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and the UK.

World Congress of Imams and Rabbis in Seville – March 2006

'Bringing together 350 Imams, Rabbis, and experts for a conference such as this was a mammoth task,' said Sidney Shipton OBE. The Coordinator of the Three Faiths Forum invited from the UK to the 2nd World Congress of Imams and Rabbis in Seville, Spain. 'Alain Michel and his team at Hommes des Paroles must be congratulated on organizing such a historic event.'

Although Prince Hassan of Jordan could not attend the Congress, his message was conveyed by video. 'The noble art of conversation,' he said, 'is not a martial art! Dialogue is essential between adherents of faiths and humanity at large. We must look at each others' texts and respond to the spread of disinformation about each other.'

'This Congress led to numerous informal contacts being made, to be followed up in the months ahead.' In addressing the plenary sessions, Mr. Shipton emphasized that the deliberations of this Congress and its final declaration must percolate to the grass roots, otherwise an important opportunity would be wasted.

The Three Faiths Forum in Sarajevo – November 2005

'The title given to my presentation,' said Sidney Shipton OBE 'is 'Learning from Other's Experience' and this is essential if understanding and respect are to follow.'

Shipton, Co-ordinator of The Three Faiths Forum, Muslim-Christian-Jewish Dialogue, was speaking at the International Consultation 'Visions of a Just Society' held in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The Conference was organised by the Abrahamic Forum of the International Council of Christians and Jews (Professor Stefan Schreiner) in association with Konrad Adenauer Stiftung (Dr. Christina Catherine Krause) and as the only British Jew participating, Sidney Shipton said he felt doubly privileged not only for this opportunity of giving a presentation on the work of The Three Faiths Forum but giving

his lecture in the Franciscan Monastery of Fojnica high in the hills above Sarajevo.

Among the 40 participants there was only one other from the UK, Imam Abduljalil Sajid and Shipton said it was a pity that there was no UK Christian representation. Shipton pointed out that the Three Faiths Forum worked both nationally and internationally and he stressed the vital importance of dialogue, although he said it differed in style and content from country to country.

Working Locally and with Others

The Three Faiths Forum also works closely with local, national and international religious leaders and the leadership of places of worship of the three Abrahamic Faiths, together with such organisations as the Foundation for Reconciliation in the Middle East, the UK Programme of Forward Thinking and St. Ethlburga's Centre for Reconciliation and Peace, on education international relations, and youth; and work with the Vatican on ecumenical issues.

Medical and Lawyers Group

The Three Faiths Forum works with professionals through its Medical and Lawyers groups; with different local communities through the development of specific programming through local TFF groups, which include Wales, East London, Kensington, SE London, Surrey and Hants and Dorset, and forums for young people in Eton College. By twinning synagogues, churches and mosques, the Three Faiths Forum has been able to develop a strong network of local groups who meet quarterly to discuss strategies and local programmes.

Before I conclude let me share with you some recent activities;

A seminar was held with the Institute of Education on Faith Schools and Social Cohesion: Help or Hindrance? The results of the discussion has led to a follow up which is being considered.

A consultation on Sacred Voices: convergence and contrast in the music of the Abrahamic faiths was held in St Georges House, Windsor Castle, between 30th January and 1st February participants included St. Georges House, The Institute of Ismaili Studies, The Festival of Muslim Culture, The Jewish Music Institute and the Three Faiths Forum. During this unusual and possibly unprecedented conference a concert of music from the three Abrahamic traditions took place in St. Georges Chapel and was virtually a sell out.

A meeting with 100 Ambassador & Heads of Mission held at Ambassadors Court, St. James's Palace on the 13th February 2007 and the speakers included Sir Anthony Figgis (HM Marshall of the Diplomatic Corp), Sir Sigmund

Sternberg, Sherif El Diwany (Director of Middle East and C100 and Arab Business Council of the World Economic Forum), Sir Peter Ricketts KCMG (Permanent Under Secretary and Head of the Diplomatic Service), Gary L. Krupp (President of Pave the Way Foundation, New York), Rabbi A Soetendorp (member of C100/WEF).

A reception was held at the Romanian Embassy hosted by the Charge d'Affaires Mrs. Raduta Matache, and Sir Sigmund Sternberg of the Three Faiths Forum to mark the accession of Romania to the European Union.

A presentation was made on the work of the Three Faiths Forum by the Co-ordinator at a meeting of the Women against Fundamentalism and for Equality held in the House of Lords on the 13th February 2007.

A presentation was made by the Co-ordinator of the Three Faiths Forum to the annual meeting of the Royal United Services Institute Homeland

Security and Resilience Department for Defence and Security at its Politics and Terrorism annual conference held at their Headquarters in Whitehall on 14/15th February 2007.

Youth Education Department – Our text-based programme and Tools 4 Dialogue were delivered to five universities in and around London, as well as to the British Library for its 'Sacred' exhibition. Together with St. Ethelburga's Centre for Peace and Reconciliation and with the Cambridge Interfaith Programme, the Scriptural Reasoning programme is being delivered as both a civic and youth practice at the British Library and at Camden Council.

Iraq in Common – a network of young people of Iraqi origin living in London – held a meeting at Chatham House with Patrick Cockburn, author of 'The Occupation'

This is how we commit ourselves to the dialogue of cultures and civilisations in the global world.

D. V. YATSKEVICH,

11-year pupil at School No. 411 '*Harmony*' at the Petrodvoretsky district of St. Petersburg, winner of the All-Russian contest of creative works of senior students *D. S. Likhachov's Ideas and Modern Times*

D. S. LIKHACHOV'S IDEAS AND MODERN TIMES

It is a great honour for me to be present at the annual International Likhachov Conference. Certainly, I never expected such a high appreciation of my composition, though I hoped to become the contest prize winner.

For this success I would like, first of all, to thank my parents, school, where I heard for the first time about Dmitry Sergeevich, my literature teacher, Olga Borisovna Moris, and other teachers and, of course, St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences for establishing such wonderful contest. I think that Dmitry Sergeevich will be proud of how his precepts on saving the Russian culture are implemented and how his main ideas in this respect are brought to life. And not by chance Dmitry Sergeevich became the first Doctor *honoris causa* of this University.

My feeling embarrassed about such appreciation of my modest composition and invitation to the International Likhachov Scientific Conference has, as a matter of fact, excuses. I'm speaking for the first time at such large scientific forum. What is going on seems for me unreal, as if it happens not to me.

All the things in the world are interconnected. Therefore, in fact, indirectly I knew

Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov already through one person, my father. He had (and still has) a friend, who in childhood lived in one house, one riser block of flats with the academician. They met quite often, in the elevator, at the stairs, in the yard, greeted each other, and the strongest impression after these meetings of the friend of my father, who at that time was about 8 or 9 year boy, was that the respectable academician always addressed him in a respected formal manner and let him to be the first at the doors...

At school, our humanitarian cycle teachers often mentioned the name of this great person, but initially, to my shame, I did not have any specific interest in Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov, knowing only that he was a symbol of the Russian and St. Petersburg intelligentsia. But later, learning the Silver Age culture that was specifically considered at the classes of literature and history, I thought: 'Where is the continuation of these greatest days, was everything indeed completely destroyed by the revolution?' Right then, searching for answers on this question, I read memoirs of Likhachov, containing dozens of names of scientists, philosophers and poets of those days. I tried to follow fates in generation of people being born at the end

of the 19th – beginning of the 20th century, and understood that it was Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov, as well as Daniel Granin, Mikhail Bakhtin, Lev Gumilyov, Alexey Losev and other geniuses of the epoch, who are direct heirs of the Silver Age. I wanted to write a composition on these not loud, but true heroes of our recent past – representatives of the great Russian culture. I would like to be like these people, though this level is extremely high.

Searching for materials on the Likhachov's generation, I read lots of books and understood many of 'copy-book maxims' anew. It became clear to me, that high tragic nature, brightness, responsibility of non-standard, creative persons make them different from the crowd. Certainly, I was unable to mention all such people in my small work – I just mentioned the most important, indicative names.

It seems to me that the best remembrance of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov will be any particular good and creative deed, and would really like to find such one and to dedicate my life to it.

In conclusion, I cannot but express most sincere gratitude to St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences for organizing that wonderful contest that allowed me to open new horizons. In 1993, when accepting a cloak of the first Doctor *honoris causa* of this University, Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov said: 'There are institutions being proud of their past. And our University can be proud of its future. I feel myself in the University of the 21st century'. Now this is the 21st century, and I think that Dmitry Sergeevich, if still with us, would be proud and glad, that his words have been so remarkably brought to life.

Round Table

THE DIALOGUE OF CULTURES & CIVILIZATIONS IN THE GLOBAL WORLD

Conference Hall, Radisson SAS Hotel

May 25, 2007

Moderators:

- A. S. ZAPESOTSKY** Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, Chairman of the Executive Committee of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Honoured Scientist of the Russian Federation
- V. V. POPOV** Ambassador at large of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Director of the Centre for Partnership of Civilizations of the Scientific-Coordination Council on International Researches of Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation)

Participants:

- N. AL-ATTAR** Vice President of the Syrian Arab Republic, Doctor
- A. CLESSE** Director of Luxembourg Institute of European and International Studies (Luxembourg), Doctor
- Y. DROZD** Consul General of the Polish Republic in St. Petersburg
- P. DUTKEVITCH** Director of Institute of European and Russian Studies (EURUS) at Carleton University (Ottawa, Canada), Professor
- A. A. GUSEYNOV** Director of Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences
- V. P. KAZARIN** First Deputy Chairman of Sevastopol City Administration, Dr. Sc. (Philology), Professor
- S. Z. MAHMOOD** President of the Interconfessional Coalition for Peace (India), Doctor
- W. MITTER** Professor of German Institute of International Researches in the field of Education (Germany), foreign member of the Russian Academy of Education
- V. V. NAUMKIN** Head of the Department of Regional Problems of the World Politics of Moscow State University named after M. V. Lomonosov, representative of the Russian Federation in the High Level Group of the UN Project *Alliance of Civilizations*, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- A. E. PETROV** Scientific Secretary of the Department of History and Philology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Deputy Chairman of the Coordination Council on the issues of young people at the Presidential Council on science, technology and education, M. A. (History)
- G. M. REZNIK** President of the Lawyer's Chamber of Moscow, Chair of Law at the Academic Law University of Institute of State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences, member of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation, M. A. (Law), Honoured Lawyer of the Russian Federation

- V. S. STEPIN** Head of the Section of Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology and Law of the Department of Social Sciences of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Scientific Head of Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences
- M. TLILI** Founder and Director of the Dialogs: *Islamic World – USA – West* Program, University of New York (USA), Professor
- G. A. YAGODIN** Professor of Russian Chemical-Engineering University named after D. I. Mendeleev (Moscow), academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Chemistry)

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY

– Dear friends, we continue our dialogue dedicated to problems of cultural interaction, interaction of civilization in the global world. It seems to me that it is appropriate at the beginning of our today's meeting to give a floor to those of our guests who did not have a chance to speak yesterday at the plenary sessions. I think they should have special advantages. Therefore, let me give the floor to Dr. Dutkevich. It is especially pleasant for me to note that Dr. Dutkevich is Doctor *honoris causa* of two very famous Russian universities in Moscow.

P. DUTKEVICH

– I would like to present some thoughts on conflict and dialogue versus cooperation and competition of civilizations. First of all I want to say that we are living in a binary world, when approaching this issue. Dialogue is opposed to conflict. Dialogue is spontaneous and it has the UN spirit and the clash of civilizations that was so expressively presented in the works of Dr. Huntington. I would say that current international environment requires switching the gear to another approach, namely to consider the possibilities within which we would probably be able to go a bit deeper in understanding and collaboration of civilizations or partnership of civilizations versus competition of civilizations.

First, we are living in the world that is quite unstable. Within the certain civilizations that are supposed to be more or less unified we can see the cracks. If you look at the European dialogue, transatlantic relations, there are some cracks – the evidence we are not going the same way. The cracks are normative, the cracks are legal, the cracks are economic, the cracks in ensuring security. Europe is a bit cracking. If you see the European Union and its new members like Poland, for example, the Poles think they are the perfect Westerners. But this is

quite wrong. As we see from the actions of the current Government they do not understand the normative aspect of the European Union completely. They are taking the actions with no regard to well-established European tradition. So my point is: even within the Western civilization we have a lot of work to do in understanding each other. But we have certain institutions, like the European Union or transatlantic institutions that help us to form an active dialogue.

If you see the current situation in the US, you will notice contradictions there. I can see at least three of them: the contradiction between globalization and protectionism, the second contradiction is between the perceived power and the real power of the US, the third lies within the notion of stability. The US prosperity requires a high level of stability, but its actions worldwide create a lot of instability.

The problem (or should I say a challenge) for us is also China. Obviously, there is an interest to cooperate with China at the moment but in the long term we will not cooperate with China, we will compete with China. The problem is how to peacefully compete with China rather than to form a dialogue. All these questions are very serious and deep questions but my point is that we should probably think of the key question: What is universal among our civilizations? First, we have to understand the universality of our approach, because the cooperation or partnership is not possible without understanding the communalities. I would say that there are some issues that are universal. We are not ready yet to be universal. My point is that there are 4 elements of this universality or the ground base – zero ground of our collaboration and cooperation.

One is the issue of poverty, not even poverty within the states but the poverty as the cause of globalization, the result of globalization. Unfortunately, there is no time but I have wonderful data to show that the income inequality

within the countries isn't so great – about ten times, but frankly speaking globalization is increasing this level to hundreds. This is a very serious problem and if poverty is defined culturally we will have a very meaningful discussion about that in the future. Defined culturally it may be solved on individual and collective level.

The second is the issue of security also very broadly defined as a potential base for cooperation among nations. Security which will include the individual security, collective security, state security, the issue of terrorism, security of the people of the old age. The third element is education or studies. Two thirds of the world lives with no knowledge of how to read and write, among 6 milliards people two thirds can not communicate with each other. I can continue and continue but there is no point in that. The issue connected with poverty and lack of education is health. There are common diseases and diseases that will harm the whole world if they become widespread.

The forth is the issue of tolerance. How to build tolerance among civilizations? What is common in our doctrines, in our norms, in our values, including religion? Sometimes we do not understand that Islam and Christianity are closer than we think. They have the same roots, they have the same or similar background. Anyway, we should know this and try to underline the similarities rather than differences.

In current world the great leaders are saying that the future coalitions will be temporary that the future coalitions will be the coalitions of the willing. We have to specify the common ground in the terms understandable to different civilizations. The question is how to find universality within these 7 or 8 major civilizations, and ideally we can write a Manifesto, starting with the words: 'We, people of the world without the tradition and identity.' This is the idea. We will probably not reach the point of this Manifesto because the people can not live without the tradition and identity. We need tradition to perfect and to some extent to protect the state, but with time we will find the links to link the states and civilizations.

I would like to conclude by saying that we need a competition. We need a competition of civilizations. The problem is how to make this competition not violent and streamline it into certain areas. We need a competition because we don't like the world in which a certain civilization dictates the others what to do and how to do that, how to do the best. There is no one solution, you know. We have spoken about it so much yesterday. There is no one civilization that is better than other and that's why we

need a competition. The competition will answer those fundamental questions about health, education, poverty, dignity and tolerance. We need this competition to answer the most important question of our time: 'Are we in the West rich because the rest is poor? Or may be the rest is poor because we are rich?' My answer is: 'We are rich in the West because the rest is poor.' The question is how to make the rest less poor, more adjusted to the Western standards. It will change the entire world and we will live in the different world. So we need the competition as we need cooperation.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY

– I would like to give the floor to Yaroslav Drozd, Consul General of the Polish Republic in St. Petersburg.

Y. DROZD

– Dear ladies and gentlemen, the interaction of cultures is the most interesting constituent of the social and public processes, which are to be experienced by our society. What was done gradually in the past, due to limited travel possibilities and communication, nowadays, on the contrary, is happening at breathtaking speed. The dynamics of the transference of people and information brings up the interaction of cultures to another level, to the one, individuals and society are not ready for. That's why our estimations (assessments) and comments are often impulsive and emotional. Our reaction to separate events is somewhat conservative since our perceptual and analytical mechanism is traditional against the technical progress, the speed and complexity of culture's interaction processes in the modern world.

To clear my further reasoning I would like to give you an example based on the real life.

Lieutenant Shmidt Bridge in St. Petersburg designed by the Polish engineer Stanislaw Kerbedz had been built for eight years (1842 to 1850). Its opening meant a new epoch of the bridge-construction in Russia and created preconditions for the railroads development including the Transsiberia railway. The new bridge in St. Petersburg was erected as a symbol of mutual cooperation and understanding by the Poles, Russians, Germans and representatives of other nationalities. Their common aim was that one which could serve as a good ground for the interaction of their cultures. The bridge was opened as Blagoveshchensky (the Bridge of Annunciation) then it was named Nikolayevsky Bridge, Lieutenant Shmidt Bridge and now it

is said to be retained to its initial name Blagoveshchensky.

Regardless of the changed names by the leading policy and social regime this bridge and many others have all the time been serving for the society. That is why the word 'bridge' has a broader meaning, represented for us as a symbol, as a union of people, cultures, religion and a challenging creation of new opportunities.

Having used the example, which is so typical for such a multi-national and multi-confessional city as St. Petersburg is, I wanted to emphasize the importance of searching and cultivating the highest values and focusing our activity on them. It's necessary to build different bridges in every sphere of our life and activity, since there is always lack of them in the modern world of various cultures. That's why it is hard for me to agree with some utterances and opinions of Dr. Dutkevitch, director of EURUS, concerning Poland. The usage of the words 'absolute Westernists' speaking about my compatriots because of Poland's membership in the European Union as well as the conclusion about incomprehension of the normative aspect of the EU in Poland, points out a rather simplified way of the theme presentation.

My country, with its centuries-old history, has a very rich experience of interaction with various cultures and societies. The part of this tradition of co-existence with other nations arose exactly in St. Petersburg, the city where before the revolution of 1917 more than 250,000 Poles lived, forming the third largest national group in the city. The example of a display of the tradition is the already mentioned genius engineer Stanislav Kerbedz.

That's why it's very hard for me to agree with the assertion that any nation is 'absolutely' such-and-such or so-and-so. In our national and cultural tradition the concept 'absolute' is mostly a religious or philosophical category. The usage of it while hastily and emotionally estimating any political situation is rarely well-grounded.

It's necessary to look for common values and use their integrating influence. Intelligentsia plays a very important role in it. It is intelligentsia who should set the tone of the dialogue between different cultures and civilizations in the global world. Its special receptivity, the way of expressing sympathy and antipathy influence on the way our states and societies look in the eyes of others. That's why I think that we need to carry on the dialogue in the spirit of mutual understanding but not making the things absolute. We need to build bridges because there is always lack of them.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY

– I would like to give the floor to Dr. Armand Clesse, Director of Luxemburg Institute of European and International Studies. Welcome, the floor is yours.

A. CLESSE

– Is a dialogue between religious and secular cultures more difficult than a dialogue between two religious cultures or two secular cultures? How may the religious element facilitate a dialogue and how may it hamper it?

1. Dialogue between two secular cultures. What does it mean to exclude one dimension – the religious, spiritual one? Is such an exclusion bound to lead to an impoverished exchange, a diminished or even a trivial one? Or may such a dialogue rest on firmer, more rational ground and in the end prove to be more substantive and more productive.

2. Dialogue between two religious cultures such as Iran and Iraq, societies with strong religious underpinnings or even foundations, significant religious influences on all aspects of society including politics, culture, even economics and foreign policy. Such a dialogue may be characterized by high potential for a rivalry, misunderstanding, jealousies, latent or open animosity due to different forms of proselytism, a relentless contest about who possesses the truth, who is more successful and can attract more followers. But it may also reveal a higher potential for interaction, genuine mutual understanding and respect since both sides may be on the same spiritual wavelength and pursue similar metaphysical aspirations.

3. Dialogue between a religious and a secular culture such as between the Arab world and Western Europe or perhaps even the USA and Western Europe. In such a dialogue there may be an inherent strong tendency to convince the other side that one's own model is superior, for the religious side to denigrate the 'infidels', the 'atheists', the 'materialists', their decadence and perversity. For the secular part there is a temptation to condemn the others as being irrational, as behaving as fundamentalists, zealots and crusaders, to use people with religious beliefs for political ends. Such entrenched positions may make it difficult to have a substantive dialogue since each side may be convinced of the superiority of its model.

Of course the distinctions between a religious and a secular state are not always very clear. Western Europe has experienced half a century of secularization with a considerable shrinking of religious beliefs and even more of religious

practice whereas the United States of America remains a very religious country. Poland remains religious whereas religion may come back in other Eastern European countries after the end of communism. There may be a similar revival in some Asian countries, even in China. One may call the USA a model of the religious international actor, semi-religious, semi-secular, standing somewhere between a fundamentalist state such as Iran and a secular place such as Europe but it is not sure, contrary to what John McCormick argues in his new book 'The European superpower', that 'in a world where there are many religions, and where fundamentalism has become a critical factor in the politics of many societies, the association between religion and political power inevitably works against the United States, while its secularism works in favour of Europe'.

One should remain aware of the fact that differences in spiritual, religious beliefs may be superseded by basic political, ideological differences engendered by diverging hard, material economic and strategic interests.

Is there a danger of polarization of the world, a new bipolarity setting what one may call 'religionism' against secularism, replacing the old antagonism between communism and capitalism. Certainly the new driving force towards a new division could be a vital and militant Islam with other religions trying to resist and to compete. In particular Christianity or rather what one could call 'Christianism' may take up the challenge. The same may happen with Hinduism with the danger of destabilization of large parts of India and even the whole Indian society engulfing neighbouring states such as Pakistan and Bangladesh.

In general one may watch a radicalization, a strengthening of all kinds of fundamentalisms and militantisms. So-called secular countries may become aware of a certain intrinsic weakness as compared to religious ones and may be tempted to compensate for the lack of spiritual content with a certain economic and strategic aggressiveness. This however would contain a grave danger of escalation and may lead the world back to confrontations that were thought inconceivable and obsolete following the disastrous experiences of the past. The onslaught by some Western so-called intellectuals, followed sometimes by politicians and journalists, on religion in general and Islam in particular may prove to be a highly unwise and counterproductive approach. What is rather needed is a new form of mutual empathy, of efforts to understand the difference, the otherness, to develop in common a new sense of tolerance.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY

– Thank you, Dr. Clesse. And now Dr. Mustapha Tlili will have the floor. He is the Founder and Director of the *Dialogs: Islamic World – USA – West* Program. Dr. Tlili has come to us from the USA, New York University, where he works as a professor.

M. TLILI

– There is a kind of inherent clash between a certain monolith that is West and a certain monolith that is Islam. First let's focus a little bit on a concept of a clash. If you look at the history of the encounter between the Islam and the West, this history is a long one – 14 centuries. And the periods of cooperation and collaboration were longer than what Samuel Huntington calls a 'clash'. Now I come to make a few remarks about his theory.

The moments of clash were presented and one of these examples is Andalusia. Everything there was created by three cultures: Jews, Muslims and Christians. That is part of the history Samuel Huntington ignores. I call the whole idea of the clash of civilizations as the pop-philosophy, rather than a philosophical concept rooted on knowledge or philosophy or the history of ideas or the history as such. I would refer to a magnificent book by my colleague at Columbia Richard Butler 'Muslim-Christian civilization'. It's a book about Muslim and Christian cooperation. You look at these assumptions and see they are not very dated.

We were explained by those who speak from the face of the West that now it's the time to replace the monolith that used to be communism. The end of the cold war of course provided that opportunity and it was an easy fit for those who follow that what we call the Carl Shmidt 'friend-enemy' concept. They needed part of that concept to be fit and Islam seemed ready to cease the opportunity. And, as we have heard September, 11 came at the right time to validate this myth of the Islamic threat. So why should we question the concepts, why we should deconstruct them? Because deconstructing them we notice more nuances both in the US and in the Islam. When we speak about the West it is important what we mean: Europe that is secular or the US which is constantly proving whether they are Democrats or Republicans, The White House or someone else. The truth is that 76 per cent of the US population believes in God and in that point of view there are more communalities between the Muslim world and the US. There are alliances that sometimes form in the UN on the number of issues such as birth control

and others of social nature where you see the natural alliance between the so-called conservative European or I would say Western states and the so-called Muslim states on the number of issues.

The Europeans today have problem of identity, no wonder that we are hearing here all different conflicting voices from both right and the left. Europe is facing a crisis not only vis-a-vis its destiny and its relations with the US, but vis-a-vis itself, its core values. We hear all the time this talk about core values, I always ask what are the core values of Europe, I get no answer, if there is any one. Europe is said to be a Christian nation, and on that basis Turkey should not be part of Europe, because it's not Christian. Really, Europe is only believed to be Christian.

Let's focus a little bit on this monolith – Islam, that is believed to be: one – threatening, and two – sort of a block that is uniform in its beliefs and traditions. It's important to distinguish what the Europeans usually mix – the Muslim world and the Arab world. This is simplification and I should call it ignorance. That is the point I argued about with Samuel Huntington, criticizing his historical ignorance.

Following this dangerous route we will come to the concept that will put the world to a dangerous way, based on pop-culture, lacking intellectual integrity. Today we do not have intellectual integrity, we offer to the world concepts that remain paradigms both for the intellectuals and those who do politics. If you start analyzing the Islamic world you will understand how diverse the Islamic world is. It is more diverse than ever in history and perhaps more diverse than the Western world itself.

Who speaks on behalf of the Islamic world today? What is the Islamic world like today? First it is geographical and historical diversity. Diversity in the faith, diversity in expressing it. Islam came to many parts of the world as a set of principles and then it simply adapted, there was the contextualisation of the faith and it took different forms and different historic realizations that we nowadays see flourishing in different parts of the world from conservative Saudi Arabia to Turkey today. There they have reversions of the Islam practice after the Ataturk revolution who somehow tried to crash that part of identity of the Turkish people. And therefore we see all this diversity and we have to recognize that is the part of the picture.

What we have also to understand is that the focus of the so-called theoreticians of the clash of civilizations and the media that gave them the voice – is a very small fringe of those who

pretend to speak of Islam. That is the radical fringe ignoring 98 per cent of the Muslim world, which simply goes their lives as Russians go their lives producing culture, producing goods, producing spiritual values and who are not part of this monolith Samuel Huntington and his colleagues try to create.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY

– Thank you ever so much. The next speech will be delivered by Dr. Syed Zafar Mahmood, President of the Interconfessional Coalition for Peace (India), Doctor.

S. Z. MAHMOOD

– By now, humanity is mature enough to fully realize that the purpose of creation of the world is not mutual destruction but only pursuance of an agenda of justice, peace, love, equitable distribution of resources and universal development. Therefore, the mandate given by the founder of every faith must have been in consonance with these laudable objectives. If any apparent dichotomy is ever seen by anybody between any two faiths it must be based on some lack of understanding. It is, thus, absolutely necessary that the leaders and the followers of all the faiths, cultures and civilizations should not only read and understand the real import of their own scripture but also the sacred books of others.

This must be done without any pre-conceived notions, with an open mind and most selflessly. No universal faith confines the area of its operation to any given country or region of the world. Nor does any faith disregard any phase of human history. On the other hand, cultures and civilizations are reflections of faiths, one or more at a time, in a given phase of human history and spanning given regions of the world. Yet, neither of them can override the requirements of the mother faith.

The new millennium demands that a combined effort should be made at the world level to dovetail the various faiths, cultures and civilizations into a position of mutual equality like the colourful strands of a beautiful spectrum. They should not be subjected to politicization. Rather, they should be utilized for strengthening the bonds of friendship, love, equity, justice, peace and universal development.

Culture is the way people live in accordance to beliefs, languages etc. But in the context of this conference we should agree on universally acceptable set of moral values and try to develop a universally acceptable culture. Those who followed culture should be known as cultured.

Then there shouldn't be anything as high culture or low culture. This approach fully matches with the late 19th century decision of anthropologists to adopt the term culture to a broader definition that they could apply to a wider variety of societies. Attentive to the theory of evolution they assumed that all human beings were born equally and that the fact that all humans have cultures and must be derived from human evolution.

Edward Gibbons was interested in decline and fall of the Roman Empire. He said that the decline of Rome was the natural and inevitable effect of immoderate greatness. The cause of the destruction multiplied with the extent of the conquest. The story of Rome is simple and obvious. Gibbons suggested that the final act of the collapse of Rome was the collapse of Constantinople in 1463. On the other hand Theodor Mommsen in the 'History of Culture' suggested that Rome collapsed with the collapse of Western Roman Empire in 476 AD and he also wrote about the biological analogy of genesis, growth, senescence, collapse and decay.

Arnold Toynbee in his 'History of Culture' suggested that there had been a much larger number of civilizations and that all civilizations have to go through the cycle identified by Mommsen. Because of the fall of civilizations the cultural elite became a parasitic elite when living through the rise of internal and external proletariat. Similar was the case with the Indus Delhi civilization. This civilization of plant cities came to an end around 1700 BC either through external invasion perhaps due to drying of the earth caused by geological and climatic changes in the civilization area.

Thus civilizations last for a limited period at the most for a few centuries. So the life of any civilization is much shorter and is not necessarily very significant for the life of the world. Yet, in a given phase of a human history the prevailing set of civilizations does matter and it is only prudent to take all possible positive joint actions to keep them together. Yet, the modalities of this effect have to conform to the larger universally acceptable principles of morality, coming across historical phases of human development. So is the very purpose of the existence of the humanity.

The principles of cultural diversity and pluralism must be integrated into all national policies in particular domains relating to quality education, environment, heritage management, media information technologies and creative industries.

The Russian Federation, being the largest one of the most sparse populated predominantly

urban country with large number of followers of Orthodox Christianity, Islam, Protestantism, and Catholicism, is a suitable place for carrying out an international dialog between cultures and civilizations. As Dr. Putin said recently, we know how a powerful uniting force religion can be. Yet, people have to understand the potential consequences of a clash of civilizations being imposed on the world.

This can be very well achieved through interaction, dialogue and praxis among the various cultures and civilizations at the global level. Once the process begins with good and selfless intentions it would be easy to find innumerable commonalities among the peoples – in their precepts and practices. These can be developed, emphasized and taken to the masses in order to make the world a place of mutual advantage.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY

– Thank you. Dear friends, the list of preliminary applied talks is over. Now I would like to say that we have here some people who did not prepare any presentations but I would really like them to speak briefly. In our hall we have lots of foreign guests who often meet each other at international conferences on these issues, moreover, our Ministry of Foreign Affairs calls them – and they deserved it – wise men. When we discussed the participants to be invited to the Conference I was happy that we are going to have such great persons here. But in Russia we do have influential persons whom you are likely to have never seen before. These are people who enjoy special authority and respect. I would like to name several of them present here: one of the most famous Russian and world philosophers, academician A. A. Guseynov, Director of our Institute of Philosophy; academician V. S. Stepin who also is positioned quite high in our scientific hierarchy and one of the most prominent Russian philosophers at the world scale. Yesterday I limited time for the speech of the outstanding Ukrainian scientist who in the former Soviet Union was called the outstanding Soviet scientist – this is Dr. V. P. Kazarin from Sevastopol (Ukraine). Naturally, I was absolutely unsatisfied with the time that we were able to assign for Dr. G. A. Yagodin, the most prominent scientist in the Russian education. Regretfully, we were unable to allocate sufficient time for the reports of Dr. V. V. Naumkin and Dr. G. M. Reznik. Dr. Naumkin represents Russia in the High-level Group of UNESCO. Dr. Reznik is one of the most famous lawyers and a well-known personality in the Russian humanitarian society. Near to Dr. Reznik there

is a young scientist, Dr. A. E. Petrov. He represents here the Department of History and Philology of the Russian Academy of Sciences. And Dr. Drozd, Consul General of Poland in St. Petersburg has also joined us; he is a person who is well-known and respected in our city. I do hope that everybody will add something to the subject of our discussion. Besides, we have not heard Dr. Wolfgang Mitter, an authority in the field of education, honorary member of the Russian Academy of Education.

I'd like to exploit my rights as a speaker and give the floor now to Dr. Yagodin.

G. A. YAGODIN

– Alexander Sergeevich, thank you once again for both the invitation and the opportunity to participate in this wonderful discussion, which is that important and duly. I think that we underestimate tragic nature of the moment and tragic nature of the main purpose of our generation. This purpose is to save the civilization on the planet of Earth. The number of people living on the Earth these days is 6.5 billion; it is unaffordable for the life support systems. There are several important systems: the ozone layer holding back hard ultraviolet of the Sun not allowing to destroy life; the favorable for man climate that was being formed for a long time and photosynthesis mechanisms; atmosphere that appeared on the Earth as secondary containing significant portion of oxygen and, thus, a source for transformation of chemical energy of food into body energy; sweet water.

All these systems are under a threat of destruction with existing number of people because starting from 1986 resource use for satisfaction of human needs exceeded their reproduction through substance turnover in the open system, Sun-Earth. Since 1986 due to imperfection of our technologies wastes amount exceeded natural assimilation capacities resulting in worsening of quality of atmosphere, fresh water, etc. Cardinal changes of life style, purposes, culture are required and the most profound reason for joining our efforts in fighting a threat of losing our civilization. To my mind, at that the main driving force is an education system despite that two third of the Earth population are illiterate.

Experience of Russia and Soviet Russia has shown that such profound illiteracy can be eliminated in rather a short period of time if to focus efforts on this purpose.

Let's turn to the ideal of the end of the 18th – beginning of the 19th century – the English poet William Blake:

To see a world in a grain of sand,
And a heaven in a wild flower,
Hold infinity in the palm of your hand
And Eternity in an hour.

We should come back to integral recognition of the world. Then: I don't like the translation of the poem by Marshak, so I would like to say it the following way: *'the broken egg cannot be transferred into unbroken, it's been broken forever'*. We, people, have no rights to lose what we can't recreate. And these ideas should be imparted into everybody since his or her early years.

Is it possible for civilizations to unite for the sake of such good idea as saving the humanity in the future? Maybe. But for that it is necessary to leave the mid-term political purposes to the strategic one, slightly more prolonged in time. Before we thought that it is 300 years. No, regretfully, not 300. Now scientists assume that the point of the bifurcation forming after that it would be impossible to return just by holding back some factors is 20 (pessimists) to 80 (optimists) years away from the current moment. It does not matter for the generation studying at school now. Are there any examples in the history of humanity where such outstanding purposes were attained? Yes. The Second and, I hope, the last World War: Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill, three different ideologies, three different cultures that united and eliminated the threat of totalitarian regime on the Earth. This threat was absolutely real. Such joint efforts require another culture, and such culture can emerge only via another education.

Refusal of the Ptolemaic point of view and the Copernicus statement that the Sun is the center made necessary to change the entire scientific and education system. But today recognition that the biological constituent of life where the man is only a part, only an apex, automatically regulates the life supporting mechanisms made us to change the school education system. We have an assistant, the most important one – this is the nature. Climate changes of the last century were tremendous. I am sure that if 300 years ago people knew about cells and forms of life as much as we currently knew an industrial revolution, energetic supply systems would not follow the path of burning carbon fuel increasing carbon dioxide in atmosphere that resulted in the climate change. We feel these changes since the climate is an averaged weather of the last 30 years. And it hits the most insurance companies: hurricanes and typhoons with sweet lady names incurred such losses to the financial world that

it actually made insurance business exclusively risky. But more changes threaten us. If Greenland ice melts and it is melting though in some points its depth is up to 700 meters and the Gulfstream is no more of temperature equal to the average one of the Earth, taking into account that the water density is highest at 4 °C, and if the Gulfstream becomes an underwater stream then the climate of England will come to Chukotka, and climate of Europe to the Polar regions. Understanding of these problems made Dr. Blair make the first talk the one on the Kyoto protocol on maintaining measures for saving the Earth. Can we, people, conduct collective measures on maintaining the life support systems? Yes, we can. But for that we need to develop an ideology for such maintenance, its philosophy, and belief that it is possible.

V. V. POPOV

– Thank you, Professor Yagodin. And I have a short question about your last statement. Now it is very popular to make various prognoses about demographic consequences of the global warming. It is said that in several dozens years about 1 bln of those living in the currently warm regions that will be covered by the World Ocean waters are going to flood the Northern hemisphere causing a humanitarian catastrophe. What do you think about it, Dr. Yagodin? And, in general, should we talk and consider such possibilities?

G. A. YAGODIN

– I can say nothing about flooding. When I studied in the Imperial College in 1963 it was a city of white people. And when I visited London three years ago I was amazed with the change of its population. The South-Eastern Asia moved considerably to London and into Europe in general. This is a natural process of blending of the Earth population into a united human community. I think it is normal.

V. V. POPOV

– Thanks a lot, Professor Yagodin. Now I would like to give the floor to Professor Wolfgang Mitter.

W. MITTER

– The encounter of cultures is a phenomenon whose history traces back to pre-modern periods, and the same is true of whether such encounters have caused hostile attitudes and actions or led to peaceful processes and solutions focussed on dialogues. However, in many cases they

result in circumstances characterised by ambiguity. As a prominent example of European antiquity the Greeks are worthy of primary attention. Though divided into a number of independent territories, they considered their common culture as an essential element in the demarcation of themselves from the – as a rule civilised – barbarians, whereby the common language played an essential role. Moreover, language could also demarcate social groups within a political unit, usually following a shift of dominance after war and conquest, such as in England after the Battle of Hastings (1066), the Norman conquerors speaking French, the subjected Anglo-Saxons preserving their English vernacular. In the modern periods this phenomenon has reached a new quality as a consequence of the continuous expansion of the space where such encounters take place, due to ‘discoveries’ and explorations of hitherto unknown territories, conquests, colonial imperialism and, in our days, globalisation and the establishment of electronic networks of information and communication. Taken as a whole the encounter of cultures can be observed and discussed in two dimensions: firstly, of the domain of international relations among states and regions, secondly, of the co-existence of people with different cultural descent and identity within the borders of states or regional units. In the second of these two dimensions the concept of multiculturalism.

This exemplary retrospect demonstrates that the history of the encounter and, in particular, of multiculturalism is millennia-old. As regards multiculturalism in our current age and its predictable perspectives the following three main trends have to be distinguished. They are interrelated. Firstly, multiculturalism takes a prominent part in the overarching globalisation that has seized all continents and pervaded all societies with their economic, socio-political and cultural domains. It has its growing impacts on mobility and migration. Lots of people leave their home places for what may seem to them a ‘better life’, be it in big cities of their own countries or somewhere abroad in the ‘rich’ or ‘safe’ regions of our planet. Often individuals (mostly males) move by themselves, but more often they take their families with them. This trend challenges the receiving countries with the troubles of taking special provisions for social welfare and educational facilities in the widest sense.

Secondly, globalisation is paralleled by trends toward regionalisation, such as occurring in Europe with the expansion of the European Union, and localisation claims to self-

government and autonomy with regard to local communities and schools or school centres. In regard to multiculturalism this means that the macro-level with its global, regional and national ranges is reinforced by the micro-level of local communities. It makes a great difference, whether the given situation is the outcome of governmental or municipal planning or of unplanned moving-in, caused by the newcomer's financial and social circumstances.

Thirdly, multiculturalism, as a constitutive component of globalisation, has become an ubiquitous reality which makes it stand against the 'virtual reality' that has been so well demonstrated in Goethe's *Faust* (part 1), where a few townsmen have a chat 'in front of the gate about war and murder far behind, far away in Turkey'. Already Goethe presented this scene in an ironical view – two hundred years ago! Modern communication media provide people with data and facts on multiculturalism, even if they do not meet the 'others' in everyday reality.

The growing stream of border-crossing migrants as well as the increasing awareness of cultural identity among members of indigenous and migrant minorities have radically reinforced the impacts comparable events in former periods had on education systems and educational processes.

Intercultural education, with the development of dual language awareness and competence as an irreplaceable base, has to begin in the early childhood. In the everyday school practice the existence of multicultural pupil populations can be a source of conflicts, but also a chance of mutual experience to be gained by sharing co-operation, benefiting from multifaceted information and promoting co-education inside or outside the classrooms.

In principle, viability and success of all approaches in the field of intercultural education depend upon the availability of teachers and, consequently teacher trainers, who are capable and willing to undertake this special responsibility with regard to its cognitive, affective and social components.

Multiculturalism is a substantial and essential level of the encounter of cultures. In the current period, however, it must be correlated with the level of international relations. This interdependence is caused not only by the growing establishment of global networks of real and virtual communication and co-operation, but also by the fact that in most cases migrants (and also members of indigenous minorities) maintain their cultural – and in many cases also their political – affiliations to

the cultures of their home countries or regions. There is even growing evidence that such commitment has reached members of the 'third generation' to a stronger degree than to be observed among their parents.

There have been remarkable efforts to promote various approaches to dialogue and communication as well as of co-operative projects including nationals (including indigenous minorities) and migrants (of different descent), in particular by the development of 'mixed' living areas. Intercultural education has become a greatly significant domain. Its chances for success necessarily depend upon willingness and action of those whose responsibility is to enable and encourage people to live in peaceful co-existence and to be provided with adequate socioeconomic and political conditions to use these chances.

V. V. POPOV

– Thank you. Professor Mitter, you have indeed dwelled on a very interesting and important issue. Now the floor is given to Andrew Evgenyevich Petrov – Scientific Secretary of the Department of History and Philology of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Deputy Chairman of the Coordination Council on the issues of young people at the Presidential Council on science, technology and education, M. A. (History).

A. E. PETROV

– I would like to give some comments on thoughts and ideas expressed here. Actually, my main concern is that recently we more and more often witness that humanitarian cultural and historical issues and problems become reasons for very serious tensions, conflicts and even victims. We all do remember rather recent conflict on cartoons about Prophet Mohammed; we have just observed an episode related to the move of the monument to the Soviet soldiers in Estonia. Right now in Iran that considers itself as an heir of the Persian Empire we can see quite negative reaction on the new Hollywood blockbuster about the Spartans, *The 300*, where Persians are depicted as miserable, greedy and terrible people. Quite often such '*civilization mini-clashes*' – I put these words into brackets – have myths in their impulse point. In that sense, I do support Professor Tlili's words when he said commenting some of his discussions with Dr. Huntington that rather often authors of large culture generalizations are not aware of specific historical realities. It truly becomes an issue at some point.

For instance, in Russia, in Tsarskoye Selo there is a church with the cross on it and a crescent below the cross. Tour guides have to answer hundreds of times questions on the meaning of the crescent below the cross. Usually, it is assumed that this is a symbol of victory of Orthodoxy over the Muslim religion. What kind of victory? Were there any war? Was there the Crusade at all?

In fact, the Russian history shows that, first, the symbols are different: it comes to absolutely different catacomb early Christian culture where an image of an anchor or a ship was a symbol of salvation – therefore, there is this semi-circle under the cross. Secondly, reviewing facts of the early Russian history we will doubt significantly on point of the victory of the Orthodox religion over the Muslim one. Yes, there were conflicts between Muslim states (the Horde, Volga Bulgaria) and Russian principalities but as to the sources we have the Russian princes even when they campaigned against the Muslims they fought against some ‘infidels’ but not specifically against the Mohamed worshippers. There is a very good example in such wonderful historical monument as the *Legend of the Slaughter of Mamai*. It describes the Kulikovsky battle, the marked event of our history, Mamai flight after the defeat – and the author, medieval Russian scholar, in about 16th century wrote: ‘And calling their Gods’, and listed those Gods: Khors that is the Slavic pagan deity, Rakli where one can identify Greek, Hellenic Heracles as well as Mohamed and Salavat. In fact, in Islam thanksgiving prayers are called *salavats*...

There were very hard periods in relationships of the Orthodox state being the united Russian one and entering the path of the Empire development with those states practicing other religions. It was the 16th and, certainly, the 19th century, the Caucasian war. But even in this case the religious slogans were used only as tools. By the way it was well demonstrated with the Caucasian war example when changes of the household, mood, consciousness of mountain dwellers resulted in appearance of muridism. It emerged after some actions when Caucasian territories were gradually brought under control of the Russian Empire.

Often we can see in newspapers, magazine materials funny historical mistakes in textbooks on history of CIS or Baltic states, other bordering countries. We made fun on that: Estonians conquered Constantinople instead of Prince Oleg when the prince and his army were asleep, and so on. Here we like to discuss it saying: ‘Look at how they present our common history!’ Well, without doubt we do have

common history. And I’m not bothering about mistakes, it is more of an issue for those nations and countries where such ideology emerges and such mistakes are supported.

Russia has already come through those tremendous social and mental consequences that happen after new generations found out reality and truth. The same enlightenment is going to take place in the Ukraine when they finally realize that the famine at the early 1930’s was not a deliberate genocide of the Ukrainian nation, that people in Kazakhstan and Volga regions along with people of other nations died as well. Of course, it happened in rural areas not in cities where fewer people died.

The example of Turkey is very representative. Russia-Turkey relationships came to normal and Turkey made a declarative decision: to remove from the history textbooks everything mentioning the Russian-Turkish wars. Is it right or not? The great time period starting from the 17th century when civilizations interacted in military way and in the 18th century some acute issues emerged as well. What will happen next when the new generation is grown up and they found out from somewhere, for instance, from the works of German scientists since there are many Turks living in Germany and in Europe in general that there were the Russian-Turkish wars, there were lots of injustice as in all wars in general from both sides? Should we do it at all?

In connection with what was said I would like to draw your attention to what Syed Zafar Mahmood said: a set of moral values is good, important and necessary. But it is necessary to have something beside these moral values obligatory or desirable for everybody: it is necessary to have targeted policy and state correctness. And the matter in hand is not only in textbooks. Prior to looking ‘at the speck of sawdust in your brother’s eye’ pay attention to your own to find there a large log. A good example is our last ambiguities with the Russian holidays. There is a complete confusion. A new holiday, November, the 4th, was introduced and people when they were asked about this date said: ‘Minin and Pozharsky defeated the Tatars at the Kulikovsky field’. Certainly, not everybody, not the majority but as polls show 11 %, which is not a small number. It happened since there was celebrated the Kulikovsky battle anniversary, 625 years, and the new holiday was introduced. Anniversaries of cities, regions as I can see are important for our country...

I love the city of Kazan with all my heart, it is a wonderful city but as a historian I can’t agree with the date of 1000 years since the day

of Kazan foundation. In a year or two Ufa will approach respective authorities with the request to celebrate, for instance, 1200-year anniversary basing on approximately reasons. It is clear they aim for jubilee funding and special resource distribution. But are we doing right? We should be more correct in this field.

In this respect I should note that, regretfully, our country does not have strategic policy; there is practice, which is momentarily and associated with some specific political decisions, but we need long-term policy. Let's not forget one interesting Chinese phrase that the most mass movements in history are conceived in separate, particular minds. And by no means is it always the case that these minds are not 'hotheads'. We should not provoke dramatic overturns in minds but press for gradual changes for the better.

V. V. POPOV

– Thank you, Andrew Evgenyevich. Now I would like to give the floor to Henry Markovich Reznik.

G. M. REZNIK

– Globalization immeasurably increases responsibility of political, religious elite in various countries. That our colleague has talked about right now – there was a keyword, *using*. There were no cartoons against Mohammed, initially there were no idea on demolition of the monument in Estonia, its move, all these things and other named conflicts are exaggerated and exploited by politicians. Excuse me, but who of those infidels and Muslims in other countries knew that some Danish magazine published a cartoon in style of Jean Eiffel or Herluf Bidstrup?

Ladies and gentlemen, there is the following situation: neither morals nor religion can provide security and tolerance in international relationships or the ones among people. It can be secured only with the help of law.

No compromise of law and culture as Alexander Sergeyevech Zapesotsky said with religion is possible since it erodes legal criteria. Specific compromises in politics are possible but the matter is that the law has exclusive value; it provides certainty in relations among people and certainty in relations among countries. And everything has been already created. Let's take a look: when yesterday I defined in concrete terms and brought to the level of specific rights and values what the liberalism actually was, we saw that everything was written in international legal enactments. '*Human Rights Charter*,

'Covenant on International and Political Rights', multiple conventions on racism disapproval. Basically, they should be followed.

I can agree with academician G. A. Yagodin that, in general, there is an objective for the humanity survival and it is clear that there are absolutely opposite tasks at all. Just one small example. There is a task for diminution in number of people inhabiting the terrestrial globe but some countries are targeted on population increase. I think that when we task for the Russian population increase it is just erroneous and is not supported with any objective trends. We do not aim for the population diminution but I can tell you that we should rely on the scientific data. As for the most optimistic prognoses by 2050 the country population will diminish to 116 million. A pessimistic prognosis says 90. We need just to rely on the scientific data, on what is actually inevitable and inescapable.

And whether we want it or not globalization will result in disappearance of some ethnos since languages they speak will die out. An inevitable consequence of globalization will be increased crime rate since social control is going to fall. Now attempts to return to actually religious basics of governing the world are also absolutely utopian because we entered a whole different stage of world development and, in fact, we are talking about responsibility of political elites and religious elites. Background of many conflicts contains interests of these elites, these groups striving to retain their supremacy. These are interests of specific people and groups rather than some organic conflicts peculiar to the humanity nowadays.

V. V. POPOV

– Thank you for such an acute polemic talk. Now I would like to give the floor to Professor Vitaliy Vyacheslavovich Naumkin.

V. V. NAUMKIN

– I'll try to bridge with the last two talks: the ones of Dr. Petrov and Dr. Reznik. In fact, we are saying that there are conflicts and real problems and, of course, there are manipulations with religion and ethnicity, and among the manipulations with ethnicity there is such detrimental event as ethnicity biologization. Many current works of our political scientists, ethnologists and those trying to rule the minds contain an adverse idea that there is kind of genetic code, civilization code in nations, that people are born with some codes and that some ethnic groups can be more predisposed to, let's say, crime behaviour than another.

We should do whatever it takes to make these concepts today not to spoil lives, not to manipulate ethnic identity and aspiration in groups to advocate for their ethnic, religious and other identity in order to oppose themselves against other groups.

Now let's talk about those conflict issues that were mentioned. We should not forget that many of events pointed here are mythologized; conflictologists have a special concept, a *myth-symbol* complex. That is, some events are mythologized, changed, transformed into myths and legends, even if there is a historical basis. There are events becoming symbols. A typical example of a symbol is an Armenian genocide. It does not matter whether it was or not (I think it was real). That's not the point but that this event becomes a symbol starting to determine international relations, starting to determine: to be in Turkey or not to be, for instance, in the European community. This myth-symbol complex starts to be more and more important at the field of proneness to conflicts. One shouldn't avoid it.

It is directly related to Russia. We set a task for consolidation of the Russian people, the Russian nation, and lots of efforts are utilized in this direction. We have already discussed the issue of relationships between the Russian and Tatars; not everything is all right there. Looking at our own textbooks and the ones written by some Tatar authors we'll see such contradictions that by themselves might give rise to conflicts. I think that a role of the society that organizes such conferences is to find objective solutions as it was after the 2nd World War when one of the main breakthroughs for creation of the united Europe was development of a united view on history among France and Germany. We need to do the same.

V. V. POPOV

– Thank you, Vitaliy Vyacheslavovich, it was a very important talk. Vyacheslav Semyonovich Stepin wanted to tell a couple of words. You are welcome.

V. S. STEPIN

– In fact, I would not agree with the idea expressed by esteemed Dr. Reznik that the Earth population should diminish, there is not enough resources for all of us and that during globalization some ethnos should die out, and if in Russia the population is decreasing it seems to be fine and there is no reason to get concerned with the population growth, let this ethnos die out. This is the logic. I don't know whether

Dr. Reznik intended to express it but it happened this way. I can't agree with it since globalization is associated with more complicated processes. First, we are talking about that we need to build relations emphasizing universal values. Then globalization is not related to conflicts but tolerant behaviour.

Indeed, universal values can be seen in any types of cultures but the matter is that these values in their pure form never programmed people. They create extremely general programs of human life activity, these are like prohibitions *Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal* – these are ideals being compulsory set off with particular norms, particular customs, habits, behaviour samples. They are fused and all together it constitutes an area of that culture which is called national historic peculiarity.

One should understand that in the modern western culture these values to a large extent are inseparable from ideals of a consumer society. And it is impossible to propose all people to live in accordance with the given ideals, at least, because it is not enough resources to spend for the entire population on the Earth if the standards of living of a consumer society as those seen in America and developed countries of Western Europe. As for different estimations, America consumes approximately 42–44 % of world energy, produces 2/3 of manufacture wastes, at that, these wastes are not in the States but in those countries where manufacture is transferred to. These are the third world countries with cheap labour, companies go exactly there.

If the entire Earth population is brought to this level of energy consumption, all currently known resources that can be utilized will be depleted in 15 years. Of course, technical progress may discover some principally new energetic resources but so far I can with assurance say that since I know this process currently to set hopes upon, for instance, low temperature thermonuclear synthesis does not seem possible. And, actually, all these new ideas are still too far from technological implementation.

There is a question: is it possible on basis of modern values to set up the global world? All civilization clashes are collisions exactly related to values. I have been developing the following concept: there are several types of civilization development. For a long time there existed a type of civilization development that was related with traditionalist cultures; then a new type of culture appeared next to it. I call it technogenic civilization related to utterly new values being in many respects alternative, with

new understanding of man, activities, nature, new understanding of personality, power and strength. Coexistence of these two types of civilizations resulted in appearance of modernization processes. All these inoculations of western values to traditionalist cultures begot modern civilizations of China, India, Japan and Russia where quite prominent layer of traditionalist but converted cultures exists.

And now there is a whole set of questions and discrepancies on this issue: some civilizations that we observe at present, which contain a layer of traditionalist cultures, they perceive liberal values in a new way, differently, for instance, human rights. To be a person in traditionalist cultures means to be a part of a clan, cast estate. There such community is at the first place and a person is revealed through the community. In western culture traditions to be a person implies being sovereign, autonomic personality that chooses for him or her social links, teams where it is identified, and, in this respect, developed. In such case, the human rights in the western culture tradition are the main thing while in the traditionalist ones the main is likely to be rights of nation, rights of cooperation, and rights of some group.

And there is a question: what to do there? Is it sufficient to limit the human rights with such interpretation existing only in the West and written in various great declarations or one should think to make these two vectors – person rights and group rights, collective rights of nation and person rights – to be united somehow? I think the process enters the uniting pace.

That is, the issue on values is a very complicated one, and the issue on value interaction is not that there are hard and fast values of the Western culture that must be inoculated and that everybody should live according to them but that both these and those values shall undergo change. And the last thought. One should not forget that modern ecological and anthropologic crises are associated with invasion into human corporeity opening options for manipulation with inheritance codes; all these crises are begotten with values of the Western, technogenic civilization.

They have to and will change in coming years. There are going to appear ideas, trends, tendencies oriented on changes of these values. Great Western philosophers are talking about it: Jurgen Habermas with his idea of new modern, Ulrich Beck, quite famous Western philosopher who writes about the same subject. It seems to me that changing values that may happen can be salvation for the humanity. It will be entering some new development cycle,

neither traditionalist nor technogenic. Something third shall appear. Otherwise, there shall emerge such crises that will become aggravated all the time, and the humanity will go through another stripe of large catastrophes. Therefore, I am rather sceptical about the idea that everything is ready with regard to values and all we have to do is to accept them, nothing shall be touched but they are just to be imparted into oriental cultures, and then everything is going to be fine.

It seems like there are more questions than answers and even in this distinguished and eminent audience we won't come to solutions of all problems. Nevertheless, to my mind our work was very fruitful, and it happened to a large extent due to efforts of the members of the Organizing Committee of the present Conference. Once again I would like to acknowledge it.

V. V. POPOV

– Thanks a lot, Vyacheslav Semenovich. I would like to thank academician V. S. Stepin for his very interesting opinion. It seems like there are more questions than answers and even in this distinguished, good and eminent audience we won't come to solutions of all the problems we face. Nevertheless, to my mind our work was very fruitful, and it happened to a large extent due to efforts of the members of the Organizing Committee of the present Conference. Once again I would like to acknowledge it.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY

– Dear colleagues, I would like to draw your attention to some fundamental principles, which scientists-humanitarians won't argue about. For instance, that all religions constitute a large moral and cultural value of the humanity. Certainly, each intellectual person, not only scientist-humanitarian must object to any attempts to humiliate any religion and to insult believers. It seems obvious to me. And each culture is valuable, and that even culture of small nations has a value none the worse than culture of the great ones, is also undisputable. I think these are things we all understand similarly.

We are going to distribute to all present here *Declaration of Rights of Culture* developed under the guidance of academician Likhachov. It is published in Russian but I do hope you will facilitate its translation into various national languages. This document, to our mind, in the world society will be at the same level of importance as *Declaration of Human Rights*. True, culture is not a subject of law; it cannot

come to court and file a lawsuit. Suits to protect culture should be filed by men. But it seems to me that the very idea of *Declaration of Rights of Culture* is important.

This is truly *St. Petersburg Declaration* where we suggest stating fundamental world principles to be a basis for joint world approach to culture. I think that eventually this document will be adopted by UNESCO though still it requires a compromise between a classic science of law and interests of culture. It seems to me that the very ideas of the Declaration are important.

I would like to dwell on two more significant problems existing today. One of them is a crisis of leadership in the world society. It seems to me as well as for many of those here that a single-pole world with one country, one religion, one culture dominating cannot exist. It is impossible. And it seems to me that the attempt for the 2nd Crusade undertaken by some forces is very dangerous.

Some of guests present, for instance, Dr. Reznik, who as far as I can see is a bearer of classic liberal Christian values, perhaps will not agree with me in the following opinion. But to my mind today in Russia a public opinion caused by extreme disappointment about modern values of the West gains momentum. For the last 15 years we conducted tremendous reforms that were initiated at the beginning with exceptional attractiveness of the West values, firstly, the ones of the USA and Western Europe. However, today many Russian intellectuals came to an idea that we were cynically cheated. We believed that the West follows all values it declares but, in fact, it is obsessed with greed, itch for money, world domination, suppression of other cultures.

Russia learned it by doing and can see it by examples of other countries such as Yugoslavia. The West defied international law that we consider an important civilization achievement. Therefore, now many people in Russia look at China and know what they say there: 'Look at those terrific errors Russia made cheated by the West, and by no means should we repeat them'. It is a bitter lesson for us.

The speech of our Chinese friend was dedicated to the issue that none of the countries or cultures should be tempted to make abrupt, hasty, ill-considered moves on the way of its development. I agree with him.

We think that Russia is no less a European country than, for instance, France or Germany. But these times we can hardly consider Western Europe or the United States as moral leaders in this world – a leader that has a right to explain

to all other countries and cultures how they should live. Therefore, now a very serious issue is development of unified approaches, unified views and, perhaps, not leadership of some cultures but leadership of those ideas that all cultures may accept.

In this connection, there is a question how we should live in this world of many cultures and how the humanity will live in the multicultural world because today it is already clear that each man will have to live in the world of many cultures in the future. Certainly, there will be a danger for small cultures concerned with the problem that they will be suppressed with larger ones representing huge ethnos and having greater history. These concerns are understandable.

It seems to me that we have to consider Huntington's concept as one of those of many possible that constitutes just one version for the event development. In this sense I would compare it with Karl Marx's concept who stated that in the future a class struggle would dominate at the world arena. But the time showed what came up. Therefore, when Huntington says that in the future there is going to be an ethnic struggle we can listen to him attentively but should not forget that the future, actually, can be totally different. We should see positive sides of such prognoses since they enable taking into consideration some possible scenarios of succession of events. As if, for instance, the West countries seeing what happened in Russia, that is, the revolution and the triumph of Karl Marx's ideas, took this experience into account and understood what they should do to avoid domination of the class struggle. At the same time, Karl Marx's ideas won and strengthened not only in Russia but in some other countries... This is experience as well. That is why, looking into the future, into the intellectual space that should appear further on we shall consider all lessons of history.

Dear colleagues, I would like to draw your special attention to the most dramatic and difficult problem of our days – situation of a type of 'overturning' of a culture system of a country, when a small ethnos with its culture in several dozens of years catches up in number a main nation inhabiting this area, and starts to strive for gaining rights for its culture equal with the dominating nation. World civilization already faced it during various wars, conflicts, territory seizures but it never happened before as a result of peaceful culture development. And today we can see that there is a range of regions in the world where there develops rapidly in numbers those segments of population that bear

with them another culture, another cast of mind, and they challenge dominating cultures.

Each dominating nation is ready to be very benevolent to another culture if the latter is not going to become dominating. For instance, in France today we can see the results after incautious statement of Dr. Sarkozy about Turkey and we understand why it happens. There is a growing foreign cultural community tremendous in number that is not ready to accept the culture of that country as the main one. France can already see that it is quite possible that multiple members of a different culture will say: 'we would like to be principal there, our culture will dominate'. And then as a result of demographic procedures they may gain such an opportunity. There appears a new type of culture struggle, extremely acute cultural conflict.

The same is happening now in the Baltic countries with more than 30 % of the Russian population. Members of the dominating culture beware of their influence, therefore, to struggle with them they utilize such methods that are far from being democratic.

Let's take a look how today particular people of various cultures live, how such combination is possible. For instance, in the Baltic states

with more than 30 % of the Russian-speaking population the state decides that there is no place for the Russian language... Or in the Ukraine, which is the country where half of the population is Russian-speaking and experiences strong pressure from the authorities.

Regretfully, the humanity now has no practical mechanisms to resolve these issues and even directions for their search are not quite clear. It is easy to say: 'We would like equal rights for all cultures'. But it is very hard to provide such equality. There are large, tremendous problems on this way.

At some point in each of us biological instincts wake up that say that a foreign language, a foreign culture should be suppressed, even destroyed, that the native culture should be the main one. This becomes, to my mind, not a less acute issue than the financial interest conflict. Actually, money does not rule the world. I think that we are to make sure not once that culture rules the world. But it also carries considerable threats if we do not develop proper mechanisms for the dialogue of cultures.

In conclusion I would like to thank you for your fruitful work at the 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference and to wish success to each of the participants.

INDEX OF NAMES

Al-Attar, N. 34
Asadullin, F. A. 52
Bogomolov, O. T. 54
Chubaryan, A. O. 33
Clesse, A. 64
Drozd, J. 63
Dutkevich, P. 62
Granin, D. A. 20
Guseynov, A. A. 39
Jingjie, L. 28
Joshi, M. M. 31
Kazarin, V. P. 51
Khokhar, R. X. 43
Kokoshin, A. A. 26
Likhanov, A. A. 50
Mahmood, S. Z. 66
Mitter, W. 69
Naumkin, V. V. 53, 72
Petrov, A. E. 70
Piotrovsky, M. B. 23
Popov, V. V. 45, 69,
70, 72, 73, 74
Reznik, G. M. 48, 72
Saltanov, A. V. 36
Shipton, S. L. 56
Stepin, V. S. 73
Tlili, M. 65
Vasilyev, Y. S. 33
Yagodin, G. A. 44,
68, 69
Yatskevich, D. V. 59
Zapesotsky, A. S. 18,
62, 63, 64, 65, 66,
67, 74

Scientific edition

**DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND CIVILIZATIONS
IN THE GLOBAL WORLD**

The 7th International Likhachov Scientific Conference
May 24–25, 2007

(ДИАЛОГ КУЛЬТУР И ЦИВИЛИЗАЦИЙ В ГЛОБАЛЬНОМ МИРЕ

VII МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЕ ЛИХАЧЕВСКИЕ НАУЧНЫЕ ЧТЕНИЯ

24–25 мая 2007 года)

Выпускающий редактор *И. В. Петрова*
Художественное оформление *В. Б. Клоков*
Технический редактор *Е. Ю. Николаева*

ISBN 978-5-7621-0392-3



Подписано в печать с оригинала-макета 25.09.07. Формат 60x90/8
Гарнитура Schoolbook. Усл. печ. л. 10,0. Тираж 500 экз. Заказ №

Издательство Санкт-Петербургского Гуманитарного
университета профсоюзов
192238, Санкт-Петербург, ул. Фучика, 15

Отпечатано в ГУП «Типография «Наука»
199034, Санкт-Петербург, В. О., 9-я линия, 12