

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 UNDER GLOBALIZATION

DISCUSSION MATERIALS: Vol. 2
12TH INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

May 17–18, 2012

*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*

*The conference, originally called 'The Days of Sci-
ence in St. Petersburg University of the Humanities
and Social Sciences' is the 20th in number
and the 12th in the status of the International
Likhachov Scientific Conference*

The project of 'The International Likhachov Scientific Conference'
was implemented in 2012 under the support
of the Interstate Foundation for Humanitarian Cooperation
of the CIS member states



**St. Petersburg
2012**

ББК 72

Д44

Scientific editor

A. S. Zapesotsky, Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation, Artist Emeritus of the Russian Federation

Editor of the English language edition

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

Recommended to be published by the Editorial and Publishing Council
of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences,
minutes No. 10, dated from 25.05.12

Д44 **Dialogue** of Cultures under Globalization. Vol. 2 : Discussion materials of the
12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 17–18, 2012, St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2012. — 56 p., il.

ISBN 978-5-7621-0694-8

The book presents discussions proceedings of the plenary session and the 1st workshop of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference that took place on May 17–18, 2012 at St. Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences in accordance with the Decree of President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin № 578 from May 23, 2001 ‘On perpetuating the memory of D. S. Likhachov’.

Among the participants of the Conference there are prominent scholars, members of the Russian Academy of Sciences A. A. Akayev, A. A. Gromyko, A. A. Guseynov, A. V. Dmitriyev, A. S. Zapesotsky, G. B. Kleiner, V. L. Makarov, V. V. Mironov, V. V. Naumkin, A. V. Smirnov, V. S. Styopin, Zh. T. Toshchenko, and others, heads of research centers, well-known political figures, statesmen and public officials, clerisy representatives: judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation G. A. Hajiyev, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation G. M. Gatilov, Deputy Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation M. V. Dulinov, President of the Bar of Moscow H. M. Reznik, writer A. A. Likhanov and many others.

Among foreign participants of the Conference are HRH Michael of Kent (Great Britain), ex-vice-president of the Republic of Bulgaria A. Marin, members of the foreign academies of sciences: F. Unger — President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts, A. N. Nysanbayev — from the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, V. Prodanov — from the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, G. Xing — from the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences; French slavist R. Guerra, J. Wiatr — Rector of the European School of Law and Administration in Warsaw, P. Dutkiewicz — Director of the Centre for Governance and Public Management at Carleton University.

The role of the Conference was highly estimated by the President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin who pointed out that ‘in the time of globalization the issues of dialogue of cultures expansion and ethno-confessional conflicts prevention have special significance and prove convincingly that humanistic ideas of D. S. Likhachov, prominent Russian scholar and public figure, are timely nowadays’.

ББК 72



**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 Science (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 Science the Likhachov Memorial Prizes of the Russian Academy of Science 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

GREETINGS OF VLADIMIR PUTIN TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

Dear friends!

I am happy to welcome you in St. Petersburg and to congratulate you on the opening of the 12th Likhachov Conference.

Your forum is an important event in the social life of Russia and of a number of foreign countries. It traditionally brings together representatives of scientific and artistic communities and competent experts.

Under globalization, the issues of extending the dialogue of cultures, preventing ethno-confessional conflicts are of paramount importance. There is compelling evidence that the humanistic ideas of academician D. S. Likhachov, an outstanding Russian enlightener and public figure, are still up-to-date.

I am convinced that the suggestions and recommendations drawn up in the course of your meeting will be sought after in practical terms.

I wish you new achievements and all the best.

President of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 17, 2012



Dear Friends!

I would like to welcome participants, hosts and guests of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference!

Your forum, traditionally gathering the cream of the Russian intellectual community, prominent scientists and public figures from all over the world in St. Petersburg is an outstanding and remarkable event in the international scientific and cultural life. It is crucial that the topics of the Conference precisely reflect the most urgent and acute humanitarian issues, the main of them being promotion of the dialogue of cultures and civilizations in the modern world, establishment of moral and spiritual foundations of the society. And certainly, one of the priority tasks for you is preserving the invaluable legacy of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov, which is as relevant and significant as before.

I wish you fruitful and constructive discussions, interesting and useful meetings.

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 5, 2011



Dear Friends!

I am sincerely pleased to see you in Saint-Petersburg and open the 10th Anniversary International Likhachov Conference.

This reputable forum is always notable for the substantial membership, comprehensive and effective work, and wide spectrum of issues to be discussed.

I am sure that the today's meeting devoted to the dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations should be one more step forward in promoting interconfessional and international communication to bring people closer to each other. And, certainly, again we can see so many prominent people together, among which are scientists, public figures, intellectuals,

representatives of arts community, everyone who shares notions and opinions of Dmitry S. Likhachov.

I wish you good luck and all the best!

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 11, 2010



I want to extend my welcome to hosts, participants and guests of the 8th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Holding this scientific forum has become a good and important tradition. It helps not only to realise the value of humanistic ideas of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov, but also to understand topical issues of the modern world.

That is why the agenda of the Conference involves problems vital for everyone, like personality and society in a multicultural world; economics and law in the context of partnership of civilizations; mass media in the system of forming the worldview; higher education: problems of development in the context of globalization and others.

I am sure that a lively discussion closely reasoned and utterly transparent in its exposition and logic will contribute to the development of the humanities, steadfast and righteous moral norms.

I wish the hosts, participants and guests fruitful cooperation and all the best.

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 22, 2008



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.

President of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 25, 2006



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.

President of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 20, 2004



I should first like to welcome the participants of the International Scientific Conference “The world of culture of 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.

President of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 21, 2001

GREETINGS OF DMITRY MEDVEDEV TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

Dear friends!

I am glad to welcome you and congratulate you on the opening of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

The unflagging interest in your reputable forum is evidence of the fact that it is still one of the most significant and anticipated events in the international cultural and social life. The current conference has again brought to St. Petersburg representatives of scientific and artistic communities, political figures and experts from many countries. It is important that the eventful programme of the meeting, the informative discussions and reports are devoted to the acute and called-for humanitarian issues, first of all to the dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations in the modern world. And certainly, the great emphasis which you always lay on the questions of upbringing the younger generation, imparting the invaluable literary, philosophical and artistic legacy of our outstanding compatriot Dmitry Sergeyeovich Likhachov to youngsters deserves sincere recognition.

I wish you fruitful and successful work.

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

D. MEDVEDEV

May 15, 2012

Dear friends!

Congratulations on the opening of the Likhachov Scientific Conference, which has brought to St. Petersburg prominent scholars, figures and experts on culture from more than 20 countries of the world.

You are about to discuss some key humanitarian issues of the contemporary age, the main of them being the development of the dialogue of cultures. The current Conference's special feature will be an opening of the unique exhibition of Dmitry Sergeyeovich Likhachov's works, which will be of interest to both the participants of the forum and a wide audience outside. I am certain that your meetings will henceforth promote humanistic values and ideas. And the initiatives set forth at the Conference will become a significant contribution to improving international and inter-confessional relations.

I wish you every success and fruitful work.

President of the Russian Federation

D. MEDVEDEV

May 11, 2011

Dear Friends!

I am sincerely pleased to see you in Saint-Petersburg and to open the 10th Anniversary Likhachov Conference.

This forum traditionally brings representatives of scientific and arts communities, famous politicians, and experts from Russia and all over the world.

This year the Likhachov Conference is devoted to one of the today's key issues, establishment of global culture and preservation of national identity.

Today, with convergence and interpenetration of cultures it is important to preserve original traditions, languages, lifestyle, and spiritual and moral values of the folks as a basis of cultural diversity of the world in the time of globalization. I hope you

enjoy interesting discussions and fruitful communication, and wish good luck and success to the senior pupils who are participating in the Competition 'Ideas of D. S. Likhachov and Modern Age'.

President of the Russian Federation

D. MEDVEDEV

May 12, 2010

Dear friends!

I should like to welcome you on the opening of the 9th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. I wish all the participants success and fruitful and prolific discussions.

Your reputable forum has always been a remarkable event, gathering the world intellectual community. Its brilliant discussions and reports on various topics, such as: the role of culture and humanities in people's contemporary life; partnership of civilizations and others arise great interest and deeply affect public life.

A remarkable event in the course of this year Conference has become introduction of a special youth programme 'Likhachov Forum for High School Students'. I have no doubt that establishing ethic and moral norms with the generations to come demands studying fundamental works and scientific heritage of academician Likhachov whose humanistic ideas have eternal context.

I should like to express my hope that the suggestions and recommendations elaborated within your conference will contribute practical activities and assist in long-term international humanitarian projects development.

I wish the participants and guests of the conference all the best.

President of the Russian Federation

D. MEDVEDEV

May 13, 2009

WELCOME ADDRESSES TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE 12th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

To the hosts and participants of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

*Dear hosts and participants of the Scientific Conference,
I welcome all of you who have come to St. Petersburg for the traditional Likhachov Scientific Conference.
Your reputable forum plays an important role in the social discussion on many acute issues of developing science and education, economics and law, literature and arts.
The Scientific Conference held annually contributes greatly to perpetuating the memory of an outstanding figure of modern times, academician Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov. His research is important for solving many acute problems, including the problems related to the dialogue of cultures under globalization.
Historically, Russia has always been based on interaction and mutual enrichment of different ethnic groups. Today it is very important to remember the timeless traditions of respect and mutual neighbourly cooperation, collaborative work and creation, the diversity of the great Russian culture. This is where the inexhaustible resource for Russia's development can be found.
I wish the participants of the 12th International Likhachov Conference fruitful discussions and all the best.*

S. Ye. NARYSHKIN,
Chairman of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation

To the participants of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

*Dear friends,
I am glad to greet the participants of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference in St. Petersburg. This significant forum at the Neva Riverside annually brings together representatives of science, culture, public figures from Russia, the CIS-countries and other foreign countries.
Our city is proud of the fact that one of the most outstanding representatives of Russian intellectual élite, prominent scholar Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov lived and worked here. He was the first person in the recent history of our city to be awarded the title of the Honoured citizen of St. Petersburg.
The subject area of the conference – 'Dialogue of cultures under globalization' – is important and timely in present-day world. Our city, which since its foundation has been a multiethnic and multi-confessional one, still performs its mission today: to unite peoples with due respect for their original nature.
I wish all the participants of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference fruitful communication, interesting discussions, and those who have visited St. Petersburg for the first time – pleasant impressions in Russia's cultural capital!*

G. S. POLTAVCHENKO,
Governor of St. Petersburg

To the participants and guests of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

*Dear colleagues,
I am glad to greet you at the regular 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.
Over the years the International Likhachov Scientific Conference has become an important platform for fruitful and constructive discussions on acute issues of today, where Russian and foreign scholars, political and public figures, representatives of artistic community take part. It is evidence of the widespread international interest in D. S. Likhachov's ideas.
Drawing on the legacy of Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov contributes to a better understanding of the ways, means and content of the problems which Russian science and education face today.
I value the fact that in the context of the conference there is held a contest of creative projects delivered by senior school students, which aims at involving young people in active research activities and in studying the works of D. S. Likhachov.
I wish all the participants of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference successful work to the benefit of science and education!*

A. A. FURSENKO,
Acting Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation

To the hosts, participants and guests of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

I would like to heartily greet the hosts, participants and guests of the reputable scientific forum – the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. The scholarly meeting held annually in St. Petersburg, at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, D. S. Likhachov being one of the originators of it, becomes an important platform for discussing the acute issues of the dialogue of cultures. Today the world has drawn closer to a situation when most problems of social and economic life cannot be solved without taking culture into account. The cultural potential of each social group cannot become more active without a dialogue, which is a new basis for interaction between peoples, which is particularly relevant for multiethnic Russia.

Drawing on the creative legacy of D. S. Likhachov within the Conference should help breach the mental barriers which accompany the monologuism of great cultures. It is this fact that should promote the dialogue accompanying globalization processes. This is where a passport to the mankind's successful progress to unity is found; it being a universal world process today.

I wish all the participants of the Scientific Conference fruitful work, interesting meetings and well-being.

A. A. AVDEYEV,
Acting Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation
May 14, 2012

To the hosts, participants and guests of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

On behalf of the Ministry of Public Health Care and Social Development of the Russian Federation I warmly greet the hosts, participants and guests of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

The annual Conference held at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences has become a reputable platform for fruitful discussions, serious talks about the pressing problems of today in the context of social and cultural life. Among participants of the Conference there are prominent political and public figures, scholars, lawyers, representatives of the sphere of education, literature, arts; at all times it ensures a high professional level of reflections on the issues under discussion.

The conceptual core of the forum, which is of international importance today, is the legacy of the outstanding Russian scholar and public figure, Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov, who saw culture as a most important constituent of social development, an integral part of the nation's spiritual progress. The legacy of D. S. Likhachov is an essential part of the Russian and world scientific thought.

As well as in the past years, the conference now covers various subjects: the balance between national unity and cultural diversity, the cultural support for social development, education and dialogue of cultures and other topics.

I wish you successful work, lively constructive discussions and all the best!

T. A. GOLIKOVA,
Acting Minister of Public HealthCare and Social Development of the Russian Federation
May 14, 2012

To the Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences A. S. Zapesotsky, participants and guests of the Conference

*Dear Alexander Sergeevich,
Dear colleagues,*

On behalf of the Russian Academy of Sciences I congratulate you on the opening of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference – the biggest world-class forum of humanist scholars, who represent various areas of scientific knowledge. The conference was initiated by St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences in 1993 and since then it has been held annually.

I would like to note that the world is gradually starting to understand the truth that further development of the civilization is only possible on the basis of mutual understanding, dialogue and equal partnership. In this context your forum is not only a way of collective search for the scientific truth and an effective way of uniting the intellectual and spiritual potential of prominent humanists, but also a means of consolidating the values of cross-cultural, inter-confessional and interethnic communication as a key life principle.

The topics covered at the conference are particularly acute for Russia, which is experiencing an important stage in its development; a stage which needs mobilizing efforts of the nation and searching for resources of spiritual and moral revival, social consolidation and stable future. We live at an age of global challenges to the modern civilization, and the duty of all

humanists is to search and find the possible scenarios to answer them. It is no coincidence that for almost two decades your Conference has been putting into practical effect the will of D. S. Likhachov, developing the academician's ideas of culture as a pacing factor of realizing man's creative potential and the humanistic guideline of the development of civilization. The published proceedings of the Conference assert the mission of the humanitarian knowledge as an integral part of the spiritual culture; they are notable for their high intellectual level, moral pathos and extraordinary topicality of the problems under discussion. The topics of the Conference always attract wide international interest and draw a wide response in the scholarly community; they provide political and public figures, representatives of artistic community with beneficial food for thought about the fortunes of Russia and the world, about the meaning of their professional vocation and duty.

I wish you tireless search for the truth, fruitful discussions and fundamental results!

Yu. S. OSIPOV,
President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician

**To the Chairman of the Organizing Committee
of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference,
corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences A. S. Zapesotsky,
to participants of the Conference**

Dear Alexander Sergeevich,

*Dear participants, guests, members of the Organizing Committee
of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference,*

On behalf of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia I congratulate all the participants and hosts of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference on the opening of the unique international scholarly forum, to say the least of it.

The conference is traditionally held at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. The Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia is justifiably proud of the University, which has become a leading centre of the humanitarian scientific thought of Russia.

The Likhachov Scientific Conference annually attracts the attention of a great number of scientists, public figures and statesmen from different regions of Russia, from the CIS and other foreign countries. To a great extent this is due to the fact that the topic of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference – dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations – is central not only for Russia, but also for the entire world community.

Holding the Likhachov Conference at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences is a sign of the fact that the world and Russian scientific community recognize the priority of the University in development of scholarly research into this subject area. To a certain degree this is due to the fact that Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov was Doctor honoris causa of the University. It was in this University where many ideas of D. S. Likhachov were supported and developed. It is St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences that carries out constructive and dedicated work to propagandize the legacy of the great scholar.

The Federation of Independent Trade Unions, uniting representatives of different jobs, is one of the most important institutions of the country's social life. Today Russia's professional movement faces a serious task set by President of Russia, Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin – to ensure the stable development of Russia and make it a prosperous state.

I wish the participants and hosts of the Conference great success!

M. V. SHMAKOV,
Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia

To the organizers and participants of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

Dear ladies and gentlemen,

The conference named after the prominent Russian thinker academician Dmitry Likhachov has gained deserved recognition and authority in the world community. At the forum, which traditionally takes place at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, the most acute humanitarian issues connected with the dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations are under discussion.

As the UN High Representative for the Alliance of Civilizations I support your work, discussions, debates aimed at maintaining mutual understanding and interaction in the modern science, culture, social sphere. I believe that trust is a fundamental factor which raises the possibility of successful communication to build up more perfect societies. Now we can observe the rising distrust put in politics in old democratic countries of Europe while other countries strive to freedom and democracy as a way of realizing their self-respect. Despite the fact that every nation and every country has their own characteristic

features, which give rise to the unique nature of their social choice and the search for ways to justice and democracy, all of us, our communities are interconnected.

I would like to wish the participants of the Conference to enjoy interesting communication, make constructive decisions and creative achievements!

J. SAMPAIO,
High Representative
of the UN Secretary-General for the Alliance of Civilizations

To the Organizing Committee of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

I am honoured to greet all participants to the 12th Likhachov International Scientific Conference on the theme of the "Dialogue of Cultures under Globalization." These scientific conferences are important platforms to debate the evolution and transformation of the educational, scientific and cultural dimensions of globalization. As Director-General of UNESCO, I recognize wholeheartedly the value of this legacy of Dmitry Likhachov, a great humanist whose influence lives on today. These Conferences provide strong contributions to promoting the ideals set forth in UNESCO's Constitution, which states that "the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace ... constitutes a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfil in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern."

The power of culture and intercultural dialogue for the resilience of societies lay at the heart of Dmitry Likhachov's convictions. As a courageous intellectual committed to action, he launched and contributed to campaigns to protect many cultural sites in Russia. These included the historic centre of Saint Petersburg, now inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List under the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage, which is celebrating its 40th anniversary this year and provides a key opportunity for intercultural dialogue and exchange.

UNESCO's position is clear: As stated in the 2001 UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, "heritage in all its forms must be preserved, enhanced and handed on to future generations as a record of human experience and aspirations, so as to foster creativity in all its diversity and to inspire genuine dialogue among cultures."

Globalization is creating new opportunities for intercultural dialogue and also new challenges. Societies are more connected than ever before. Ideas and people travel at rising speed within and across national borders. These circumstances have multiplied openings for mutual understanding between people everywhere on the planet. They have also given rise to new difficulties, to misunderstandings and mistrust that have fuelled tensions between and societies, especially where young people, women, migrants and minorities face discrimination.

UNESCO is committed to fostering new forms of intercultural dialogue in these circumstances. Last November, the UNESCO General Conference adopted a Programme of Action for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence that seeks to make peace a tangible reality for all. This new Programme rests on two pillars. The first is the promotion of cultural diversity as a basis for inclusive societies and sustainable development, in terms of reflection, policy design and standard-setting. The second pillar is to take forward in practice the principle of learning to live together by assisting Member States in preventing conflict and in promoting mutual understanding and reconciliation.

I wish to thank the organisers of the Likhachov International Scientific Conference and all participants for their commitment to these values and objectives. The dialogue of cultures raises vital questions for peace and sustainable development today and in the century ahead. I look forward to your discussions and conclusions and wish you rich and productive debates.

I. BOKOVA,
Director-General of UNESCO

ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

Information

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 Day of Slavonic Letters and Culture. It was initiated by academician Dmitry Sergeyeovich Likhachov. Since then the conference has been held every year. After academician Likhachov had passed away this academic forum received the status of International Likhachov Scientific Conference from the government (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 University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress (founders: J. I. Alferov, D. A. Granin, A. S. Zapesotsky, K. Yu. Lavrov, D. S. Likhachov, A. P. Petrov, M. B. Piotrovsky). Since 2007 the conference has enjoyed the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation.

Traditionally, the most universal debatable challenges of the present time are put on the agenda of the conference: 'Education in terms of the new cultural type formation', 'Culture and global challenges of the world development', 'Humanitarian issues of the contemporary civilization' etc.

Every year greatest figures of Russian and foreign science, culture and art, public and political leaders take part in the conference. The following academicians of the Russian Academy of Sciences have taken part in the conference in recent years: L. I. Abalkin, A. G. Arbatov, N. P. Bekhtereva, O. T. Bogomolov, V. N. Bolshakov, Yu. S. Vasilyev, R. S. Grinberg, A. A. Guseynov, T. I. Zaslavskaya, M. P. Kirpichnikov, A. A. Kokoshin, A. B. Kudelin, V. A. Lektorsky, I. I. Lukinov, D. S. Lvov, V. L. Makarov, V. A. Martynov, N. N. Moiseyev, A. D. Nekipelov, Yu. S. Osipov, A. M. Panchenko, N. Ya. Petrakov, V. F. Petrenko, E. I. Pivovarov, M. B. Piotrovsky, N. A. Plateh, V. M. Polterovich, E. M. Primakov, B. V. Rauschenbach, Yu. A. Ryzhov, N. N. Skatov, A. V. Smirnov, V. S. Styopin, M. L. Titarenko, V. A. Tishkov, Zh. T. Toshchenko, V. A. Chereshnev, A. O. Chubarian, N. P. Shmelyov, B. G. Yudin, V. L. Yanin and others. Academicians of the Russian Academy of Education who have taken part in the conference are the following: S. A. Amonashvili, V. I. Andreyev, G. M. Andreyeva, A. G. Asmolov, A. P. Beliayeva, M. N. Berulava, I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada, A. A. Bodalev, E. V. Bondarevskaya, G. A. Bordovsky, V. P. Borisenkov, G. N. Volkov, Yu. S. Davydov, A. V. Darinsky, E. D. Dneprov, S. F. Yegorov, V. I. Zagvyazinskiy, I. A. Zimniaya, V. G. Kineliov, I. S. Kon, A. S. Kondratyev, V. G. Kostomarov, V. V. Krayevsky, A. A. Likhachov, G. V. Mukhamedzianova, V. S. Mukhina, V. A. Miasnikov, N. D. Nikandrov, A. M. Novikov, O. A. Omarov, A. A. Orlov, Yu. V. Senko, A. V. Usova, Yu. U. Fokht-Babushkin, G. A. Yagodin, V. Mitter (Germany) and others. Such public and state figures as A. A. Akayev, A. E. Busygin, G. A. Hajiyev, G. M. Gatilov, S. L. Katanandov, S. V. Lavrov, Ye. I. Makarov, V. I. Matviyenko, V. V. Miklushevsky, K. O. Romodanovsky, A. L. Safonov, A. A. Sobchak, E. S. Stroyev, V. Ye. Churov, M. V. Shmakov, A. V. Yakovenko, V. A. Yakovlev have also participated in the conference. Among the figures of culture and art who have taken part in the conference are the following: M. K. Anikushin, A. A. Voznesensky, I. O. Gorbachov, D. A. Granin, N. M. Dudinskaya, Z. Ya. Korogodsky, K. Yu. Lavrov, A. P. Petrov, M. M. Plisetskaya, M. L. Rostropovich, E. A. Riazanov, G. V. Sviridov and others.

Since 2007 in the framework of the Conference there has been held Likhachov forum of senior high-school students of Russia, which gathers winners of the All-Russian Contest of creative projects entitled 'Dmitry Likhachov's Ideas and Modernity' from all over Russia and abroad.

Since 2008, supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, the Diplomatic Programme of the conference 'International Dialogue of Cultures' has been implemented. Ambassadors of foreign states present their reports and give their opinions on acute challenges of present time.

Since 2010 the complex of Likhachov events has been supplemented with an All-Russian cultural-educational programme for senior high-school students entitled 'Likhachov Lessons in Petersburg'.

In 2001, 2004, 2006, 2009–2012, the hosts and participants were greeted by Presidents of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin and D. A. Medvedev, in 2008, 2010–2012 by Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation.

Every year volumes of reports, participants' presentations, proceedings of workshop discussions and round tables are published. The copies of the volumes are present in all major libraries of Russia, the CIS countries, scientific and educational centres of many countries in the world. The Proceedings of the conference are also available on a special scientific website 'Likhachov Square' (at www.lihachev.ru).

CONTENTS

Decree of President of the Russian Federation 'On Perpetuating the Memory of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov'	3
Greetings of Vladimir PUTIN to the participants of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference	4
Greetings of Dmitry Medvedev to the participants of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference	7
Welcome Addresses to the participants of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference	9
About the International Likhachov Scientific Conference (Information)	13

Plenary Session

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES UNDER GLOBALIZATION	17
---	----

PARTICIPANTS OF THE DISCUSSION:

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY , <i>President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation. Head of the Expert Council of Russian State Duma's Committee on Labour and Social Policy, Deputy Chairman of the Board of Rectors of St. Petersburg Universities, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, Artist Emeritus of the Russian Federation</i>	18
V. S. STYOPIN , <i>Head of the Section of Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology and Law of the Department for Social Sciences (the Russian Academy of Sciences), academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Doctor honoris causa of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences</i>	19
Michael of KENT , <i>His Royal Highness (Great Britain), Doctor honoris causa of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences</i>	20
G. M. GATILOV , <i>Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary</i>	21
Felix UNGER , <i>President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg, Austria), Professor, Dr. Sc.</i>	21
A. A. GUSEYNOV , <i>Director of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Doctor honoris causa of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences</i>	22
G. A. HAJIYEV , <i>Judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, LL. D., Professor, Lawyer Emeritus of the Russian Federation, Doctor honoris causa of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences</i>	23
A. A. AKAYEV , <i>President of the Kirgiz Republic (1990–2005), foreign member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Academy of Sciences of the Kirgiz Republic, Chief Researcher at the Institute for Mathematical Investigations of Complex Systems at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Engineering), Professor</i>	24
Piotr DUTKIEWICZ , <i>Director of the Centre for Governance and Public Management at Carleton University (Ottawa, Canada), Ph. D., Professor</i>	25
Xinxin CHANG , <i>Director, Dept. of Principles of Scientific Socialism, the Institute for Social Development of Party School (Central Committee of the Communist Party of China), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i>	26
Jerzy J. WIATR , <i>Rector of the European School of Law and Administration in Warsaw, Professor Emeritus of the University of Warsaw, Dr. Sc. (Sociology)</i>	26
V. L. MAKAROV , <i>Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute (the Russian Academy of Sciences), academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor</i>	27
M. V. DULINOV , <i>Vice Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, Candidate of Science (Economics)</i>	27
A. S. MAKSIMOV , <i>Chairman of the Committee on Science and Higher School of the Administration of St. Petersburg, Candidate of Science (Engineering)</i>	28
René GUERRA , <i>Head of Russian Language and Literature Chair at the State University of Nice (France), Dr. Sc. (Philology), collector, curator and researcher of the cultural heritage of Russian émigré community</i>	28
Heinrich BONNENBERG , <i>Dr. Sc. (Engineering), member of German Society for Foreign Policy</i>	29
A. A. GROMYKO , <i>Leading researcher at Institute for International Security Issues of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor</i>	30

Zh. T. TOSHCHENKO , <i>Dean of the Department of Sociology and Head of Chair of Theory and History of Social Studies of the Russian State University for the Humanities, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Chief Editor of 'Sociological Researches' Journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences ('Sotsiologicheskkiye Issledovaniya')</i>	30
G. B. KLEINER , <i>Vice Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute (the Russian Academy of Sciences), corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i>	31
V. V. MIRONOV , <i>Head of the Philosophy Department at Lomonosov Moscow State University, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor; honorary worker of higher professional education of the Russian Federation</i>	32
H. M. REZNIK , <i>President of the Bar of Moscow, Head of the Chair of the Legal Profession at the Academy University for Law under the Institute for State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences, LL. M., Lawyer Emeritus of the Russian Federation, Doctor honoris causa of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences</i>	33
A. A. LIKHANOV , <i>writer; Chairman of the Russian Children Foundation, Director of the Research Institute for Childhood of the Russian Children Foundation, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Doctor honoris causa of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences</i>	33
V. T. TRETYAKOV , <i>Dean of the High School (Department) of Television of the Lomonosov Moscow State University, director general of the Publishing House 'Russia'</i>	34
Yu. P. ZINCHENKO , <i>Dean of the Department of Psychology of the Lomonosov Moscow State University, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Psychology), Professor; honorary fellow of higher professional education of the Russian Federation</i>	35
Juan A. MARC , <i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation (2008–2011)</i>	36
Vasil PRODANOV , <i>corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i>	37
A. V. SMIRNOV , <i>Deputy Director of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i>	38
A. V. DMITRIYEV , <i>Chief Researcher of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i>	38

Workshop 1

MULTICULTURALISM AS A STATE POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	40
---	----

PARTICIPANTS:

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY , <i>President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor; Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation. Head of the Expert Council of Russian State Duma's Committee on Labour and Social Policy, Deputy Chairman of the Board of Rectors of St. Petersburg Universities, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, Artist Emeritus of the Russian Federation</i>	41
V. V. NAUMKIN , <i>Director of the Institute for Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor</i>	41
V. V. POPOV , <i>Director of the Centre for Partnership of Civilizations of the Institute for International Research at Moscow State Institute for International Relations (University) under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Candidate of Science (History), Professor; Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, honorary worker of the diplomatic service of the Russian Federation</i>	41
A. A. MOISEYEV , <i>Dean of the Department of International Law of the Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, LL. D., Professor</i>	42
Jerzy J. WIATR , <i>Rector of the European School of Law and Administration in Warsaw, Professor Emeritus of the University of Warsaw, Dr. Sc. (Sociology)</i>	43
Eberhard SCHNEIDER , <i>Professor of Political Science at the University of Siegen (Germany), Ph. D.</i>	43
René GUERRA , <i>Head of Russian Language and Literature Chair at the State University of Nice (France), Dr. Sc. (Philology), collector, curator and researcher of the cultural heritage of Russian émigré community</i>	43
Vasil PRODANOV , <i>corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i>	44
P. P. TOLOCHKO , <i>Director of the Institute for Archaeology of the National Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine, academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine, a foreign member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor</i>	44
N. G. BAGDASARIAN , <i>Professor of the Chair of Social and Cultural Studies of Moscow State Technical University named after N. E. Bauman, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), honorary fellow of higher professional education of the Russian Federation</i>	45
Guangcheng XING , <i>Deputy Director of the Centre for History and Geography of Border Regions of China (the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences), LL. D., Professor</i>	45

A. N. NYSANBAYEV , <i>academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i>	46
Juan A. MARC , <i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation (2008–2011)</i>	48
O. N. ASTAFYEVA , <i>Director of the Civil Society and Social Communications scientific and educational centre at the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration under the President of the Russian Federation, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, honorary higher education worker of the Russian Federation</i>	49
E. N. SHAPINSKAYA , <i>Chief Researcher of the Russian Institute for Cultural Studies, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i>	49
F. A. ASADULLIN , <i>Deputy Chair of the European Russian Spiritual Governance for Muslims, Leading researcher of the Institute for Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), Candidate of Science (Philology)</i>	50
A. V. KOSTINA , <i>Head of the Chair of Philosophy, Cultural and Political Studies at Moscow University for the Humanities, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Associate Professor</i>	51
A. A. GROMYKO , <i>Leading researcher at Institute for International Security Issues of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor</i>	52
Piotr DUTKIEWICZ , <i>Director of the Centre for Governance and Public Management at Carleton University (Ottawa, Canada), Ph. D., Professor</i>	53
I. F. KEFELY , <i>Head of the Chair of Cultural and Global Studies of the Baltic State Technical University 'Voenmeh' named after D. F. Ustinov, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, honorary fellow of higher school of the Russian Federation</i>	53
Angel MARIN , <i>public and military figure, Vice President of the Republic of Bulgaria (2002 — January 2012)</i>	54
Felix UNGER , <i>President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg, Austria), Professor, Dr. Sc.</i>	55
Heinrich BONNENBERG , <i>Dr. Sc. (Engineering), member of German Society for Foreign Policy</i>	55

Plenary Session

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES UNDER GLOBALIZATION

A. P. Petrov's Concert Hall
(St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences)
May 17, 2012

Chairpersons:

- G. M. GATILOV** Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
- V. S. STYOPIN** Head of the Section of Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology and Law of the Department for Social Sciences (the Russian Academy of Sciences), academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Doctor honoris causa of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences
- F. UNGER** President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg, Austria), Professor, Dr. Sc.
- A. S. ZAPESOTSKY** President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, *Scientist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation. Head of the Expert Council of Russian State Duma's Committee on Labour and Social Policy, Deputy Chairman of the Board of Rectors of St. Petersburg Universities, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, *Artist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation

Participants:

- A. A. AKAYEV** President of the Kirgiz Republic (1990–2005), foreign member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Academy of Sciences of the Kirgiz Republic, Chief Researcher at the Institute for Mathematical Investigations of Complex Systems at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Engineering), Professor
- H. BONNENBERG** Dr. Sc. (Engineering), member of German Society for Foreign Policy
- X. CHANG** Director, Dept. of Principles of Scientific Socialism, the Institute for Social Development of Party School (Central Committee of the Communist Party of China), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor
- A. V. DMITRIYEV** Chief Researcher of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor
- M. V. DULINOV** Vice Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation, Candidate of Science (Economics)
- P. DUTKIEWICZ** Director of the Centre for Governance and Public Management at Carleton University (Ottawa, Canada), Ph. D., Professor
- A. A. GROMYKO** Leading researcher at Institute for International Security Issues of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- R. GUERRA** Head of Russian Language and Literature Chair at the State University of Nice (France), Dr. Sc. (Philology), collector, curator and researcher of the cultural heritage of Russian émigré community
- A. A. GUSEYNOV** Director of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences
- G. A. HAJIYEV** Judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, *LL. D.*, Professor, *Lawyer Emeritus* of the Russian Federation, Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences
- G. B. KLEINER** Vice Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute (the Russian Academy of Sciences), corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor

- A. A. LIKHANOV** writer, Chairman of the Russian Children Foundation, Director of the Research Institute for Childhood of the Russian Children Foundation, President of the International Association of Children Funds, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences
- V. L. MAKAROV** Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute (the Russian Academy of Sciences), academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor
- A. S. MAKSIMOV** Chairman of the Committee on Science and Higher School of the Administration of St. Petersburg, Candidate of Science (Engineering)
- J. A. MARC** Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation (2008–2011)
- Michael of KENT** His Royal Highness (Great Britain), Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences
- V. V. MIRONOV** Head of the Philosophy Department at Lomonosov Moscow State University, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, honorary worker of higher professional education of the Russian Federation
- V. PRODANOV** corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor
- H. M. REZNIK** President of the Bar of Moscow, Head of the Chair of the Legal Profession at the Academy University for Law under the Institute for State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences, *LL. M., Lawyer Emeritus* of the Russian Federation, Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences
- A. V. SMIRNOV** Deputy Director of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor
- Zh. T. TOSHCHENKO** Dean of the Department of Sociology and Head of Chair of Theory and History of Social Studies of the Russian State University for the Humanities, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Chief Editor of ‘Sociological Researches’ Journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences (‘Sotsiologicheskiye Issledovaniya’)
- V. T. TRETYAKOV** Dean of the High School (Department) of Television of the Lomonosov Moscow State University, director general of the Publishing House ‘Russia’
- J. J. WIATR** Rector of the European School of Law and Administration in Warsaw, *Professor Emeritus* of the University of Warsaw, Dr. Sc. (Sociology)
- Yu. P. ZINCHENKO** Dean of the Department of Psychology of the Lomonosov Moscow State University, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Psychology), Professor, honorary fellow of higher professional education of the Russian Federation

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY¹: — Dear friends, as President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social

¹ President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, *Scientist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation. Prof. Zapesotsky is Head of the Expert Council of Russian State Duma’s Committee on Labour and Social Policy. He is Deputy Chairman of the Board of Rectors of St. Petersburg Universities and Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia. Member of the Board of the Russian Children’s Foundation.

Author of over 1,700 scholarly publications. Member of editorial boards of journals ‘Pedagogy’ (Pedagogica), ‘Literary Education’ (Literaturnaja Uchoba), ‘Philosophy and Culture’ (Filosofiya i Kul’tura), ‘Issues of Cultural Studies’ (Voprosy Kulturologiji), ‘Simurg’ (Azerbaijan).

Decorated with the Order of Friendship, medals ‘For rescuing a drowning man’ and ‘In memory of the tercentenary of Saint Petersburg’. Holder of ‘K. D. Ushinsky medal’, the Gold medal of the Russian Academy of Education, Leo Tolstoy Gold Medal of the International Association of writers and essayists (Paris). Decorated with a Badge of Honour of the Ministry of Culture of Bulgaria ‘Seal of Tsar Simeon I’.

Professor Zapesotsky was awarded the Russian Federal Government Prize (2007) and St. Petersburg Government Prize (2010) in education, he is laureate of the Gorky Literary Prize. Doctor *honoris causa* of universities of the USA, Ireland and the Ukraine. Academician of Paris Academy of Sciences and Arts, of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg). *Artist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation.

Sciences and cofounder of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference, let me welcome you and express how grateful I am that you are here.

Dear colleagues, the Likhachov Conference has its great history. Today there are a lot of new guests, who has come to the Conference for the first time. Likhachov Conference is based on the conference ‘Days of Science’ initiated in the first half of the 1990s by Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov, academician of the Russian Academy of Science, Doctor *honoris causa* of our University, who started the research of culture with us. The first conference ‘Days of Science’ was held in 1993. Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov was one of its participants, who defined its ideology.

After his death, in 2001 Daniil Alexandrovich Granin and me addressed President of Russia Vladimir Putin and asked to issue a Decree to perpetuate the memory of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov and to give the status of International Likhachov Scientific Conference to the ‘Days of Science’. This was an unprecedented case when the decree was ready in three days that shows the special

attitude of the authorities in our country to the memory of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov. Thus, since 2001 'Days of Science' have the status of International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

The cofounders of the Conference are the Russian Academy of Science and the Russian Academy of Education, and also St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, created and registered by me at the instance of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov. Besides, one of the organizers of the Conference is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia.

Thanks to our common efforts today the Conference is one of the largest annual forums of classic scholars in Russia. Annually about 1500 people take part in the Conference: today there are about 750 adult participants of the Conference in this hall, tomorrow 750 students from all country will join to held Likhachov Forum for senior pupils.

Representatives from 15 countries take part in the Conference. We got papers from about 30 members of Russian State Academies, from more than 40 scientific-research academic centres and representatives of about 60 universities.

Issue of the collection of articles of the Likhachov Conference members represents a significant move in the scientific development of the agenda reflected in the title of the Conference. It is not for the first time when our Conference is devoted to the problem of the dialogue of cultures in globalization. I expect that the present Conference will be a new step in the understanding of this topic.

Before we proceed to the presentations and discussions, I would like to remind, that traditionally the participants do not read their papers. All the articles have been published and have already entered the scientific world. The aim of the meeting is not in the reading of the articles but in the statement of the fundamental principles important for the participants of the Conference, and of course, in discussion. Only in this case the science can move on.

Now I give the floor to eminent philosopher and academician Viacheslav Semyonovich Styopin.

V. S. STYOPIN¹: — Modern globalization goes on in the time of global crises aggravation. There is a question: how can humankind overcome all these crises? Possible globalization scenarios should be estimated from this viewpoint.

¹ Head of the Section of Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology and Law of the Department for Social Sciences (the Russian Academy of Sciences), academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of Chair of Philosophical Anthropology and Problems of Complex Study of Man at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author of more than 500 scholarly publications, including 22 monographs: *Philosophical Anthropology and Philosophy of Science* (Filosofskaya antropologiya i filosofiya nauki), *Philosophy of Science and Technology* (Filosofiya nauki i tehniki), *The Age of Changes and Scenarios for the Future* (Epoha peremen i scenariyi buduschego), *Theoretical Knowledge* (Teoreticheskoye znaniye), *Philosophy and Culture Universals* (Filosofiya i universalii kul'tury), *Philosophy of Science: Common Issues* (Filosofiya nauki: obshchiye problemy) and some others. Professor Styopin is President of the Russian Philosophic Society. Dr Styopin is a foreign member of National Academies of Sciences of Byelorussia and the Ukraine, a standing member of the International Institute (Academy) for Philosophy (Paris, 2001), doctor *honoris causa* of the University of Karlsruhe (Germany), Professor Emeritus of the Academy of Social Sciences of the People's Republic of China (Beijing). Laureate of Russia's State Award in the field of science and technology. He is decorated with the Orders of Friendship of Peoples, the Order for Services to the Fatherland of the 4th degree. Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

We can single out two different and even alternative globalization strategies. The first is being realized already. It is oriented to conserve basic values of the modern anthropogenic culture and positions them as the globalizing world spiritual basis. The second implies changing of the outlined strategy, review and transformation of its value base.

Value base mentioned above is often referred to as the 'project Modern' values. They come from Western world as a spiritual basis of a civilizational development special type — anthropogenic civilization. Its culture's foundation is represented by the values of innovation, creative work, scientific and technical progress, understanding of nature as a field for human reorganizing activity and resources reservoir, ideal of independent and sovereign personality who has natural rights, understanding of power not only as domination of one person over another but also as domination and control over natural and social objects.

These ideals, values and life meanings became a core of anthropogenic civilization genetic code, in accordance to which civilization revealed and changed in the process of its historical evolution.

Rivalry between anthropogenic civilization and the preceding societies of traditionalistic types generated modernization processes. In their basis there were borrowings of scientific and technological achievements and new education system by the traditional societies, adaptation of these anthropological culture layers to traditionalistic soil. During modernization there was transition of traditionalistic societies to the way of anthropological development while keeping in them many fragments of original native cultures transformed during modernization. This was the way of Japan, Russia, China, India, Latin America countries. At the end of the 20th century — the beginning of the 21st century modernization grew into globalization.

Anthropogenic civilization basic values kept their priority here. This status was supported by the preceding success of anthropological development, scientific achievements, technological progress, economic growth leading to fast increase of public wealth and quality of life improvement. But we should not forget that the price of this success turned out to be very high. This price was appearance and aggravation of global crises (ecological, anthropological and others), threatening to demolish the basis of civilization and human sociality.

To find a way out of crises, development strategies should be changed. And as far as these strategies are defined by the basic cultural values in accordance with which a specific type of civilization development is revealed, here the transformation of these values is meant.

Here we face manifestation of general pattern of complex organizing themselves systems development. Both in biological and social systems their qualitative changes, new types formation are connected with the transformation of the programs providing systems homeostasis, its self-reproduction.

In biological evolution these programs are represented by the genetic code (DNA), in social evolution — by the system of world outlook cultural phenomena reflecting its basic values and life meanings.

World outlook phenomena are genes of social organisms. Qualitative change of the society is not possible without their transformation. As for the efficiency and

viability of the new type of social organisms that appear during this process, it will be clear in their further economic development, means of adaptation to natural environment and interaction with other social organisms (similar to natural selection in biology).

We can state that anthropogenic civilization cultural-genetic code does not contain limitations that could block ecological, anthropological and other global crises aggravation. That is why it is necessary to search for opportunities to change this code. It is important to answer the question: whether this opportunities arise inside the modern social changes processes.

New values cannot grow immediately and from nowhere. They should have preconditions in the modern conditions of social life. These preconditions appear to be the points of new values growth.

Today it is already obvious that we should change consumer attitude to nature, which was the key-note of the preceding anthropogenic development. In traditional cultures nature was never perceived as activity resources reservoir and was never interpreted as a field for active transformation and control. Traditional cultures were characterized by the attitude to nature as to the living organism, into which a human is 'incorporated'.

For a long time in the culture of 'project Modern' such organismic view on nature has been evaluated as vestiges of archaic myths and mystics. But today the situation is different. After science has formed an understanding of biosphere as an entire global ecosystem, it was found out that planet's environment really represents a complex organism, into which a human is 'incorporated'. At this point Western anthropological culture scientific achievements start to resonate with the traditionalistic images of culture as living organism.

From here new aspects of the dialogue of cultures arise. In the societies that joined anthropogenic development through globalization processes and that have kept traditional mentalities fragments, there eliminates contradiction between modern scientific and some traditionalistic understandings of culture and human's relation to it.

New scientific understanding of the environment as the global ecosystem demand technological activity strategies changes. These changes are already taking place. On the modern stage practice of technological processes ecological and ethical expertise is rooted. Innovational deployment self-value ideal is updated by the ideas of ethical control of activity transforming objects of nature in the growing scale.

And again this control correlates with the traditional cultures that developed ideas of moral self-perfection as the condition of a person's adaptation to nature.

Of course the points of new values growth are at the moment only potential possibilities of cardinal changes in civilizational development. The realization of these possibilities depends on many factors, including the actions of those social forces that are interested in keeping modern globalization strategies and will block alternative strategies. But if anthropogenic culture values transformation scenario gains force, self value of technological innovations and economic benefit will not be their constituent factor. The character of innovations and economic success will depend on ethic regulatives and new humanistic values, oriented on biosphere saving and human's spiritual development. Many philosophers speak about future civilization as

anthropocentric in contrast to the present day economic and technocentric. Thereafter social and humanitarian knowledge will gain power in the system of scientific knowledge.

Today one of the key tasks of social-humanitarian analyses is the research of modern changes in cultures, formation of new values growing points in them as the condition of way out of global crises. On this basis new aspects of the dialogue of culture arise, its aim at new world outlook meanings elaboration that can be perceived by different cultures and ensure stable development of the uniting humanity while keeping its cultural diversity.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you, Viacheslav Semyonovich. The floor is given to HRH Michael, prince of Kent.

HRH MICHAEL OF KENT¹: — Dear Ladies and Gentlemen! It was a great honour for me to take part in the Likhachov Conference in St Petersburg, the city where my grandmother Grand Duchess Elena Vladimirovna was born. Academician Likhachov was generally acknowledged as a spiritual leader of the Russian people, and I was delighted to have met Dmitry Sergeevich on the 17th of July in 1996 in the Russian Museum of Ethnography, on the occasion of the burial of Tsar Nicholas II.

The First World War was a time of changing loyalties, and events that took place then clearly had a profound impact on the people. Throughout the whole century there were to be struggles everywhere. So, what has changed during the last 20 years? First of all, the speed and the intensity of the changes themselves. Significantly, new means of transportation and communication have been developed.

Paradoxically, one of the more unexpected after-effects of globalization is a growing mistrust between different layers of society. There is a serious danger of instability and conflict.

Culture can contribute greatly to the solution of these globalization problems. We should build relationships based on mutual understanding, taking into account cultural variations. To illustrate this idea, there are organizations working to strengthen social ties: they study a given solution from different points and make conclusions that influence people through education and culture.

And let us also consider the part played here by science. Recently researches have been conducted into the behaviour of young people. The aim was to establish how the young people of Germany, France and the USA interact culturally, and by what means trust in dealing with people who live in China, India and South Africa can be developed. The results of the research show the cultural correlation between

¹ Member of the British Royal family, one of the descendants of the Russian Emperor. He maintains extensive charity work. Russia occupies a special place in his charity work: in June, 2004, Michael of Kent Charity Foundation was set up to finance projects which benefit culture, historical and cultural heritage, health, education. Patron of the Institute of Certified Financial Managers (Great Britain), the Russian-British Chamber of Commerce, London School of Business and Finance. Doctor *honoris causa* of Plekhanov Russian University of Economics.

HRH Michael of Kent has presented a number of documentaries, including: 'Nicholas and Alexandra', 'A Royal Family', 'Victoria and Albert' and some others.

Knight Commander of the Royal Victorian Order, Knight Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order, Knight of Justice of the Venerable Order of Saint John of Jerusalem (Great Britain), he is decorated with the Order of Friendship (Russia). Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

those who took part, leading to an increase in the level of trust between people and even between the governments of different countries. The whole concept of trust is important but complicated; it includes respect, devotion to the common cause and development in relations. This research has shown that cultural interrelations increase levels of trust.

This concept highlights positive aspects. In a world where people are separated by great distances, it is now possible to communicate virtually, to visit different places, such as museums. Cultural tourism is being developed intensively. Last year 5–6 million people visited the British Museum, 2 million visited the Hermitage. Every year there is a 20 % increase in the number of museum visitors. This is globalization. It captures economic, social and cultural spheres. So the more homogeneous the human race will be, the more powerful the progress will be. Thank you for the opportunity to share some thoughts with you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you! Dear colleagues, today there will take place a ceremony of awarding an honorary doctorate diploma of UHSS to His Royal Highness Prince Michael of Kent. Now I give the floor to Gennadiy Mikhailovich Gatilov.

G. M. GATILOV¹: — Dear participants of the Conference! I am glad to get another opportunity to visit the UHSS, to take part in the Likhachov Conference, and to exchange views on the dialogue of cultures and civilizations. Likhachov Conference has occupied a worth-while place in the scientific and cultural life. In fact it has become an international ground that contributes to the dialogue development. For the diplomats of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs participation in this forum has an important meaning: we analyze reasoning and opinions that are voiced by the respected world scientists and professionals in their spheres. Subsequently in our practical work we try to take into consideration attitudes that were voiced here. Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs pays attention to the cultural issues in globalization.

It seems that globalization should benefit closer cultural relations. But unfortunately the latest world events prove the contrary. In 2011, at the time of the Conference, the events in the Middle East and North Africa only began to move, and probably no one at that time could have assumed how it would finish. Unfortunately, what we have now shows that it moves in a dangerous direction, firstly from the point of cultural, confessional, and religious separation. It is not a good time for Arab people who should have been united by their culture and common values.

The crisis is developing not in the political sphere (power struggle of different political groupings) but rather in the cultural and religious. We should do everything not to let further intercultural and religious clashes, to say nothing of going of this process beyond the regional scope. At present this is one of the vital tasks of the Russian diplomacy in this part of the world.

It is vital for us, because Russia is a multiconfessional state; representatives of different peoples have been living

in our country next to each other for centuries. We are aware of where the unfavourable development of the situation can lead to in other regions of the world that are situated near us. Everything that goes on there in the spheres of culture and religion is reflected in our life. That is why the priorities of Russian diplomacy are the reinforcing of the moral principles in the world policy and taking into account peculiarities of different cultures.

Of course everything should be based on the international law. The main document, in which these principles are enshrined, is the Charter of the United Nations. In the UNO there are discussions about globalization, culture, interdependence, and tendencies correlation within these processes.

One of the first decrees signed by V. V. Putin after his taking office is devoted to implementation of the foreign policy of our country. It accents the problem of the friendly relation development between states based on the equal rights, sovereignty and territorial integrity respect. It also includes cultural relation development and the necessity to listen to and understand each other better. As for international grounds oriented on the solution of this problem, I have already mentioned the United Nations Organization; these problems are also discussed on the forum ‘The Alliance of Civilizations’. Discussions of different questions within these forums help to understand the way of scientific thought in the area of the dialogue of cultures in globalization.

I would like to point out one thing. For us the position and the role of Russia’s non-governmental organizations of non-governmental sector which becomes more and more active within the United Nations Organization plays an important part. The thoughts opined by the non-governmental organizations show us the tendencies revealing things important for the civil society, also in our country.

I consider Likhachov Conference to be one of the forums that help us in our practical work. I would like to mention once again that this Conference is very useful for diplomats. I expect that discussions of this forum will contribute to the development of ideas and will be used later by diplomats in their practical work in order to promote intercultural and inter-civilizational dialogue.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you, Gennadiy Mikhailovich. It is my pleasure to give floor to Mr. Felix Unger.

F. UNGER²: — Dear ladies and gentlemen! First of all I would like to thank academician Zapesotsky for organizing this meeting. Today it is not common to discuss the questions of culture. What is culture? It is at the same time difficult and easy to answer. Culture is everything we do, how we act and interact with things and events, how we treat ourselves and our neighbours. It sounds easy, but the notion is much more difficult. Some scientists and philosophers think that communication intensifies. We live in a global village, where information is transmitted immediately from one point on our planet to another.

¹ Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. Author of a number of publications, including: ‘Peacekeeping UN Blue Berets’ (‘Golubye kaski’ OON na sluzhbe mira), ‘Results of “The Great Gathering” at the UN General Assembly’ (Itogi ‘bol’shogo sljota’ na Genassambleje OON), ‘Results of the UN Doha Forum’ (Itogi foruma OON v Dohe) and some others. G. M. Gatilov is decorated with the Order of Friendship.

² President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg, Austria) — partner of the Russian Academy of Sciences in the European Union, Professor, Dr. Sc. Former Head of University Hospital for Cardiac Surgery at the Paracelsus Medical University. Author of a number of scholarly papers on cardiovascular surgery. Prof. Unger was the first European surgeon to transplant artificial heart in 1986 clinically. He is honorary member of the Russian Academy of Arts.

I speak from the academic world, which influences culture greatly by means of the research and innovation. We should define what science is, to find differences between the West world and the East world. It is necessary to enlarge the definition of sciences and include people's relations, spirituality, philosophy and religion too. Today in a global village we cannot speak together without widening sciences, understanding the others. When we analyze those ideas, we will come closer to the basic definition of a person. Man is a combination of soul, spirit and body. In an enlarged understanding of sciences this will be the human essence in this world where he lives. Here we come closer to the ethic side of the definition of sciences and aesthetic part of our world. What we do has a huge aesthetic impact too.

In understanding culture we have to find the lost spirituality again. In the last century there was a search for new impulses for the human's life and humanity. We have not realized yet what the spirit is and that spirit is an important part of our life indeed. We are in constant search of freedom, but freedom ends with the responsibility. Today we live in a fantastic world; we have a unique opportunity to spread our ideas to the whole 'global village', which influences us and provides us with additional information immediately.

During the last century we had a worship of a golden calf named materialism. Our researches should be the search for the truth. In Medicine we think primarily about our body but have forgotten that soul and spirit show us the way to follow. Communication also provides unique opportunities but has risks. But culture needs those ingredients too; the comprehensive view shows us the way to follow. Information exchange gives additional opportunities for building a network in a common culture of men. We should reconsider spirituality, to control what we do.

We start creating a new culture — a culture of living together globally in tolerance. Such discussions given in this meeting enrich us, emphasizing important problems. I think we all have chances to reach freedom we need, building up a human culture.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you very much, Mr. Unger! Dear colleagues, many messages of greeting have been sent to International Likhachov Conference. Unfortunately, I cannot read all of them aloud, I will only mention some.

Here is a greeting from Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation Dmitry Medvedev, a greeting from Chairman of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation Sergey Naryshkin, a greeting from Chairman of the Council of Trustees of our University Mikhail Shmakov. Here are greetings from acting ministers including Minister of Education and Science Andrei Fursenko, Minister of Culture Alexander Avdeev, Minister for Health and Social Development Tatyana Golikova. We got a greeting from President of the Russian Academy of Sciences Yuri Osipov, who participated in the Conference in 2011, from High Representative of the 'Alliance of Civilizations' Jorge Sampaio, from Director-General of UNESCO Irina Bokova.

I will read out one of the greetings: 'To St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. To the participants and guests of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. Dear Friends, I am glad to greet you in St. Petersburg and congratulate on the opening of

the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. Your forum is a significant event in the social life of Russia and many foreign countries. Traditionally it gathers representatives of scientific and creative intelligentsia, competent experts. In the time of globalization the questions of spreading the dialogue of cultures, prevention of ethno-confessional conflicts have a special meaning and convincingly prove that the humanistic ideas of academician D. Likhachov, an outstanding Russian enlightener and public figure, are still urgent in our days. I am sure that offers and recommendations worked out during your meeting will be used in practice. I wish you success and all the best. Vladimir Putin.'

And now let me invite here Doctor honoris causa of our university Abdusalam Abdulkirimovich Guseynov.

A. A. GUSEYNOV¹: — Dear colleagues, the Likhachov Conference has been sequentially elaborating the topic 'dialogue of cultures in globalization'. At the same time the Likhachov Conference has become a cultural phenomenon in itself. In my opinion, one of the most characteristic peculiarities of the Likhachov Conference is an organic unity of two important aspects. Being a scientific event, it has become a cultural phenomenon at the same time. During this conference the problem of the dialogue of cultures has been explored with good results, it has also become the form of such dialogue — a dialogue between the representatives of different fields of knowledge, different countries, and different approaches. I would say that in our case dialogue is the subject and means of research.

This year the dialogue of cultures problem is viewed from the point of national culture, national explicitness of cultures. At least three workshops names mention the national aspect of culture. I started thinking it over while preparing for the Conference. Alexander Sergeevich and I were planning the workshop 'National Unity and Cultural Diversity' in agreement with the principle that obliges to achieve such level of problem understanding that can bring to practically significant conclusions. Having plunged myself into this area, I have found it very difficult indeed.

Today during the plenary session it was already mentioned that culture is a complex, polysemantic notion. But in relation to the notion 'nation' this complexity and polysemanticism acquire such high level that the problem becomes dangerously explosive and we should treat the notion of 'national culture' with special care.

Among a great number of approaches and shades of understanding of nation two are mostly discussed. On one hand, nation is viewed as a historically built community in a row: tribe — peoples — nation; and is characterized by the general history, culture, language and psychological

¹ Director of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of the Chair of Ethics at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author of more than 400 publications, including books: *Social Nature of Morality* (Sotsialnaya priroda нравstvennosti), *The Golden Rule of Ethics* (Zolotoye pravilo нравstvennosti), *The Great Moralists* (Velikiye moralisty), *Language and Conscience* (Yazyk i sovest'), *Philosophy, Ethics, Politics* (Filosofiya, moral', politika), *The Ethics of Antiquity* (Antichnaya etika). Managing editor of the yearly *'Ethical Thought'* (Eticheskaya mysl), of *'Philosophical Journal'* (Filosofskij zhurnal) and *'Social Sciences'* journal (the English edition), member of the editorial boards of journals: *'Philosophical Sciences'* (Filosofskiy nauki), *'Issues of Philosophy'* (Voprosy filosofiyi). Vice-President of the Russian Philosophic Society. Laureate of Russia's State Award in the field of science and technology. Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

mentality. According to this concept, nation is seeking to take a political shape and forms into separate states, it is seeking sovereignty, and it is seeking to become an independent national state. This urge towards independence is a core, an internal aim of each nation. This understanding can be called ontological. On the other hand, nation on the basis of national development experience generalization (firstly European) is understood as a political construct, consequence and expression, state community fixation.

In accordance with the first approach, nation in its historical development gains its development culmination in the state. Within the second approach — nation becomes nation as a state; national identity turns out to be a synonym of state identity. It is difficult for me to give preference to one of these approaches; I perfectly admit that they can mutually complement each other. They register and exaggerate one of the aspects of nation's historical development. In the first case ethno-cultural aspect is absolutized, in the second — political. Nevertheless, nowadays both points exist as the alternatives which argue against each other and to some extent reject each other.

Here of course different research approaches are meant but not only. They go beyond the scope of pure academic interest. From these different concepts conclusions are also different. If, for example, we see nation as a political construct, proceeding from the concept of 'nation-state', it results in understanding of nationalism as the normal positive form of its social self-expression. In this case the notion 'nationalism' is relational and even coincides with the notion of 'patriotism'.

Thereafter state within this approach is always a mononational unity. Within the other — culturological approach — there is more critical and restrained attitude to nationalism. Within the scope of 'cultural nation' concept, state can be and as a rule is multinational, patriotism and nationalism differ from each other accordingly.

As opposed to patriotism, which is one of the vital civil virtues and a form of civilly responsible behaviour, nationalism often turns out to be a destructive force. This difference between nationalism and patriotism is one of the arguments for the concept of nation it proceeds from. No matter what specialists say, the real experience of social development shows that nationalism and patriotism are different things.

The second point I want to emphasize speaking about the differentiation of the two approaches touches upon person's national identity. From the first approach, where we view nation as a historically built ethnocultural phenomenon, it follows that the person cannot choose their nation, it is their destiny. Person cannot choose nation as he/she cannot choose native language, parents, epoch etc. National dimension is viewed as something that is typical for a person and makes up their way of being.

From the second understanding of nation as a nation-state it follows that person can choose their nation, changing, for example, nationality, or the state can change itself (together with the national identity), that has happened recently in the history of our country. This is a different approach. It is unnecessary to say that there are essential distinctions here. If, say, person does not choose nation, national identity is typical for him/her and makes up his/her inalienable characteristic, it means that it coincides with his/her personality core, human

dignity and consequently national feelings need to be treated sensitively and respectfully. In this case when we speak and use national qualifications in the social communication, value aspect rather than truth is important for us. In the forefront there should be desire not to insult a person. Besides, an insult is only something that a person him/herself finds insulting for him/her. If we see national identity as an option, then the address to people's national characteristics can be objectified. In any case, there are major undeveloped theoretical problems here, which refer directly to real experience of our life, to something that goes on in the streets today.

The main idea is to take into account possible consequences and deformations that will be conditioned by the use of this or that option when we develop these problems.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you, Abdusalam Abdulkerimovich. Your speech is very interesting. And now I want to invite here Doctor honoris causa of our University Gadis Abdullayevich Hadjiyev.

G. A. HAJIYEV¹: — Thank you. Dear colleagues, today in St. Petersburg there is also another forum, a kind of legal Davos. But I am here.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Because our forum is more important, Gadis Abdullayevich.

G. A. HAJIYEV: — There is another argument in favour, and it is more reliable, in my opinion. For us, lawyers, it is important to communicate with representatives of other humanitarian sciences. Sometimes closure inside legal conceptual space prevents from normal perception of the legal reality. It is true that here it is more interesting. Those who are at this forum think in a similar way. I wish all the participants of the Conference to step on this intellectual way.

Recently, I was thinking over the fact that while discussing the legal norm of Constitution we fill it with different meanings. Some judges say: 'It should be so'. Others prove the contrary. I was thinking about the significance of a legally sacred text of the Constitution. (No doubt, that it is sacred.) The text is a symbol, a sign. And this sign raises an image in the person's conciseness. And these images are different. Trying to define ontological structure of the law that influences us I made more attempts and came to a conclusion that the text does not influence us.

¹ Judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, LL. D., Professor, Lawyer Emeritus of the Russian Federation. Author of more than 200 scholarly publications, including monographs and learning aids: *Protection of Basic Economic Rights and Freedoms of Entrepreneurs Abroad and in the Russian Federation: Practices of Comparative Analysis* (Zashchita osnovnyh ekonomicheskikh prav i svobod predprinimatelej za rubezhom i v Rossijskoj Federatsiji: Opyt sravnitel'nogo analiza); *Entrepreneur — Taxpayer — the State: Legal Views of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation* (Predprinimatel' — nalogoplatelshchik — gosudarstvo: pravovyye pozitsiji Konstitutsionnogo Suda Rossijskoj Federatsiji); *Constitutional Principles of Market Economy* (Konsitutsionnyje printsypy rynochnoj ekonomiki); *Constitutional Economics* (Konstitutsionnaja ekonomika) and others. Chair of editorial board of the 'Comparative Constitutional Review' journal, member of editorial boards of five scholarly journals. Professor Hajiyev is a member of Council for Codification and Improvement of the Civil Law under the President of the Russian Federation. He is the recipient of Certificate of Honour from the President of the Russian Federation. Doctor honoris causa of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

So what influences our consciousness providing the creation of opposite images? I will not speak about ontological structures of the legal reality, because it is a complex ontological issue. But, no doubts, there is something that in the Roman law and Roman culture was called 'mores': 'O tempora! O mores!' Mores does not only mean customs. The translation is simplified. It means traditions, but this is also not accurate, because mores contains important legal potential. These are legal norms when social idea has important legal potential.

I will give you an example. In the Constitution, apart from reception (simple borrowing of Western legal norms that are seen and recognized), there are mores — qualification of our ties with the past. Ties with the past have multilayer structure, but not only positive. In the mores there is something with a minus and something with a plus.

Granovsky mentioned Mikhail Bakunin, famous Russian anarchist, for whom 'everyone is an object, not subject'. This attitude to a person not as a subject with dignity, but as a simple object whom you can order about and use as a means. Karl Marx gave Bakunin a correct characteristic: '...with his outer antiaristocratism he in fact was an aristocrat of spirit', because he considered himself chosen, and offered to create a party of people subjected to the principle developed by Jesuits: 'Be obedient as a corpse, discipline and nothing more'. Surprisingly these principles were reborn in the 20th century.

The thing that we call today *Realpolitik* is the same as escobarism, when the end justifies the means, when one can do anything to achieve the goal. When the political space contacts with the legal space, it should not work in accordance with the principle 'the end justifies the means'. Political space should be pierced with the ethic ideas. There is an independent field — constitutional ethics. Following *Realpolitik* both constitutional and legal, we should not forget that constitutional legal ethics is the core of politics and law.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you very much! Dear colleagues, it is not for the first time when academician A. Akayev has taken part in our Conference. An outstanding personality, bright politician, public figure and scientist.

A. A. AKAYEV¹: — Dear colleagues, dear friends! My article is called 'Eurasian unity — historical tendency'.

One of the global tendencies of the modern epoch is regional integration. The brightest example of the regional integration today is European Union. These countries were at war with each other (we can remember Hundred

Years War, Thirty Years War, Napoleonic wars, two World Wars, started by the Western Europe), but following the time influence, historical necessity, they have united into European Union, organized national bodies and today move on successfully. If it were not for European Union, all the peripheral European countries — Iceland, Ireland, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and Greece — would have been bankrupts. But thanks to the European Union today they have survived and have chances to revive their economics.

At the same time crisis has also shown that European Union has reached its critical size. I am sure that the accepting of large countries into EU is out of question; and we should apprehend this distinctly, especially politicians of post-Soviet areas. Now, at the beginning of the 21st century, we see that the west of Eurasian continent was structured almost optimally — European Union, NATO, ensuring Euro-Atlantic security, OSCE and others.

What do we see in the east of the Eurasian continent? Amorphism. Only in 1990s, after the Soviet Union collapse, there started to form and successfully moves forward today the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. Following the call of the times, countries, which still keep after-war opposing views such as China, Japan and South Korea (the most economically powerful Asian countries), make attempts to combine their efforts. And I am sure, this will be crowned with success.

Now let us turn to the central part of Eurasian continent. Today there are discussions about Eurasian Union forming. We must thank Vladimir Putin, the most authoritative politician of post-Soviet states, who suggested an idea to form the Eurasian Union last year. I consider this initiative to be very timely. Russia is a great country. After Soviet Union collapsed there were many predictions. The liberal politicians' guru Zbigniew Brzezinski mentioned 'black hole' on the post-Soviet area, so he hoped, that like a black hole no one can see in the starry sky, Russia would vanish and would not be seen on the political map of the world. But Russia, to our pride and joy, revived as a great democratic country, as an attractive force of the Eurasian continent. That is why I think that there are good reasons for successful realisations of the project mentioned above — the creation of the Eurasian Union.

Russia is a great country. According to the Charter of the United Nations Organization, Russia as the main winner of the World War II is in the top five of the great countries that define the development of humanity and are obliged to take care of the human civilization. Today the world moves towards a polycentric organization. I think that it is extremely important for Russia to form Eurasian Union and to be a leader, to be in the centre of this new geopolitical union. This is the only way for Russia to strengthen its status of the great country and to be one of the political power centres of the new world.

The question arises whether this is possible. In my speeches, presentations and articles, I have published recently in the magazines 'The World of Changes', 'Globalization and Safety', in the newspaper 'Izvestiya', I prove that the scientific justification of this project had been done by the great son of Russia, great historian and great Russia's patriot Lev Nikolayevich Gumilev. This year Russia and all Turkic world will celebrate the centenary of his birth. Gumilev being a great Eurasian justified

¹ President of the Kirgiz Republic (1990–2005), President of the Academy of Sciences of the Kirgiz Republic (1988–1990). Since 2005 Mr Akayev has worked as a Chief Researcher at the Institute for Mathematical Investigations of Complex Systems at Lomonosov Moscow State University, a foreign member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Academy of Sciences of the Kirgiz Republic, Dr. Sc. (Engineering), Professor. Author of more than 160 scholarly papers and study guides on applied mathematics, mathematical economy, optic computers and information technologies. Professor Akayev's political and philosophical views are stated in his works *A Hard Way to Democracy: A Memorable Decade* (Trudnaja doroga k demokratiji: pamjatnoje desjatiletije), *The History that Got Through My Heart* (Istorija, proshedshaja cherez moju serdtse), *Thinking About the Future Optimistically* (Dumaja o budushchem s optimizmom), *For the Good of the People* (Na blago naroda), *Kirgiz Statehood and the Kirgiz Epic of Manas* (Kirgizskaja gosudarstvennost' i narodnyj epos 'Manas') and others. Full member of New York Academy of Sciences. Mr Akayev is decorated with the Order of Badge of Honour and Pushkin Medal.

geopolitical, historical, and cultural necessities of Eurasian peoples union around Russia. I listened to his lectures in Leningrad. He predicted the possibility of the Soviet Union dissolution 10-15 years before it, and then suffered the dissolution of the USSR greatly. His last call was: 'Unite not to disappear'. Unless the former Soviet Union countries unite into a stable Eurasian Union — equal in power to the European Union, they will disappear. Once the Soviet Union was a superpower equal to the United States of America that is why there is a possibility to restore Eurasian union, which should be competitive in the new polycentric world of 21st century.

I want to use this platform to ask you to make a contribution, to promote the ideas of great Gumilev. Today here are the pick of Russian intelligentsia and representatives of former Soviet republics. In all Gumilev's works there is this thought about the necessity of the Eurasian peoples' unity around Russia. Russia has kept its attractive power, especially in culture. Dmitry Likhachov (I had the luck to work with him in the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union) said: 'Culture is the main force that unites peoples'. Today it is necessary to use this force to form Eurasian Union, to promote Dmitry Likhachov and Lev Gumilev's ideas. By the way, many of Gumilev's works were published thanks to Dmitry Likhachov's support, for example 'Ancient Turkic peoples' — the best Turkic peoples' history; his main book — 'Ethnogeny and biosphere of the Earth'. I think that this year should become a decisive, important link in the Eurasian Union formation.

To sum it up, I would like to thank Likhachov Conference organizers who unite people on the cultural and humanistic basis. The humanistic mission undertaken by Russia gives hope that we will be able to form Eurasian Union successfully. Once again I call to contribute to the Eurasian Union formation.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you, Askar Akayevich! We studied together in the Institute of Mechanics and Optics and listened to Gumilev's lectures.

Now I give floor to the regular participant of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference Mr. Pyotr Dutkiewicz.

P. DUTKIEWICZ¹: — Dear colleagues, dear Alexander Sergeevich, it is a great honour for me to be invited to this conference. In my speech about democracy, modernization and dialogue of civilizations, I would like to discuss four points (the text of the presentation is published in the Conference materials).

Firstly, globalization includes worlds' democratization. In my opinion, democracy is an integral part of globalization. Everyone has a good attitude towards democracy — politicians, scientists, and people. Democracy has become a model. We measure other categories with the help of democracy. If the person is a democrat — he is a good

¹ Director of the Centre for Governance and Public Management at Carleton University (Ottawa, Canada), Ph. D., Professor. Author of books: *New Europe. The Impact of the First Decade, Volume 1: Trends and Prospects*, *Theory and Practice of the Civil Society in Russia*, *Basics of Local Governance*, *NATO Looks East*, *Ukraine: Social and Economic Transformation*, *The Worst is Over?*, *Democracy Without Liberalism*, *Unemployment Insurance in Canada*, numerous chapters in books and articles in professional journals. Professor Dutkiewicz is on the board of All-Russian Human Rights Foundation, a member of the 'Valdai' Discussion Club.

person, if the country is democratic — it is a good country. It is a paradox, but humanity even starts wars to bring democracy to other countries.

Why do not democratic institutions work? Why does democratic ideas discontent grow in global, inter-civilizational scale? The answer to that is easy: because there are different understandings of democracy. For some people democracy means liberal rights and duties, that is called human rights. For others (it seems to me for the most people) democracy has a different meaning — we would like to live in the worthy economical conditions and provide ourselves with peaceful old age. And this is problematic. So, there are to understandings of democracy: on one hand — liberal-democratic, on the other — concerning our life and our future.

Secondly, global system cannot support the second variant of democracy and that is why it is concentrated on the first. It turns out that the democracy is for the élite, not for the majority of population. A paradox: democracy that should be oriented for the majority works in fact for the minority. Sovereign democracy functions for the élite, which sometimes behaves irresponsibly. It happens everywhere in the world regardless the country or the political regime. So, what we call a democracy is élite's liberalization.

If it is so we can formulate the third point — when democracy turns into goods of the political market. Now the election campaign is on in the United States of America. These are the most expensive elections in the history of the country. Those who have means buy a part of democracy at the democratic political market. The question is: can democracy be an article of trade? You cannot touch it, buy or sell. Here global economics helps, it operates with the notion of fake goods: air, water, ecology, religion — these are fake goods which globalization that has deeply penetrated into commodity relations tries to turn into real goods. Fake goods can also be goods at the political market. Democracy turns out to be a kind of fake goods that functions at the market as other goods.

The fourth point — in connection with the said above social inequality is provoked, we start to think in Wall-street categories: 1 % versus 99 %. This variant of democracy gets not only theoretical, but also practical embodiment. It explains why we stopped believing in democracy and why liberal parties brought democracy to a logical end.

And finally, it should be said that if democracy is a part of the market, then it is for the benefit of the market to save it, because it goes well ontologically into this category. There is no market without democracy, because democracy only guarantees property rights for the market and other rights that should be observed in the state. Mr. Hadjiyev has clearly pronounced this idea.

Market that buys democracy will support democracy, because it cannot exist without it. But if globalization in inter-civilizational way will be developing in the same way it develops now, we stop believing democracy with all social and political consequences.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you, Mr. Dutkiewicz. And now I give floor to our guest from China professor Xinxin Chang.

X. CHANG¹: — In my speech I will touch upon the questions of Cultural Expansionism and Cultural Protectionism in today's globalized world. As is known to all, globalization not only touches on economy. Exchanges of values and clashes of cultures are multiplying as a result of the economic globalization. Such phenomenon is also exemplified by continuous widening scope, increasing frequency and enlarging extent of the cultural communication. In contemporary world, culture has become one of the most important forces to influence nation's and global affairs overall. The end of the Cold War, as one of the other reasons, led to the importance of economy, technology, society and culture involved in global politics. Peace and development has become part of the global trend, while peaceful competition and discussion for coexistent are the characteristics of global relations Post Cold War. Besides political and military power, economic and cultural powers are becoming the main objective and vehicle to realize nation's interests for countries.

American scholar Joseph Nye came up with the concept of hard power and soft power. Nye refers the culture and ideology as the soft power, in contrast with the hard power obtained from the use of military and/or economic coercion. He also suggests that traditional power structure has been reformed due to the emergence of political, economic, cultural and technological globalization. Culture, one of the soft power functions, cannot be replaced by any hard power. However, the impact of culture was weakened before the Cold War ended, since the hard power, represented by political and military power, dominated in the global affairs. In the post-Cold War era, the trend of globalization and increasing interdependence among nations became universal. Then, a nation's security cannot be guaranteed only by hard power; the importance of soft power was fairly reflected, if not amplified. As a consequence, each nation has stressed the importance of culture in the struggle for power, to protect or enhance a nation's power by utilizing cultural interaction. The cultural expansion vs. anti-cultural expansion and penetration vs. anti-penetration in culture are one of the most critical characteristics in global political struggle in post-Cold War era. Such characteristic is embodied in cultural expansionism and protectionism.

Cultural expansionism is reflected in the situation where Western countries take advantage of their predominant positions to constrain or influence global affairs by means of cultural expansion. The United States is a typical example of countries that use cultural expansion as one of its foreign strategies. After the Cold War ended, the United States has become the only superpower in the world and paid more attention to cultural expansion as a strategy to achieve its mission that cannot be accomplished by political, economic and military power. Given its super-power status in the world, the United States is trying to use its cultural

values to influence or determine the global trend. Mass media in most countries and regions around the world is dominated or monopolized by U.S. and other western news agencies, even though U.S. population only makes up 5% of the world population. The volume of news released by western media is as 100 times as the one released by other countries in total. Cultural products of the U.S., including Hollywood movie, entertainment shows and broadcasting have already dominated the media around the world. By using mass media and e-media, the United States makes its culture widespread.

Other than western countries (the U.S. as the representative), part of third world countries also present a complex of cultural expansion as a foreign strategy. No matter how the cultural expansionism takes form, it has negative impact on global peace.

Besides the cultural expansionism, cultural protectionism is another form in global struggle for power. Cultural protectionism is reflected in the situation where some developing countries defend their own cultures and resist foreign cultures as one of the foreign strategies. In the post-Cold War era, western countries with power politics and hegemonism exerted more pressure on developing countries, creating more fierce conflicts between oriental and western value systems. In many third world countries and regions, modernization led by Pro-West leaders was frustrated and the conventional values are lost. Identity crisis and legitimacy crisis are more and more obvious. Those developing countries oppose and fight back western countries in terms of values, beliefs and life styles. Nearly all types of nationalism advocate cultural protectionism, using culture to fight with pressure and challenge given by the western countries. Positive cultural protectionism does not rule out all the cultural expansion form other countries. They both inherit their cultural heritage and absorb the essence of other cultures. In contrast, passive cultural protectionism rules out all the cultural expansion from other countries, without any reason. However, such attitude will bring adverse effect to global peace so that it requires close attention from global society.

With globalization, we should promote peace, cooperation, and harmony in global economy, politics and culture, against cultural expansionism and extreme cultural protectionism in any form and promote a peaceful development of the world and co-prosperity of diversified cultures.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you. Dear colleagues, it is the first time when outstanding European scholar Jerzy Jozef Wiatr is taking part in the Conference.

J. J. WIATR²: — Ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues, I am grateful for the invitation to take part in this important meeting. I wish you an interesting and productive discussion.

Let me say a few words about the importance of culture and education for better understanding of peoples, nations; for building bridges between nations, peoples, and states. Many years ago when I was a primary school student I learnt by heart a poem by Adam Mickiewicz, an outstanding Polish

¹ Director, Dept. of Principles of Scientific Socialism, the Institute for Social Development of Party School (Central Committee of the Communist Party of China). Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Academic editor of 'Scientific Socialism' journal. Author of books: *Peace in the Post-Cold War Era, On Two Ways of Historical Development, Up-To-Date Issues of Modern World Socialism, China Viewed from Harvard* and scholarly articles: 'The Theory of Marxism', 'Intensification of the Process of Reforms as a Result of Rethinking Them', 'Asymmetrical Development of Mutual Economic Dependence and Peaceful Relations Between Countries', 'Historical Experience of the Development of Socialism', 'To Study Socialism Basing on Capitalism', 'Lenin's Idea of Peaceful Co-Existence', 'Regime Stagnation of the Soviet Union and Rapid Changes', and some others.

² Rector of the European School of Law and Administration in Warsaw and *Professor Emeritus* of the University of Warsaw, deputy to the Polish Parliament (Sejm) (1991–2001), Minister of National Education of Poland (1996–1997), Dr. Sc. (Sociology). Author of scholarly papers on sociology of politics, including the monographs *Sociology of Politics* (Socjologia polityki). Member of the Democratic Left-Wing Alliance. Professor Wiatr is decorated with the Order of Rebirth of Poland (Order of Polonia Restituta) of the 2nd degree.

poet; the poem was called 'To the Russian Friends' and devoted to Alexander Pushkin. This great piece was written soon after the Decembrist Revolt and the execution of its leaders. The poem urges our nations to fight together for mutual goals, mutual values, and mutual understanding. It is important for all the countries and nations but it is especially important for our nations united by the tragic history.

Some years ago I was responsible for education sphere in Polish administration. We used some opportunities, appeared due to cooperation in education sphere, in order to define the ways of development. The government of Poland and the government of the German Federal Republic under the aegis of UNESCO made a decision to rewrite school textbooks in history. Recently we celebrated the 14th anniversary of this initiative. The initiative was supported by two nations separated by the tragic history of World War II. Gradually, step by step, the stereotypes were reconsidered.

There was one more initiative to make a working group including Polish and Russian representatives. This group did the same in terms of teaching history. The main attention was paid to the relationships between our nations. What is more important for understanding is that tragic things should not be forgotten, they are supposed to be reconsidered in a certain context. We did a lot in this respect. Last year the Russian-Polish working group dealt with a complicated issue, and created a memorandum which was about one thousand pages long, and comprised many interesting ideas for better understanding Russian-Polish relationships and mutual understanding. We have a lot in common. Politics, though not always, but mainly helped to build relationships in culture. Such initiatives as the Likhachov Conference are important not only for cultural sphere but also for establishing friendship and mutual understanding between nations.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you, Professor Wiatr. I would like to give the floor of Likhachev Conference to Valery Leonidovich Makarov, an outstanding Russian scholar.

V. L. MAKAROV¹: — Dear colleagues, nowadays exact and human sciences are approaching one another. One of the main questions is: how to measure what is happening in the world? We learnt to measure material world because there are various instruments for it. In particular, economics has got indexes, diagrams, table, etc. Numbers and measuring are common for economics. But human sciences are only introducing such methods.

¹ Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute (the Russian Academy of Sciences), Head of the Economics Department of the State Academic University for the Humanities, Director-Organizer of the Higher School for the State Administration at Lomonosov Moscow State University, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor. Author of over 300 scholarly publications, including: *Mathematic Theory of Economic Dynamics and Balance* (Matematicheskaja teorija ekonomicheskoj dinamiki i ravnovesija), *Intangible Assets and the Intellectual Property Value Assessment* (Otsenka stoimosti nematerial'nykh aktivov i intellektualnoj sobstvennosti), *Russian Science and High Tech at the Turn of the Third Millennium* (Nauka i vysokije tekhnologii Rossiji na rubezhe tretjego tysyacheletija), *Russia in the Globalizing World. Modernization of the Russian Economy* (Rossija v globalizujuschemsya mire. Modernizatsija Rossijskoj ekonomiki). Editor-in-chief of 'Economics and Mathematical Methods' (Economika i matematicheskie metody) journal. Member of the editorial boards and panels of the journals: 'Economics of Planning', 'Social Sciences', 'Cybernetics and the System Analysis' (Kibernetika i sistemnyj analiz), 'Economy of Modern Russia' (Economika sovremennoj Rossiji), 'Science of Science' (Naukovedenije), 'Optimization' (Optimizatsija) and others. Laureate of the USSR Council of Ministers Award and others.

For example, language variety can be measured. Such notion as 'linguistic diversity index' was introduced. If we take two random species from a population, multiply theoretical frequency of their speaking different languages by the distance between the languages, we would get linguistic diversity index. We need to learn how to measure the distance between languages, etc. 'Diversity' in this context is not only used in its humanitarian sense because we know how to measure it.

The topic of the discussion is cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue. Cultures, to some extent, are very similar to languages, so in this field cultural diversity might be measured. But before that we have to learn how to measure the distance between two cultures.

What is culture? Various definitions are possible because culture is identified by many factors. The Italians and the Chinese are considered to be far from each other: the Italians are fully open in their family affairs but the Chinese windows never face the street. According to another characteristic, they are very close being famous worldwide for their mafia gangs. Thus, the distance between cultures is a more complicated issue that the distance between languages.

What happened to Europe? Multiculturalism collapsed. For me this statement seems to be strange — multiculturalism could not collapse because no one measured it. The idea of cultural polarization in Europe collapsed. And multiculturalism, in its genuine understanding, did collapse. It is a slow process which is in progress now and it is important to measure it right.

Being a representative of the exact sciences I feel awkward in expressing my ideas in the language of human sciences, as opposed to Askar Akyevich who is a 'fluent speaker' of both exact and human sciences. But I can say that cultural diversity establishes social stability, increases tolerance and reduces conflicts. That is why civilization has to face cultural diversity in its development.

Being a mathematician, I can identify the limits of such development. There is a notion of optimality. When there are a few cultures it is bad and it is also bad if there are too many. Optimum lies in between. This problem may be solved if we learn how to measure. Everything in the world might be measured no matter what abstract notion we are speaking about, sooner or later people would learn to measure and to set such goals at optimal multicultural level.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you. The floor is given to Maksim Viktorovich Dulinov.

M. V. DULINOV²: — On behalf of the Ministry of Education and Science let me greet the forum. Andrei Aleksandrovich Fursenko wishes all the participants successful work and scientific research.

In terms of the stated topic of the 12th Conference, I would like to say that the role of education in terms of globalization is very important, especially its mission to bring up civil and national identity. But at the same time identity is not to be based on the cultural difference but on the integrity. No doubt, it is important to know how to

² Vice Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation (November 2010 — June 2012), Candidate of Science (Economics). Author of a number of publications, including: *Regulation of Law Making Activities of Federal Bodies of Executive Power* (Reglamentatsiya zakonoproektnoy deyatelnosti federalnykh organov vlasti), *Results and Effects of Implementations of the National Education Programme 'Our New School'* (Rezultaty i efekty realizatsii natsionalnoy obrazovatelnoy initsiativy 'Nasha novaya shkola) and others.

measure. Integrity points would allow us to lose cultural inheritance, national and ethnic cultural identity in terms of globalization. Cultural inheritance will not be lost if the respect to it is being brought up. The bridges between nations and cultures may be constructed on the modern foundation which is not based on the opposition but on the cultural integrity. In this sense the role of education, science in the modern world full of integration of different education systems is highly important. The questions being discussed here today are important for Russian education system which sees its new level of development nowadays.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — The floor is given to professor Maksimov.

A. S. MAKSIMOV¹: — Dear Aleksandr Sergeevich, dear participants of the Likhachev Conference, let me fulfil an honourable mission and greet you on behalf of Georgy Sergeevich Poltavchenko, the governor of Saint-Petersburg. It is wonderful that it is the twelfth time you gathered together on the Neva shores. Historically, Saint-Petersburg was constructed as a city of science, education and culture. It was Saint-Petersburg where Emperor Peter I founded the origin of Russian science, education and culture in 1724.

After listening to other participants, I realized that they set very high standards with their speeches. I would like to thank the guests who came to Saint-Petersburg to take part in such important international forum. I also would like to thank Aleksandr Sergeevich and the organizing committee for making this international forum possible for many years.

Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov said, 'from educational humanization to the humanization of the society'. In my opinion, there is the deepest sense behind these words which would help us give the common ground to our positions and make cultural dialogue which is the goal of today's meeting. I also would like to attract your attention to the role of St. Petersburg — the cultural capital of the Russian Federation which celebrates its 309th anniversary this year. From the day of its foundation our city was multinational. The knowledge and the culture of European and Asian civilizations interlaced here. Remember the names of the architects of St. Petersburg; they were Montferrand, Falconet, Rastrelli and many others. European culture was reflected in architectural complexes which are the pride of Saint-Petersburg. Remember the names of scholars and culture creators highly respected by Saint-Petersburg citizens. We recently celebrated the anniversary of our outstanding scholar Mikhail Lomonosov who was buried in St. Alexander Nevsky Monastery. His role in Russian science establishment was widely discussed. Large scientific, educational, cultural forums are held in Saint-Petersburg. That is way I would like to address the administration of the forum with the following initiative. We suggest the next forum be devoted to the role of St. Petersburg in cultural dialogue establishment. I believe this topic would touch many people and show new ways of integration and mutual enrichment. Good luck!

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Dear colleagues, today the Likhachov Conference traditionally greets outstanding

¹ Chairman of the Committee on Science and Higher School of the Administration of St. Petersburg, Candidate of Science (Engineering). Author of a number of publications, including: *Training of Personnel for Scientific and Production Facilities of St. Petersburg* (Podgotovka kadrov dlya nauchno-proizvodstvennogo kompleksa Sankt-Peterburga).

French scholar, great researcher of Russian immigration culture René Guerra.

R. GUERRA²: — Dear ladies and gentlemen, today I would like to speak about Russian contribution to the French illustrated book of 1920s–1970s. Russian post-revolution immigration was a unique event in terms of its volume and cultural importance. The phenomenon of Russian immigration culture formed within the period between the two world wars, has no analogues in history, moreover, in the latest decades this topic attracted first Russian researchers and, consequently, foreign researchers.

The revolution separated the greatest artists from Russia — practically all of them found themselves abroad and did not sever the connection with Russian tradition but it was the question of honour and dignity to break the connection with the 'new' Russian life — *Soviet* life.

French capital was always attractive for Russian masters of culture but at the beginning of the 20th century Russian activists visited Paris more often. They were striving for Paris since their young ages, loved it a priori as a Mecca of arts, so when they appeared to be at the Seine costs they considered it as a dream which came true. Many artists had also come to French capital before revolution naturally merging into artistic plankton of pre-war Paris. V. Serov, K. Korovin, M. Voloshin, E. Kruglikov, S. Yastrebtsov (Serge Ferat), L. Survage, E. Oettingen, N. Tarkhov, A. Chervachidze, N. Roerich, U. Annenkov, A. Ekster, J. Pougny, M. Chagall, B. Baranoff-Rossiné, O. Zankine, A. Arkhipenko, M. Vasilieva, S. Charchoune, L. Bakst, K. Somov, A. Benois, O. Braz, B. Grigoriev, D. Streletsky, S. Solomko, R. Tyrtoff (Erté), A. Zinoviev, O. Sakharova lived there. Many of them visited the studios of F. Vallotone and M. Denis, J. P. Laurens and L. O. Meersson, studied in different academies of H. Matisse, F. Cormon and R. Julian, Grande Chaumière, La Palette and Maria Vasilieva, exhibited in saloons like the Salon of Independent Artists (Société des Artistes Indépendants), the Autumn Salon (Société du Salon d'Automne), the Salon des Tuileries and the Salon of the Champs de Mars.

By a twist of the fate in 1924 Paris de facto became the capital of Russian art and literature immigration. All the main Russian artists, representatives of different schools and styles settled there; they were miriskusniks (members of the artistic movement 'Mir Iskusstva' — *World of Art*), neoclassical painters, symbolists, impressionists, expressionists, cubists, Dadaists, abstractionist... Artists in Paris have got fewer difficulties than writers and poets deprived of their mother tongue. Visual art and music are both above-national and do not need any translation; they prefer to stay beyond any ideological barriers. Masters of visual art from Russia forged business and informal relationships much easier (surely,

² Head of Russian Language and Literature Chair at the State University of Nice (France), Dr. Sc. (Philology) of Paris University. Collector, curator and researcher of the cultural heritage of the post-October Russian émigré community. Author of more than 250 academic and popular works on the culture (literature and art) of post-October Russian émigré community, including seven books published in Russia: *Pity for the Russian People* (Zhal' Russkiy narod), *Russian émigré artists in France in the 1920s–1970s* (Russkiye khudozhniki-emigranty vo Frantsii: 1920–1970), *They Carried Russia With Them* (Oni unesli s soboj Rossiju), *The Younger Generation of Russian Émigré Writers* (Mladshye pokoleniye pisateley russkogo zarubezhya), *B. K. Zaitsev, the Last Classic of Russian Literature* (B. K. Zajcev — poslednij klassik russkoj literatury), *Seven Days in March. Talks on Emigration with A. Vaksberg* (Sem' dnei v marte. Besedy ob emigracii s A. Vaksbergom), *When We Come Back to Russia* (Kogda my v Rossiju vernemsja...). René Guerra is Honorary member of the Russian Academy of Arts, Laureate of Tsarskoye Selo Artistic Award and Delvig Literary Award. Decorated with the Order of Friendship.

putting some effort themselves), they also came through a difficult process of adaptation to the new life much easier. Despite common troubles and due to their talent they were not only able to join artistic life of the West but also to introduce new vectors in painting.

They had lost their motherland and they were striving to conquer a new country using all the achievement of European culture. They did not lose their identity, kept the unique Russian way of thinking, the language, morality; they got recognition in the country which is considered to be the icon of faithfulness to its cultural traditions and they became the stars of the Paris artistic sky. But neither Europe, nor France could substitute their Motherland. But at the same time European and western way of life turned out to be precious for Russian talented élite for their cultural experience. If cultural dialogue between Russian writes and French literature world cannot be called successful, artists, to the contrary, managed to capture the French spirit. Their talent helped them to 'destroy the barrier' and in the end became an integral part of western artistic world within the rather difficult period of European life between the two world wars. From the very beginning the bridges were thrown very well and party because many had already visited Paris for several times before 1917. And here it is obvious to state several questions: what kind of relationships did Russian artists-immigrants have with their French colleagues, how difficult was it to adopt European artistic values, how did they manage to contribute so much to the French culture? There is an answer to all these questions: the art of the first immigration wave was not isolated, more it influenced greatly all the around fields, in addition it was open to the French influence which enriched its identity.

Artistic world of Paris cannot be imagined without Russian artists who achieved there a lot in particular in book design and illustration. To begin with, all the artists of the first generation of famous 'Mir Iskusstva' (World of Art) appeared to move from Saint-Petersburg to Paris. They were Alexandre Benois, Leo Bakst (Leon Bakst in French), N. Rerikh, K. Somoff, K. Korovin, I. Bilibin, M. Dobuzhisky, D. Strelletsky, S. Sudeikin, A. Chervachidze, N. Kalmakoff, S. Tchelonine, N. Goncharova. Then they were followed by the younger wave of soul mates. They were B. Grogoriev, A. Yakovlev, V. Shukhaev, Z. Serebryakova, S. Sorine, U. Annenkov, D. Bouchene... Russian artists quickly joined theatre and musical Paris due to per-war Russian Diaghilev Seasons together with their professional qualities like skills, experience, taste, selectiveness, understanding epoch style and unique skilfulness in theatre art, for example, the ability to make drawings of unique scenery and costume design. The majority of them were not only theatre painters but they also were great book designers: about 150 Russian artists were doing graphics for books in Paris. They designed and illustrated more than one thousands of books, both French and Russian. The most famous French publishing houses of small and large circulations immediately started to cooperate with them. Russian artists in France in the first part of the 20th century proved that book design is art and should be considered as a minor and less creative one, and may also compete with other more respected kinds of visual art. In addition I would like to recite Nikolai Roerich: 'The art of the book is the most sophisticated and the most ancient among all the decoration art'.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you, professor Guerra. I would like to invite to this stage Dr. Bonnenberg, a participant of the Likhachov Conference from Germany.

H. BONNENBERG¹: — Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here and to speak about my views. Alexander Sergeevich has been establishing a global net between people and young generation, students. I travel a lot and I often participate in meetings where there are two parties. One is the older generation, experts in science and art, another is the younger generation, and I consider Alexander Sergeevich to act as a kind of a bridge. Young people want to understand what will happen.

The main thesis of my speech is that EUROPE is MORE than the EU. The epoch of national states is coming to an end and regional aspects crossing the borders of the nations become more important, e.g. the Baltic region. In the future there will be only five meaningful centres in the world — ASEAN and related countries; CHINA and related countries; EUROPE and related countries; INDIA and related countries; TWO AMERICAS. The states are mentioned in order, not in terms of their importance.

EUROPE is an idea of civilization and occupies the territory from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. The EUROPE we are going to speak about includes Belarus, Moldavia, Russia, Ukraine and European Union and Balkan countries and others. Russia, Belarus, Moldavia and Ukraine will form a kind of Eastern European Union.

In Western Europe technology is being developed. Russia is the state of raw materials and capitals. Both regions depend on each other and compete with the mentioned centers. Eastern and Western EUROPE have essential links of history, culture, and economy.

Today two future European models are being discussed. The first one comprises the European Union for the whole Europe including Russia. This model would not be able to survive because Russia would never sacrifice its sovereignty, as well as the EU (military policy of the European Union is close to one of the US). The other model suggests partnership of the European Union with Eastern European Countries. The second model will work only if EUROPE does not depend on the US and forgets about the idea of Russia prevailing the West Europeans.

A structure of public administration acceptable for the Eastern and the Western Europe has to be developed. Beside the economic development it is important now to find the identity of total EUROPE which is More than the EU. The common identification proves that both countries have to search it in their historic context, events, and people. The identification in Russian is connection with Peter I who is one of the most important fathers of EUROPE.

I would like to ask younger generation to continue looking for the identity, European 'personality' which will unite the Eastern and the Western Europe. What is our identification? Is it business, natural gas or technologies? We

¹ Dr. Bonnenberg studied Physics and Economics at the universities of Aachen and Berlin. He is an expert on issues of safe use of nuclear power plants. At the age of 33 he set up his own company which deals with developing facilities to protect the environment, including waste burning facilities. Heinrich Bonnenberg is a German public figure, member of the German Society for Foreign Policy, member of the board of trustees of the 'German-Russian Forum', expert on safe use of nuclear power plants. After 1990 he occupied executive positions in state enterprises of the FRG and was in charge of privatization of enterprises of the former GDR; he was head of 'Energiewerke Nord' company, which 'meets' the gas pipeline 'Nord Stream' from Russia on the territory of Germany.

need to find our common identification. The Enlightenment, Peter I, Karl Marx. One more variant suggests the Soviet flag. Come to Berlin to discuss the question of identification, the search of personality and yourself.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — The floor is given to Anatoly Andreyevich Gromyko.

A. A. GROMYKO¹: — I would like to thank you, Alexander Sergeyevich, and the University for inviting me to participate in the Likhachov Conference. The issue discussed here — international relations and their influence on cultural variety — will traverse in my speech at the section of the Conference, and now I would like to speak about the following. On the contemporary level of international relations development, the problems of globalization are multiplex. All the speakers highlighted this or that side of the problems connected with globalization of international relations. For example, we ought to respect and historical memory and intellectual achievements of previous generations. At the same time we must not estimate contemporary international relations only from the point of inevitable reforms and new political institutions creation. If it is old it is not necessarily bad. My opinion is a little different. Reforming something we do not have to strive for a complete change of the main principles which are the bases of international context. We have to be reasonable in combining the experience of past generations and contemporary complicated condition of the global context.

Now I am working on globalization problem. I see it as a process of multiplex events. Many things are changing in our life. But nobody knows in what direction.

In 20th century there were a lot of disasters: two world wars, revolutions, it was the century of contrasts, ideological wars, but the fascism was also defeated in the 20th century. When Soviet, American and English armies united in Germany, military engagements were still in progress, and the United Nations were created. The principles of the United Nations charter ought not to be forgotten by politicians who administrate the world, organize our life in terms of international relations. The Charter of the United Nations says that wars have to leave our lives otherwise either wars will become old-fashioned or people will. Today too little attention is paid to crucial global, especially natural problems. People would not be able to survive if the situation does not change.

We do not need a new world order; we need a new global legal regulation. International life is to be regulated by the norms of law, morality, ethics but not by the strange political claim (if you are not with us, you are against us; as Bush's junior administration did). Culture is very important to understand these problems. The cult of peace, not war

¹ Leading researcher at Institute for International Security Issues of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor. Author of over 30 books: *Africa in World Politics* (Afrika v mirovoj politike), *Masks and Sculpture of Tropical Africa* (Maski i skulptura Tropicheskoy Afriki), *The Kennedy Brothers* (Brat'ja Kennedy), *New Thinking in the Nuclear Age* (Novoje myshlenije v jadernyj vek), *Andrei Gromyko: The Flight of His Arrow* (Andrej Gromyko. Poljot jego strely) and some others. Mr Gromyko is also the author of more than 300 scholarly publications in journals. President of the movement 'For the Consolidation of the Democratic World Order and the UN Support'. Member of the Royal Academy of Sciences of Morocco, of Malagasy Academy of Sciences, Doctor *honoris causa* of University of Leipzig. Mr Gromyko is decorated with the Order of October Revolution, the Order of Friendship of Peoples. He is recipient of the USSR State Prize and V. V. Vorovsky Prize.

ought to be developed; politicians of the international arena have to get rid of military way of thinking.

Such conferences as the Likhachov Scientific Conference made me write a brochure which is called 'Challenges of the 21st century and the United Nations' where I analyzed the future of the humanity. Before that two of my books were published: *The Flight of His Arrow* about Andrei Andreyevich, my father, and *Metamorphoses of Our Times*. The Likhachov Conference helps us understand that we are people of the Earth with similar problems.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you. The floor is given to Zhan Terentievich Toshchenko.

Zh. T. TOSHCHENKO²: — Dear colleagues, in my speech I would like to mention the problems which are important, as I think, for all the Russians and the popularity of the former Soviet republics. I mean the destiny of the post-Soviet territory I do not think that I agree with Askar Akayev in terms of this question. It is an acute situation. In reality there 15 independent countries and the question is 'Will we live together or separately?'

Trying to solve this question we meet contradictory and sometimes mutually exclusive tendencies. The first tendency is connected with the official position the heads of countries administration. I mean different variant of such kind of understanding. For example, the Russia and Belarus Union despite many obstacles and doubts saw substantial changes and now citizen of both countries have got equal conditions in job application process in both countries. The second tendency is connected with Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan linked up with Kirgizia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. There is one more variant of cooperation which sees, with some restrictions, the necessity to cooperate closer in terms solving social, and especially economic problems. Such cooperation is supported by Ukraine and Uzbekistan who

² Dean of the Department of Sociology and Head of Chair of Theory and History of Social Studies of the Russian State University for the Humanities, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Chief Editor of 'Sociological Researches' Journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences ('Sotsiologicheskije Issledovaniya'). Author of more than 550 publications, including 18 books: *Social Infrastructure: Essence and Ways of Development* (Sotsialnaya infrastruktura: suschnost i puti razvitiya), *Social Planning in the USSR* (Sotsialnoye planirovaniye v SSSR), *Social Projecting* (Sotsialnoye proektirovaniye), *Paradoxical Man* (Paradoksalny chelovek), *Three Distinctive Faces of Power* (Tri osobennykh lika vlasti), *Ethnocracy: History and Modernity* (Sociological essays) (Etnokratiya: istoriya i sovremennost (sotsiologicheskije ocherki)), *Sociology of Labour: Attempt at New Understanding* (Sotsiologiya truda: opyt novogo prochteniya), *Theocracy: Phantom or Reality?* (Teokratiya: fantom ili realnost?), *Centaur-Problem* (Attempt of Philosophical and Sociological Analysis (Kentavr-problema (opyt filosofskogo i sotsiologicheskogo analiza)) and others, as well as the course books *Sociology* (Sotsiologiya), *Sociology of Labour* (Sotsiologiya truda), *Sociology of Management* (Sotsiologiya upravleniya), *Political Sociology* (Politicheskaya sotsiologiya). Editor and member of the team of authors of the thematic reference dictionary *Thesaurus of Sociology* (Tezaurus sotsiologii), of the bibliographical dictionary *Sociologists of Russia and of the CIS member countries* (Sotsiologi Rossii i stran SNG). He was the editor of 13 editions that were devoted to studying the issues of intelligentsia in modern Russia, among which are: 'Intelligentsia and Power' ('Intelligentsiya i vlast'), 'Intelligentsia in the World of Modern Communications' ('Intelligentsiya v mire sovremennykh kommunikatsiy'), 'Intelligentsia in the Ethnoco-fessional World' ('Intelligentsiya v etnokontsionalnom mire'), 'Old and New Intelligentsia: Common and Special Features' ('Staraya' i 'novaya' intelligentsiya: obschee i osobennoye') and others.

Head of the Academic Council of the Russian Academy of Science 'New Phenomena in the Public Consciousness and Social Practice'. Member of the Editorial Board of the Russian Academy of Science Journal 'Social Sciences'. Member of the Academic Expert Council under the Chairman of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation. Full member of the Academy of Social Sciences of the Republic of Belarus and the Republic of Kazakhstan. Laureate of M. M. Kovalevsky Award of the Russian Academy of Sciences, awarded with P. A. Sorokin medal.

stick to rather contradictory positions, though. And, finally, the Baltic countries and Georgia who did not support them; they do not reject the idea of creating something completely new on the basis of the post-Soviet territory.

In this situation it is important to value efforts directed at connection and at creation of a form of cooperation which would satisfy all the countries or the majority of them. It is especially important because we have to admit that CIS (the Commonwealth of Independent Countries) and its institutions do not work or do not work effective enough. Another suggestion is to create a Slavic Union or a Slavic Republic, and considered to be devitalized. There is one variant to get back to the USSR or something similar to it, but it is our past and we cannot bring our past to our present. So, it is important to estimate all possible changes based on the real interests, like Custom Union establishment or Common Economic Zone which is planned to be created and would help to realize our potential.

Estimating these efforts made on the highest political level, it is important to compare all of them with people's opinion towards these initiatives. What do people think about such unions? Being a sociologist I can say that sociological research done in the former Soviet countries show that about 70% of population regrets that the Soviet Union collapsed. But it does not mean that people want to get back the USSR. They prefer to have a kind of synthesis of new countries, their economic and cultural cooperation. I am sure that if these tendencies are not supported in public opinion we will not get the union our politicians want to. Only if public opinion in these countries has a fellow feeling to each other we will be able to answer the question why we have such attitude to immigrants, international exchanges, integrated education and what breaks rational ideas of alliance. To solve both big and current social problems we need to strengthen foundation of national mental communication. The dialogue of cultures we are speaking about now is a primary basis to form political, economic and social unifying ideas.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you. The floor is given to Georgy Borisovich Kleiner, an outstanding Russian economist.

G. B. KLEINER¹: — Alexander Sergeyevich, I would like to express my admiration of the atmosphere in this hall and in the University on the whole. It is full

¹ Vice Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute (the Russian Academy of Sciences), corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor. Head of Chair of Economics of the State Academic University for the Humanities, head of chairs of Institutional Economics of the State University of Management, head of chair of System Analysis in Economics of the Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation, professor of Economics Department of the Lomonosov Moscow State University, of Moscow School of Economics of Moscow State University, Research Advisor of the Institute for Innovative Management of Economics of the State University of Management and Department of Economics and Management of Dubna University. Author of more than 500 scientific publications, including the following books: *Strategy of Enterprise* (Strategiya predpriyatiya), *Microeconomics of Knowledge* (Mikroekonomika znaniy) (with co-authors), *Theory of a Firm and Practice of Russian Enterprises: condition, challenges, prospects* (Teoriya firmy i praktika rossiyskikh predpriyatii: sostoyaniya, problemy, perspektivy), *Evolution of Institutional Systems* (Evolutsiya institucionalnykh sistem), *Business Functions: theory, methods, applications* (Proizvodstvennyye funktsii: teoriya, metody, primeneniye), *Perspective Planning of Business in a Corporation (attempt of modeling)* (Perspektivnoye planirovaniye proizvodstva v obedinenii (oput modelirovaniya)) and others. Chief Editor of the 'Economic Science of Modern Russia' journal ('Ekonomiceskaya nauka sovremennoy Rossii'), Vice Chief editor of the 'Russian Journal of Management' ('Rossiyskiy zhurnal menedzhmenta'). He is awarded with the Order 'for Services to the Fatherland of the 2nd degree'. Laureate of V. S. Nemchinov Award of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

of intelligence, etiquette, future forecasting. I genuinely wanted to meet your appeal to discuss the ideas of other contributors more than one's own concerning the topic of the conference. Unfortunately, it is impossible to fulfil in terms of the main concept of my published report and in terms of the main concept of the contemporary intellectual 'agenda' which is *justice*. The notion which I am highly interested was mentioned only once in the name of the title of the prince of Kent — 'the Knight of Justice'. But in my opinion, nowadays justice is the resource of prime necessity in terms of contemporary social and economic reality and every person needs it, and every organization needs it, and the society on the whole.

My article for the Conference is called 'Economics. Culture. Justice.' In my opinion these three concepts are connected with each other and represent three key features modern society should be based on. Our economics is developing, as well as our culture but the question of justice is still very complicated.

Our contemporary world is characterized not only by the amplification but also by the disintegration of social and economic units including the connection between countries. Usually in order to strengthen the relations states are suggested to expand marketing cooperation. But in fact our contemporary world economic relationships are usually characterized by such terms as 'gas blackmailing', 'oil wars'... Close marketing relations do not guarantee close, friendly and fair relations between countries.

Cultural integration is considered to be the way to strengthen relations between countries, but in reality the situation around is also complicated. Speaking about university exchanges as a part of cultural space we have to admit that V. M. Polterovich, academician of the Central Economic and Mathematic Institute of the Russian Academy of Science was right saying that borrowing education systems and technologies from one country to another leads more to the dependence and stimulates negative aspects of the relationships.

I think that in such situation we ought to think about progress opportunities which may be called *export/import of justice*. I do not mean protests as a reaction to injustice but I mean justice transition. Obviously, countries vary depending on the level of justice. The task is to export case studies of fair decisions, local approaches, traditions and habits which strengthen justice and are based on the synthesis of these cases from more just countries to less just.

What is justice? Traditionally this concept is defined as *the understanding of the right*. But what do we mean by the 'right'? My understanding is that justice is *interdependence* (mutual concurrence) of decisions, actions and results. For example, if you worked more than your neighbour you are supposed to get more money than them according to the principle of justice. If there is no justice between work and salary then there is no connection between the notions. Interdependence also includes the connection between decisions it means that decisions are not made unexpectedly but they are based on the previous decisions and intentions changed in terms of the changing situation. Unfortunately, nowadays the way of taking macro-decisions resembles a geyser valley: a geyser appears and disappears unexpectedly here or there. The decision making process became full of surprising facts, or it is better to say artefacts, appeared due to the wish of any powerful unit. Justice is dependence of everything on everyone in time and space.

In my opinion there are several types of justice which social dialogue focuses on. For example, justice is widely discussed when it concerns relationships between groups of people, social justice when it concerns justice in terms of society. In fact, social levels or large social groups become the subject of justice. Sometimes we speak about justice and injustice between definite people especially it is connected with juridical decisions. It also seems to be important to introduce the concept of *system justice* which would become intermediate between global and local justice. Such system justice is to be formulated according to the present social and economic system in order to apply methods of system analysis. In these terms we would be able to define justice for the long and short living systems. For example, the Conference is being held within two days only and that is why we have our own understanding of justice based on the time distribution between the participants, everybody has to meet the stated time limits. There are also systems of other type, for example, large corporations or states where justice includes unlimited time and sometimes unlimited space. Such systems define justice completely different.

In conclusion I would like to share the idea of academician V. L. Makarov who said that all the studied objects are to be measured. I would like to appeal to all the participants, scholars whose majors include all the disciplines of social sciences to research the way justice and its level can be measured. In more general understanding it is necessary to put some effort to make the concept of justice as measurable as the other two included into the name of my article 'Economics. Culture. Justice'.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Dear colleagues, the floor is given to professor Vladimir Vasilievich Mironov.

V. V. MIRONOV¹: — At the conference a lot has been said about the importance of the dialogue we are engaged in here. But I would like to get back to the prime theme of the conference — the problem of globalization and the dialogue *per se*. Indeed, we often forget that some process or idea being objective, for instance globalization, does not mean its being positive. Still, statements of this kind are often imposed on the society; we are told that if the process is under way and there are conditioning factors it must be positive. Today, globalization is connected not only with the integration that involves many problems, but with processes of disintegration as well, particularly with those that destruct culture. That is what Vyacheslav Semyonovich Styopin spoke about today.

We discussed this issue at the Likhachov conference last year and I would like to retrospect that conversation and to see how cultures have been interacting in a short time span. Indeed, when we consider classical culture we can see that

its variants are set apart from one another. In general, the idea of a global culture sounds metaphorically, since any culture has been localized in space, semiotically (as it was brilliantly demonstrated by Yuri Lotman). Dmitry Likhachov used to say the same about dialogue of cultures. Every time the dialogue would start in culture, the situation would occur when two multitudes overlapped in various fields. Their overlapping could be full (something very unlikely), partial or little. Such an overlap is a condition for dialogue of cultures. However, things that do not match are no less important in culture. So the dialogue of cultures is about contact points in the overlapping area. Remember Alexander Pushkin's words, 'He'd brought back all the fruits of learning from German realms of mist and steam...'. The poet continues saying that his soul became 'Göttingen-like'.

That means that a man who had immersed himself in a different culture became German to a certain extent, Pushkin says. Thus, a special semiotic space developed in the dialogue. Lotman used the term of 'semiosphere' and defined it by analogy with biosphere. So, academician Likhachov was right arguing that one's immersion in the dialogue is a condition of one's level of culture. We cannot speak about our culture in superlatives, for example, without learning at least one different culture, for we have nothing to compare so far. We can talk about the great and rich Russian language as much as we desire but if we do not know other languages, our assertion is questionable.

In the early twentieth century, media and communication space began to develop, which changed the situation dramatically. It 'immersed' all cultures into a 'media bag' forcing them to work by its laws. The laws of contacts between cultures within the semiosphere used to be formed according to national, cultural and religious backgrounds, whereas the media space makes cultures communicate in accordance with the laws, imposed by communication itself. As a result, the communication stops being a tool and turns into a goal. That is why we can witness that a child, born in our culture, for example, may not know who Baba-Yaga is, but they do know who Mickey Mouse is, because the culture in this 'media bag' is permeated with network connections of shared cultures. Moreover, these network connections are imposed by the culture dominating technologically. Therefore, 'Americanization' is not a negative attitude toward the United States as a country, but toward the system, in which relationships and patterns are imposed, ranging from behaviour to clothes, as we undermine the foundations of our culture from the inside. Many researchers call it media-virus, and I in my works call it the transformation of culture, when a culture is modified by the donor's influence bringing new information genes in our culture (as Vyacheslav Semyonovich said). And this is happening rather fast.

As a dean, I can say that generations grow to differ more headily judging by our students. Not long ago the generation span was 15–20 years, whereas today graduate students fail to understand freshmen. In many ways, this is due to the emergence of new technology, new networking opportunities. By the way, it affects the problem of law and the view of democracy. There appears a layer that simulates democracy. Many researchers suggest that, for example, the network structure of the Internet makes it possible to build a seemingly democratic society that is easy to manipulate and which in fact is an intense totalitarian system.

¹ Head of the Philosophy Department at Lomonosov Moscow State University, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, honorary worker of higher professional education of the Russian Federation. Author of over 60 publications, including: *Patterns of Science in Modern Culture and Philosophy* (Obraztsy nauki v sovremennoj kul'ture i filosofii), *Philosophy and Metamorphoses of Culture* (Filosofija i metamorfozy kul'tury), *University Lectures on Metaphysics* (Universitetskije leksiji po metafizike), *Ontology and Theory of Knowledge* (Ontologija i teorija poznanija), *Philosophy* (Filosofija) and some others. Editor-in-Chief of journal *Moscow University Bulletin. Series 7. Philosophy* (Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Ser. 7. Filosofija), member of editorial boards of journals *Issues of Philosophy* (Voprosy filosofii), *Bulletin of Russian Philosophical Society* (Vestnik Rossijskogo filosofskogo obvestva), *Philosophic Sciences* (Filosofskie nauki). Prof. Mironov is Vice-President of the Russian Philosophical Society. He is decorated with Medal of the Order for Services to the Fatherland of the 2nd degree.

You can speak at length about culture, dialogue of cultures, but what Alexander Zapesotsky has been doing all these years allows us to carry on a dialogue, and it is very important because apart from the dialogue between cultures, there is an inner dialogue between individuals. When individuals who voice their opinions, who understand what they say, and who get inspiration from what they hear can get together, that is wonderful. Thank you very much, Alexander Sergeyevich!

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you. The floor is given to Henry Markovich Reznik.

H. M. REZNIK¹: — Dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen! When pondering on the problems we face that are in the centre of our discussion, I remembered a practically unknown and never published story by Vladimir Galaktionovich Korolenko. I came across it in the foreign press about 20 years ago. This story is called ‘Mr. Jackson’s opinion on the issue of Jews’. Korolenko wrote that he and a group of Russian intellectuals are going by an ocean liner to America. They meet Mr. Jackson, a typical American, make fun of him, and then accidentally discover that he is an anti-Semite. They ask him a question, ‘Mr. Jackson, what would you do with the Jews, should you become President?’ He replies, ‘Nothing.’ — ‘How come? You do not like them, do you?’ — ‘So what? You eat peas, but I cannot stand them.’ Korolenko concludes his story, ‘...suddenly we saw that wings started to grow on Mr. Jackson’s back.’ This is partly an answer to an important question, which Abdusalam Abdulkirimovich posed.

Indeed, we should wait neither for sterility, nor for heaven on earth, instead, we should be concerned so as not to turn our life into hell. We must look for an antidote, so that peoples should not sink in savagery, barbarism, so that tyranny which the Roman emperors could have envied should not reign.

The twentieth century arouses despair. Faith, Orthodoxy in Russia were not able to prevent the mayhem and the Bolshevik dictatorship. In Germany, the highest achievements in culture, philosophy, literature, music which served as an example to the world did not stop Nazis. A partial answer lies in this story. Of course, Mr. Jackson does not identify himself with the Jews either ethnically or culturally, but for him they belong to the same nation politically, at least those who live in the U.S., the Americans. That is what America called the ‘melting pot’ was able to do. These ideas of the founding fathers enshrined in the constitutions of the United States and in the bills of rights, of course, had grounds because emigrants in America were creative, freedom-loving,

initiative, enterprising, mobile people from Europe. All of them formed a united nation. In his private life a man can either believe or not believe in Christ, holy cow, Buddha, Allah, communism, and pray, sing the ‘Internationale’, etc. in his free time. But a man must act in accordance with law. Law is the only tool that allows to reach consensus for people of a single country united in a politically single nation that lives by the laws common for all. Things are not at all good in this area. The problem Belinsky wrote about in his letter to Gogol remains: we should follow at least the rules we have. In general, in Russia law has never been respected as an independent value. Alexander II made an attempt to regulate that sphere, and we all know what it resulted in.

Currently, the primary task is to form a political nation. I would like to call it Russian but am reluctant to do so because its meaning has acquired a strong ethnic colouring. We cannot say that we all are Russian. The same refers to the word ‘nationalism’ which should imply ‘healthy’ but a negative meaning has stuck to it tightly. Russian people should form a united political nation. We are all Russians regardless what denomination we belong to, what political views we support and what ethnicity we identify ourselves with. However, life should be lived according to laws common for all. That is what Mr. Jackson demonstrated to our intellectuals. They believed that one should be guided by likes and dislikes, empathy, norms of truth and justice. This is a higher moral level compared to the necessity to follow the law even if you do not like it.

Dmitry Medvedev said that this country demonstrates a total disregard for law. We can agree with him. Everybody in the country defies law and order, I would say this is because higher officials do not respect law either and rank and file people watch them do so all the time. One of the speakers mentioned principles of justice. In particular, some types of principles worth introducing were spoken about. It reminded me of Aristotle’s two types of justice: distributing and levelling ones. Distributing justice will never content people; everybody is inclined to consider that others get more. Levelling justice means everybody’s equality before law and justice, something we lack in our country. So, when those in power call for obeying the law I address myself to the higher bureaucratic officials, ‘Doctor, heal thee!’

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you. The floor is given to outstanding Russian writer Albert Anatolievich Likhhanov.

A. A. LIKHANOV²: — It seems to me that the word ‘globalism’ is often taken in vain. We are not aware of what

¹ President of the Bar of Moscow, Head of the Chair of the Legal Profession at the Academy University for Law under the Institute for State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences, LL. M., Lawyer Emeritus of the Russian Federation. Author of over 300 publications on issues of criminal law and procedure, criminology, including the monographs: *Inner Convictions When Evaluating Evidence* (Vnutrennije ubezhdenija pri otsenke dokazatel'stv), *When Liability Incurs* (Kogda nastupajet otvetstvennost'), *Constitutional Right For Defence* (Konstitucionnoje pravo na zashchitu), *Honour. Dignity. Business Reputation: Debates With the Participation of Mass Media* (Chest'. Dostoinstvo. Delovaja reputacija: spory s uchastijem SMI) and others. Member of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation. Vice-President of the International Union (Association) of Lawyers. Member of the Council for the Issues of Justice Improvement under the President of the Russian Federation. H. Reznik is decorated with F. N. Plevako Gold Medal, a badge of public recognition ‘The Symbol of Freedom’ of the Russian Union of journalists. Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

² Writer, Chairman of the Russian Children Foundation, Director of the Research Institute for Childhood of the Russian Children Foundation, President of the International Association of Children Funds, academician of the Russian Academy of Education. Author of literary, popular works and fiction, including: *Clean Stones* (Chistyje kamushki); *Deception* (Obman); *The Maze* (Labirint) (the trilogy of *Family Circumstances* (Semejnije obstojatel'stva)); *Good Intentions* (Blagije namerenija); *Golgotha* (Golgofa); *Innocent Secrets* (Nevinnyje tajny); *Capital Punishment* (Vysshaja mera); *Spring Flood* (Pavodok); *Nobody* (Nikto); *A Broken Doll* (Stomannaja kukla); *Russian Boys* (Russkije mal'chiki); *School for Men* (Muzhskaja shkola); *Juveniles* (Sletki); *Pre-Childhood* (Preddetstvo); *Compassionate Mood* (Sostradatel'noe naklonenie) and others.

A. A. Likhhanov is decorated with the Order of the Labour Red Banner, the Order of Badge of Honour, the Order for Services to the Fatherland of the 4th and the 3rd degree and orders and medals of Bulgaria, Georgia, the Ukraine, Byelorussia and Armenia. He is the recipient of Leninist Komsomol Prize, the Russian Federation Presidential Prize in education, and the Russian Federation Governmental Prize in culture. Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

we curse ourselves with. With global equality or, perhaps, global inequality? Today I would like to speak of a reverse side of globalization, of what it offers and what not.

At the moment the Russian Children's Fund has to deal with the following problem. According to statistics, in 2011 eighty thousand people (both young and old) fell ill with tuberculosis in Europe. In our country two hundred and seventy thousand children fall victims to this disease every year. Let me note that by the time the Soviet Union ceased to exist, tuberculosis had virtually been done away with.

So, what is tuberculosis? Historically, it is a disease of the poor. Children TB is a disease of poor kids and poor parents. Tuberculosis has various new types now that cannot be cured with antibiotics. It results in a very high death-rate of children under two, in an incurable development of the illness among teenagers with no way to save them. The whole world has been concerned with the problem. In our country drugs and treatment are provided more or less properly thanks to our doctors' efforts, the only exception being the fact that many regions, mostly remote ones lack physicians and specialists. The government spends money to fight the disease but not children's poverty.

After the acute stage of the disease, such children are nursed for about six months in specialized convalescent centres. Poor parents can afford sending their kids there with a bag of clothes only. Excuse my mentioning it, but after only two laundries their underwear goes to tatters. We tend to speak a lot about niceties. In Ivan Turgenev's novel *Fathers and Sons* the principal character says, 'Arkady, my friend, do not talk nicely.' We talk nicely a lot and do nicely very little.

I approached the authorities with the problem, we published an independent report of the Russian Children's Fund 'Children Tuberculosis' and distributed it. No response.

However, our so called civil society which is so much talked about might as well solve the problem independently and without any participation of the government, if, let's say, wealthy citizens agreed to donate two thousand rubles each to carry out the project. With this money, it would be possible to buy footwear and clothes for poor children, to purchase new books and sports equipment they do not have. Children's tuberculosis is only one example.

Besides, there are seven hundred fifty thousand orphans in our country. Every year parents abandon from one hundred thousand to one hundred and twenty thousand children; some parents are deprived of their parental rights legally. To take children into custody away from their parents is becoming a fashionable trend today and juvenile police is responsible for the practice.

We have a number of other problems too, for example, there are seven hundred thousand disabled children. In a word, we are losing childhood. In 1991 there were forty million children, today — only twenty six million. We have lost fourteen million kids. We can often hear the expression 'a demographic pit' today. One of the reasons for that is that women are reluctant to have children because they do not want to raise them in poverty.

Globalism is a myth. We must start taking care of the problems in our great country. The rest of the world could nor care less of our children's and hence our own future.

Thus, we need more social sobriety!

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you, Albert Anatolievich. The floor is given to Vitaliy Tovievich Tretyakov.

V. T. TRETYAKOV¹: — I would like to share my opinion on what I have just heard. I think it is more effective to have a sort of a discussion, debate, polemics rather than a series of presentations. Much of what has been said here evoked disputes. It refers to the word 'justice' which, by the way, is slowly disappearing from our phraseology and is replaced with the word 'mobster notions'. Political discussions do not touch the question how legal procedure is carried out in this country; according to law, to mobster notions or to justice. Authorities assert that it is guided by law. Opposition and those malcontent state that mobster notions prevail. And nobody mentions justice. Justice is not considered a universal notion. Well, what does the term 'mobster notion' mean? It is one of the few Russian words in the political vocabulary and it can be explained. 'Criminal world notions', 'mobster notions' are two first meanings that come to mind of an educated person. Not the notions used by the Athenian academy of sciences or notions of the Renaissance. To judge by 'notions' or to make decisions 'by notions' means to do so by mob notions, i.e. by the notions of closed criminal groups. Criminal world has well defined notions which are almost as strict as professional norms of legal procedures. That is why they are easy to apply.

Can anybody explain why only criminal meaning has been singled out of a great number of other meanings? Because they are the most effective and quickest, they were advocated by the creative class in the period of the initial accumulation of capital (the class that was the most active then). In the late 1980s and the early 1990s did artists become popular in Russia? Were any literary masterpieces created or extraordinary films made? Unfortunately, nothing of the kind happened and perhaps will never happen in future. Whereas money was gained fast. Later on, the capital was to be protected with the help of politics and jurisdiction. In fact, the principal method of protecting one's property with the absence of legal methods of retaining it is the seizure of the political power and the propaganda of the fact that you are the owner. It is not necessary to file suits against those who lay the claim on your property. Suffice is to make them believe that this is your property or, at least, that they are unable to take it away from you.

Thus, the rule of mobster notions was introduced extensively by the class which at that moment demonstrated its creativity by way of the mass media which was also in their hands. Now, after long years that people had been taught to live by 'mobster notions', they are required to obey the law. But it cannot happen overnight. At least some intellectual steps are necessary in order to shift from mobster notions to the law.

My second consideration is about what I have heard here. Our educated and cultured politicians (to be more

¹ Dean of the High School (Department) of Television of the Lomonosov Moscow State University, director general of the Publishing House "Russia", Chief Editor of the "Political Class" journal ("Politichesky klass").

Author and presenter of the programme 'What is to do?' ('Chto delat?') (TV 'Culture' ('Kultura') Channel). Author of a number of journalistic, scientific and educational works, including the following books: *Russian Politics and Politicians in Health and Disease: Glimpse of Events of Russian Life, 1990–2000* (Russkaya politika i politiki v norme i patologii: Vzgljad na sobytiya rossiyskoy zhizni 1990–2000), *Do We Need Putin After 2008?* (Nuzhen li nam Putin posle 2008 goda?), *How to Become a Famous Journalist: A Course of Lectures on Theory and Practice of Modern Journalism* (Kak stat znamenitym zhurnalistom: kurs lektsiy po teorii i praktike sovremennoy russkoy zhurnalistiki). Laureate of TEFI Award, of the 'Golden Pen' award of the Union of Journalists of Russia, he is decorated with the Golden Badge of Honour 'Public Acknowledgement', laureate of the award of the Russian Biographical Institute.

exact, those who consider themselves to be educated and cultured) and the lawyers who work together with them (partly in this case perhaps this is Henry Markovich in the sense that he was speaking of the universality of the law and justice ensuring the law), do not object to court decisions dictated by the rule of mobster notions, they do not denounce the institute of law which in this country is divided between exclusive corporate blocs. I would like to comment on what the writer Likhonov said about juvenile law. From now on, we will have a separate law for children, a separate law for the elderly, a separate one for straight people and a separate one for sexual minorities. This is exactly the transition from a universal law to the law dictated by the rule of 'mobster notions'.

My last point is that we must stick to a single ideology, a single concept. One cannot promote single rule in one case and declare juvenile, middle age or senior age law in the other. It is as clear as day that we are witnessing this tendency, the courts will progressively multiply. We, however, must make a choice between single norms or multiple norms. In the latter case, we will have the rule of 'mobster law'.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you. Whenever Tretyakov and Reznik meet they always argue. The floor is given to Yuri Petrovich Zinchenko.

Yu. P. ZINCHENKO¹: — Dear chairman! Dear participants of the 12th Likhachov conference! I am glad to have the opportunity to weave a psychological thread in the pattern of the polydialogue between leading philosophers, specialists in culture study, lawyers and other participants. We have been weaving this pattern together carefully guided by Alexander Zapesotsky to commemorate Dmitry Likhachov. His calm and penetrating voice leads us and shows us moral orienting points to interact constructively with representatives of other cultures in various spheres of human activity in this boisterous 21st century of globalization. His work 'The Reforms of Peter the Great and the Development of the Russian Culture. Reminiscences. Meditations. Works of Various Years. St. Petersburg, 2006, Vol. 2. Pp. 179–185 in which he ponders on the inner and I would say psychological meaning of these reforms and in which he highlights 'the development

¹ Dean of the Department of Psychology, Head of Chair of Methodology of Psychology of the Lomonosov Moscow State University, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Psychology), Professor, honorary fellow of higher professional education of the Russian Federation. Author of more than 150 scientific publications, including: *Clinical Psychology of Human Sexualism in the Context of Cultural Historical Approach* (Klinicheskaya psikhologiya seksualnosti cheloveka v kontekste kulturno-istoricheskogo podkhoda), *Methodological Aspects of Sexualism Studying* (Metodologicheskiye aspekty izyucheniya seksualnosti), *Philosophical and Psychological Aspects of Human Reproductive Function Studying* (Filosofsko-psikhologicheskiye aspekty izucheniya reproduktivnoy funktsii cheloveka), *Sexual 'cultural body'* (Seksualnoye 'kulturnoye telo'), *Clinical Psychology as a New University Specialty* (Klinicheskaya psikhologiya kak novaya universitetskaya spetsialnost) (with co-authors), *Pathopsychological Aspects of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder* (Patopsikhopaticheskiye aspekty posttravmaticheskogo stressovogo rasstroystva) (with co-authors), *Evolution of the 'Symptom' Concept* (Evolutsiya ponyatiya 'simptom') and others. Chief editor of the 'Bulletin of Moscow University' journal ('Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta') (series 'Psychology'), 'Russian Psychological Journal' ('Rossiyskiy psikhologicheskiy zhurnal'), 'National Psychological Journal' ('Natsionalny psikhologicheskiy zhurnal'). President of the Russian Psychological Society, Chairman of the Council on the Psychology of Education and Methods Association of the Russian Federation on Classical University Education, Vice-Chairman of the Expert Council of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Russian Federation on Pedagogy and Psychology. Laureate of Russia's State Award in the field of education.

of a personal component in all types of creative work and in very diverse forms', the change of 'sign system' in all spheres of society, the 'synthesis of sciences, crafts and arts', the gravitation toward 'scholastic attitude to the world', all of which remove the fear of the future and rapid changes of the present.

Even now at the beginning of the century we come across a statement that the principal science of the 21st century will be psychology as physics was the principal science of the 20th century. The point is not that scientists have already been busy building psychological weapons of the fifth generation, while information and communication overloads have led to the outburst in demand for psychological knowledge and practices both on personal and state levels; the point is that without psychological analysis it is hard to make a correct decision in case of technological disasters, terrorist threats and national stand-offs. That is why I deliberate on what my colleague Mironov said about globalization threats, and I will say a few words about globalization challenges and advantages which we can use for the development of the Russian society.

We are all well aware that psychology was a repressed science along with cybernetics and genetics, and for a long time psychology developed somewhat isolated from the world science under the umbrella of philosophy, medicine and biology.

Now thanks to globalization processes we are engaged in a constructive dialogue with our foreign western and eastern colleagues, and we face a very curious phenomenon. On the one hand, there are the richest methodology tools developed within psychodynamic science, behaviorism, cognitive science, humanist psychology in the form of tests, smart experimental models, technology of skill building and scenarios of supervision. On the other hand, we are faced with the 'poverty of methodology' and loss of the subject of psychology as a discipline.

It turns out that psyche is not only behaviour, conscious and unconscious, but 'something' else which can be found in the works of Russian psychologists and philosophers Lev Vygotsky, Alexei Leontiev, A. Lurie, V. Stepin and A. Smirnov. Psyche as the activity generating concepts and meanings is engaged in the dialogue with something meaningful in the 'zone of the nearest development.' They are fascinated by the euristics of building experimental procedures and modelling of the psychological phenomena in the framework of the post-non-classical science postulated by V. Stypin. Our western and eastern colleagues are busy actively translating the works by L. Vygotsky and A. Leontiev.

The problem is that Russian psychological school quickly and uncontrollably adopts and uses western tests and oriental psychological techniques developed within methods and spiritual theological concepts different from ours. In this connection, we see great prospects for the logic and meaning approach suggested by A. Smirnov in the comparative analysis of the ways and principles of psychological contents in Russian and foreign schools of psychology for the creative convergence and adaptation of knowledge about human mind.

The next important globalization challenge and advantage is the transition to a new stage of human civilization, to the 'society of knowledge', which means a bigger role of science in all spheres of human endeavour.

And this is not only the science of the world around us, but the science of man: neurobiology and cognitive science help information and communication technologies influence the mind, behaviour and decision making both on an individual and on a group level, they also involve more people in the process of knowledge acquisition which before had been elitist knowledge. Any Internet user is able to learn how to make gunpowder, and not only that: he or she can acquire such skills which help them start efficient communication or influence people by means of psychological techniques.

Psychology becomes a strategic resource of the society, so we need to transform the system of psychological education. In this country we have four hundred psychology departments with psychology department at Moscow university being a principal centre for setting new standards in education. We, in close contact with the European psychology community, attempted to set up a single educational standard on psychology. The ideas of V. Lektorsky, his deep understanding of the need to preserve cultural diversity in the single world, have been of great help. In fact, education is the most important tool in human socialization and self-identification which 'does not exist without group and cultural identification, without concepts of man, his abilities and constraints, freedom and dignity.' We thought it was important to preserve our own Russian traditions and education technologies in the new education standard. On the other hand, we needed to take into account and creatively adopt the achievements of the European education, but without replacement or exclusion of our own experiences and practices. Now our dialogue can be acknowledged in the European community.

Alexander Zapesotsky is quite right when he poses the question of the need 'to train students in professional areas aiming at forming moral and ethical principles and social attitudes of future specialists'.

An important step in this process was the adoption of the ethical code of the psychologist by the Fifth Congress of Russian psychologists with over two thousand participants from all the regions of the country. Academician A. Guseinov's advice helped us a lot to formulate the main points of the document.

Intensification of economic, political and social life in the country led to information stress and overloads of all social layers which resulted in greater demand for psychological help. The data of the Russian psychological society show that it is high time we should work out a legal status of the psychologist and psychological help, as well as legal norms of psychological groups as the civil society in Russia is being formed. (We hope that leading specialists will support us in this pursuit, such as T. Ya. Khabriyeva, etc.). The model of the state of law offered by T. Ya. Khabriyeva can be used as a basis of the development a legal status of the psychologist like the one of other specialists.

Finally, one of the most topical challenges of the dialogue of cultures in the globalization age is interaction of diverse discourses in the information and communication space. In it technological breakthroughs are presented as number one news by the world media. We share A. Zapesotsky's concern about it. He points out that 'mass media influence on people's minds and on the state of our culture in general compared with the influence of other social institutes is constantly growing' and mass media are becoming a key

factor forming the whole spiritual and moral space of the country which affects the picture of the world, the system of values, interests and standpoints, culture of speech and everyday behaviour. Today we witness the dominance of Anglo-Saxon paradigm in the international information space.

In one of his notebooks, Dmitry Likhachov recalls an old man, a character of Walter Scott's novel who was scraping ancient mossy gravestones to make engravings readable because oblivion is worse than death.

I suggest that we should critically estimate the challenges of the information globalization and found a union of educators which will actively use Russian polyethnic content to scrape 'moss and lichen' of pop-culture off our youth's minds with the help of modern information and communication technologies. This should be done in close contact with top managers of public television.

(Our classical literature which according to I. T. Kasavin's metaphorical definition 'can design the archetype of the dream, miracle and legends' can be a basis of information discourse opposing pop-culture.)

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you very much, Yuri Petrovich. Mr. Juan Antonio Marc is invited to speak from the podium of the Likhachov Conference.

J. A. MARC¹: — In my opinion, a great advantage of globalization is the fact that it brings in its DNA the victory of diversity. History has experienced too many attempts to destroy the rich diversity of the nations under the credo of a ruling empire. Napoleon, for instance, was eager to create a 'new Europe' unifying all cultures under a single paradigm. The Nazis wanted to build also a 'A new civilization' by imposing his pattern to the rest. Obviously in their case it was terrible, as uniformity was connected with racial considerations and the degree of pain, misery and destruction caused has been unique. Nazi's bet for a monolithic society has been without any doubt the most deplorable experience of mankind in the crazyness to reduce diversity, the climax of this insain ambition for destroying variety after perceiving it not as a factor of development but as a disruptive force. At present, the good news is that the opposite tendency to "harmonization", the respect for diversity, has become the common practice. We are living under the success of diversity in the era of the global world.

Today, the richness of communications has neutralized any capacity of control by a central power and human beings are individually, through the millions of spontaneous initiatives, consolidating diversity. On the other hand, thanks to the revolution in transports we can benefit of the rich cultural diversity existing in our planet in real time. We must never forget that diversity is inherent in Nature and it is rooted in its dynamics. How bad would it be if only one kind of butterflies, roses or tigers existed! Diversity of species is what makes nature so attractive and diversity in points of views, ideas, credos and ambitions is what

¹ Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation (2008–2011). Ambassador — Permanent Spanish Envoy to the UN and to international organizations in Geneva (2004–2008). Director General of the Ibero-American Cooperation Institute (the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation), Counsellor of Embassy of Spain to Mexico (2001–2004), Counsellor of Embassy of Spain to Great Britain (1996–2001). Permanent Representative of the European commission to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (1989–1993). Author of the book *Wait for Me in Havana* and of a number of publications on issues of modern international relations.

makes of human beings the most creative creatures in the universe. Obviously diversity brings about the problem of communication but perhaps during this century we will witness the invention of a mechanism to help us to overcome language barriers.

Globality should continue progressing in protecting diversity at its maximum. It is very important that the prevalent thinking insist in the idea of diversity as a factor of development not as factor of disruption. Europe and the United States are taking steps in this direction through protecting all sorts of groups and social interests.

On the other hand in this global world it is important that citizens of all nations feel themselves with good capacities for succeeding in life. The global world is opened for everybody and it is key that in the new generation everyone could be well prepared for having success. At this respect a deep transformation in the educational systems is really needed. Each and every citizen is going to be capital in the new world. We need to do of each and everyone of them our best resource and by being useful they will be able to make of globality a solid environment and at the same time they will be able to develop at the maximum their capacities. We need to remember that a hundred years ago successful large enterprises had factories employing ten thousand people in mechanical functions and only twenty managers in intellectual jobs. That was the case in the textile or the car industries of the beginning of XXth Century. Today the situation has changed dramatically; where there was one large factory there are now ten thousand small industries... employing only 20 people each... and all in intellectual jobs! This is the case of most of the high tech industries. Opportunities for the new generation are now immense ...on the condition we can provide them with the new education they need! Under the new effective educational pattern every student must now not only gain knowledge but also prepare he or she to have capacity to deliver something necessary for the other. They need to have a real value to trade. They can study whatever they want... but under the condition to be really good, really performant. If we manage to give a future to the new generations through the adequate professional capacity, our global world will experience for a long time three very positive developments; large growth, reduction of conflicts among groups, and consolidation of diversity at all levels.

Finally, I will refer to the other essential factor to keep globality developing, the political one. Our future depends enormously on the capacity to guarantee peace and stability in the world. Technology has opened the doors for the great development of mankind and has given to each human being the capacity for being an important driving force for growth and prosperity. New educational patterns can give the capacity to human beings to insert themselves successfully in society. But we need absolutely, nations to coexist in peace and cooperation. The political factor is fundamental.

Which is the best way to maintain political stability in our modern world? The best way in my opinion, is to have a system of collective power than could guarantee cooperation and protect diversity. The best way in our historical moment is to act under the United Nations' structure, but reforming and updating the Security Council. In my opinion, the right idea is to incorporate new large

countries as permanent members in it. The Council should retain its five present permanent members who have the right of veto but should incorporate five new permanent ones. This would enlarge the scope of representation of the Council and would reinforce its legitimacy to act as a global power in difficult situations.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we are on eve of the most promising moment of humanity if we are able to preserve the value of diversity as the most most positive and effective driving force for prosperity. It is good to see that as a concept diversity is nowadays worldwide accepted. At this respect we have to underline the role of United Nations by approving the initiative of the 'Alliance of Civilizations' which works successfully in reinforcing the mentality of diversity. Follow to that, the key pending issues are how to progress fast in the transformation of the educational systems to create the professional capacities the new generations need and how to be successful in the transformation of the United Nations to have the effective political Institution that with full legitimacy could guarantee progress in the diversity and cooperation through stability. Many are today working for these changes but the essential is that all citizens continue to support the values of freedom and diversity as the main pillars of the global society.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you. The floor is given to professor Vasil Prodanov.

V. PRODANOV¹: — I would like to say a few words about philosophical problems concerning the issue of determinism. Today in a few presentations we have heard about the tendency of improving and perfecting culture. First, we have to understand that culture is an autonomous phenomenon but in a world of neoliberal globalization culture is increasingly a market phenomenon. Second, culture is becoming a more important phenomenon today but as a market product. These are important trends. We must consider not just about globalization in general, but specifically also neoliberal globalization where economic factors play a crucial role. Economic determinism today is a more important tool than twenty years ago. We live in the world where culture, politics and democracy are intertwined.

For example, thirty years ago Daniel Bell considered culture, politics and economy as separate. At that time in the Western welfare state culture was a much more autonomous phenomenon. That situation no longer exists. Today we live in a world where economic determinism is more important than thirty years ago. Economic inequality has perhaps never been so noticeable throughout the history of the mankind as it is right now. The economic divergences between cultures, nations and ethnic groups are so significant that if we ignore the problem of economic determinism, we will not be able to understand the dialogue of cultures and civilizations.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY : — Thank you, Mr. Prodanov. Let me invite Andrei Vadimovich Smirnov to the microphone.

¹ Corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author of over 500 scholarly publications, including 21 monographs: *Person and Politics, Knowledge and Values, Bio-Social Values, Bioethics, Civil Society and Global Capitalism, Violence in Modern Age, The Future of Philosophy* and some others. Prof. Prodanov is a member of editorial boards of a number of journals.

A. V. SMIRNOV¹: — In my brief speech I would like to bring up an idea for discussion. In the last few decades one question has actively been discussed as to what culture is and how representatives of different cultures (typically, these are cultural minorities) can integrate into a society. There has been done a lot in this sphere, primarily by Western authors. I would like, however, to draw your attention to the fact that in Russia the situation has taken a different route, different from the one the countries of the West are confronted with.

For instance, traditionally Islamic peoples in Russia are not immigrants who have to integrate into the society which has been formed and has a history of many centuries, its logic of advancement. In other words, the reality is that we do not have some civilization site awaiting the arrival of new ethnic groups which are yet to adopt already existing rules and play by them. Islamic people who have their own cultural history have been living in this country from olden times, not less than those whose religion has traditionally been Christianity. The relation between these two big denominations and two big cultures sprouting from these religious traditions cannot be inclusive. Here we must adopt some other categories of thinking.

Culture has a logic of its own. Some researchers do not share this view, while others do. I side with the latter. Culture has its logic, and this logic is clearly transparent when you begin an in-depth study of the culture you do not belong to, that is when you come across the logic you do not have *a priori*. Consequently Christian and Islamic cultures have their own logic. These logics are different which does not mean that one is better than the other. They are just different and we must understand them. What should be done in order to enable people with different logic of cultures, often incompatible, to live in one civilization space which is Russia? How can we build a site to live together?

I would like to suggest the concept of 'civilization equality' for deliberation. We talk a lot about legal equality meaning the equality of subjects of law. There are, however, no two persons equal: differences and, hence, inequality is always there, though in court they are equal. In other words, legal equality is feasible as equalizing two things which otherwise are not equal.

Civilization equality, however, cannot be understood in this manner. We are faced with different civilizations and different cultures which cannot be equal in principle, since they have their own inherent logic. This means that their unlikeness cannot be reduced; we cannot equal them in the way we do with the subjects of law. How can we define equality in this case? This is a serious problem which today

should be brought up for discussion and which should be in the limelight.

As the bottom line, I would like to say this. When we consider these phenomena, we must take into account the experience of world science, and primarily Western science. We also have to take into consideration our own experience, namely that of the Russian philosophy. Nikolai Danilevsky in his book *Russia and Europe* postulated some ideas which can be viewed differently. Some of them are of historical interest only. But one of them — the category of 'all-human' which is used as opposition to 'commonly-human' makes a very interesting point for discussion.

We are used to speaking only about the all-too-human, i.e. about what is suggested by the given entity; about things in which we are equal, similar (as similar as the subjects of law). But when we speak about different cultures with different logic, there is no such a site which, stripped of all differences, would present a picture of similarity. In order to think in this direction, we need another category, other than 'commonly human.' And, maybe, the category of 'all-too-human' postulated and developed by Nikolai Danilevsky, is the one which might help us understand this problem.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you very much. The floor is given to Anatoly Vasilievich Dmitriyev.

A. V. DMITRIYEV²: — I totally disagree with many points presented here. My field is conflicts and their management. I am sure that every phenomenon is dual-sided. Each is aimed at agreement, cooperation of civilizations on the one hand, and stand-off and conflict, on the other. Incumbent phenomena in culture, on the one side, are linked to modernism, longing for Western culture and other forms of culture, and interlacing. On the other side, we are witnessing the comeback to traditional culture. Conflicts are naturally born within these two tendencies.

Any conflict is complex in its origin. It engages many subjects, there are many changes in the course of it: new subjects emerge with their ideologies, some parties are able to eschew the conflict. It is a complex problem.

I would like to dwell on just one aspect caused by migration and consequent conflicts. In recent years, migration has gained speed, it affects all spheres of life of people, including the people of the Russian Federation. In this connection, I have a dual opinion of the longing for Eurasian culture. From the political and economic points of view, acceptance of the oriental culture, with its worship of leaders, disregard for law and legal norms, can be justified. But Russia is adjacent to Europe. St. Petersburg is the window opened by Peter the Great onto Europe singularly for Westernizing Russia. Russian society at that time was faced with the need to modernize its regular army, to obtain European technologies and European education. The longing for European culture

¹ Deputy Director of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of the Oriental Department of Philosophical Faculty of the State Academic University for the Humanities, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author of more than 100 scholarly publications, including 8 monographs: *The Logic of Meaning. Theory and its Application to the Analysis of Classical Arab Philosophy and Culture* (Logika smysla. Teorija i jejo prilozhenije k analizu klasičeskoj arabskoj filosofiji i kul'tury); *Logical and Cognitive Foundations of Arab and Muslim Culture: Semiotics and Visual Art* (Logiko-smyslovye osnovanija arabomusul'manskoj kul'tury: semiotika i izobrazitel'noe iskusstvo); *La Filosofia a Mistica e la ricerca della Verità* (Mystical Philosophy and Search for the Truth) [in Italian]; *On the Approach to a Comparative Study of Cultures* (O podkhode k sravnitel'nomu izucheniju kul'tur) and some others. Executive Editor of the 'Philosophical Thought of the Islamic World' (Filosofskaja mysl' islamskogo mira) series (of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences). Deputy Editor-in-Chief of the 'Journal of Philosophy' (Filosofskij zhurnal).

² Chief Researcher of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author of more than 300 scientific publications, among which are the books: *General Sociology* (Obschaya sotsiologiya), *Social Conflict: General and Special* (Sotsialny konflikt: obščeye i osobennoye), *Conflicts of Migration* (Konflikt migratsii), *The South of Russia: Conflict Dimension* (Yug Rossii: konfliktnoye izmerenije), *Migrants in the New Environment: Attempts at Cooperation* (Migranty v novoy srede: praktiki vzaimodejstviya). Chief Editor of the 'Sociology of Education' journal (Sotsiologiya obrazovaniya). Laureate of M. M. Kovalevsky award of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

was in evidence. This tendency must keep on taking into consideration present political and economic problems, migration playing an extremely important part.

According to the data of Gallup (the survey was conducted in forty countries including Russia), about fifteen million people are ready to leave Russia mainly for Europe. The figure should be considered critically, because our data provide another number — seven million. The reasons to immigrate are desire to live in another social system (Sobchak can hardly make a good company to rally with); security reasons, economic well-being. In accordance with Gallup, about seven million people want to migrate to Russia, most of them from eastern republics of the former Soviet Union. Qualification level of those coming and going is quite different. We may face serious

problems if we try to solve the demographic problem by the import of labour force from the republics of Central Asia under the slogan of building European-Asian community and neglect working conditions of our own citizens. Thus, I would like to stress that the efforts of our government in economic and political spheres seem indisputable to me. At the same time I doubt the trend of Russia to build European-Asian community and cannot agree with its policy in culture.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you. Dear colleagues, the plenary meeting has come to an end. I thank all the participants and hope that tomorrow our work at workshop sessions will be no less fruitful, interesting and efficient. All the best to you!

Workshop 1

MULTICULTURALISM AS A STATE POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

'Radisson SAS' Hotel, Assembly Hall
May 18, 2012

Chairpersons:

- P. DUTKIEWICZ** Director of the Center for Governance and Public Management at Carleton University (Ottawa, Canada), Ph. D., Professor
- V. V. NAUMKIN** Director of the Institute for Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- F. UNGER** President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg, Austria), Professor, Dr. Sc.

Participants:

- F. A. ASADULLIN** Deputy Chair of the European Russian Spiritual Governance for Muslims, Leading researcher of the Institute for Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), Candidate of Science (Philology)
- O. N. ASTAFYEVA** Director of the Civil Society and Social Communications scientific and educational centre at the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration under the President of the Russian Federation, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, honorary higher education worker of the Russian Federation
- N. G. BAGDASARIAN** Professor of the Chair of Social and Cultural Studies of Moscow State Technical University named after N. E. Bauman, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), honorary fellow of higher professional education of the Russian Federation
- H. BONNENBERG** Dr. Sc. (Engineering), member of German Society for Foreign Policy
- A. A. GROMYKO** Leading researcher at Institute for International Security Issues of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- R. GUERRA** Head of Russian Language and Literature Chair at the State University of Nice (France), Dr. Sc. (Philology), collector, curator and researcher of the cultural heritage of Russian émigré community
- I. F. KEFELY** Head of the Chair of Cultural and Global Studies of the Baltic State Technical University 'Voenmeh' named after D. F. Ustinov, chief editor of journal 'Geopolitics and Security' (The Geopolitika i bezopasnost), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, honorary fellow of higher school of the Russian Federation
- A. V. KOSTINA** Head of the Chair of Philosophy, Cultural and Political Studies at Moscow University for the Humanities, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Associate Professor
- J. A. MARC** Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation (2008–2011)
- A. MARIN** public and military figure, Vice President of the Republic of Bulgaria (2002 — January 2012)
- A. A. MOISEYEV** Dean of the Department of International Law of the Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, LL. D., Professor
- A. N. NYSANBAYEV** academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, *Scientist and Engineer Emeritus* of the Kazakhstan Republic
- V. V. POPOV** Director of the Centre for Partnership of Civilizations of the Institute for International Research of Moscow State Institute for International Relations (University) under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Candidate of Science (History), Professor, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, honorary worker of the diplomatic service of the Russian Federation
- V. PRODANOV** corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor
- E. SCHNEIDER** Professor of Political Science at the University of Siegen (Germany), Ph. D.
- E. N. SHAPINSKAYA** Chief Researcher of the Russian Institute for Cultural Studies, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor

- P. P. TOLOCHKO** Director of the Institute for Archaeology of the National Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine, academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine, a foreign member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- J. J. WIATR** Rector of the European School of Law and Administration in Warsaw, Professor Emeritus of the University of Warsaw, Dr. Sc. (Sociology)
- G. XING** Deputy Director of the Centre for History and Geography of Border Regions of China (the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences), *LL. D.*, Professor
- A. S. ZAPESOTSKY** President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, *Scientist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation. Head of the Expert Council of Russian State Duma's Committee on Labour and Social Policy, Deputy Chairman of the Board of Rectors of St. Petersburg Universities, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, *Artist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Dear friends, allow me to welcome you on behalf of the Organizing Committee of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference and extend my best wishes. The work of the section is chaired by brilliant and very interesting fellows, such as Mr. Felix Unger — President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts with headquarters in Salzburg (it is an official partner of the Russian Academy of Sciences in the European Union), Piotr Dutkiewicz — head of the Centre for Governance and Public Management at Carleton University and Vitaly Naumkin — one of the most famous Russian scholars who deal with international affairs studies. Mr. Naumkin is the head of the largest scientific and research institute in Russia that is engaged in Oriental studies, and also Mr. Naumkin is a world leading expert on the issues of dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations.

V. V. NAUMKIN¹: — Thank you, Alexander Sergeevich. It is a great honour for us to participate in yet another Likhachov Conference, and particularly, to discuss the issues of multiculturalism that is growing more and more acute. I would like to remind you that today we will be concerned with multiculturalism not as a philosophical or ethical issue, but rather a challenge of the state politics of relations between states. Evidently, we come across the rising tide of crisis signs on the level of state politics. Our European guests are well aware of it. The ideas that multiculturalism is outdated and falling apart are articulated not only by a number of marginal politicians,

¹ Director of the Institute for Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor. He is author of more than 500 scholarly publications, including the books: *History of the East* (Istorija Vostoka), *The Soqatri* (Sokotrijtsy), *Islam and the Muslims: Culture and Politics* (Islam i musul'mane: kul'tura i politika), *Middle East in the World Politics and Culture* (Blizhnij Vostok v mirovoj politike i kul'ture), *The Red Wolves of Yemen* (Krasnye volki Jemena), *Island of the Phoenix* (Ostrov Feniksa), *Abu Hamid al-Ghazali: Revival of the Sciences of Faith* (Abu Hamid al'-Gazali: Voskresheniye nauk o vere), *Radical Islam in Central Asia: Between Pen and Rifle* and others. Prof. Naumkin is Editor-in-Chief of the 'East (ORIENS)' journal. Head of the Chair of Area Studies at the Faculty of World Politics (Lomonosov Moscow State University). Chair of the editorial panel of 'The Eastern Archive' (Vostochnyj arhiv) journal, member of editorial boards of a number of journals. Many of his books have been translated into foreign languages. Prof. Naumkin is decorated with the Order of Friendship, he is recipient of foreign and public awards, including the Order of Honour from Russia's Council of Muftis. Laureate of V. V. Posuvalyuk Prize for his outstanding contribution to international journalism.

as we could witness it 5–6 years ago, but by important and prominent public figures and even heads of states. Indeed, today it is more and more difficult to find examples of beneficial co-existence of people that belong to different cultures, civilizations, ethnic groups, confessions, of major population with migrants groups in any country.

This process is accompanied by xenophobic attitudes growth, on the one hand, and on the other hand by the tendency of isolation of immigrants communities. In this context we still highly respect Canadian attempts represented here by professor Piotr Dutkiewicz. Canada is one of the few countries where this paradigm is still successful.

As far as Russia is concerned, our problems have recently been viewed in a different way. We have always stated that for centuries different ethnic and confessional groups have been living together, as Russia is a multicultural country in its essence. But a new element has been added nowadays, a large number of migrants, mostly from southern regions of the CIS, that's why problems that European politicians are concerned with are becoming acute for us, too. To my mind, when discussing multiculturalism, one should touch upon the issue of importance of diversity and respect of diversity as a principle of international and state politics. I give the floor to Ambassador Veniamin Popov who has been dealing with practical issues of partnership of civilizations for many years and who has accumulated a large experience in the field of building relations between Russia and the Organization of Islamic Cooperation.

V. V. POPOV²: — Multiculturalism is a problem of co-existence and cooperation of different civilizations and religions. Humankind practice of this area has not yet been successful. For about 15 years we have been speaking about the necessity of dialogue of civilizations, cultures, religions, but we still remain on the level of academic discussions.

² Director of the Centre for Partnership of Civilizations of the Institute for International Research at Moscow State Institute for International Relations (University) under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Candidate of Science (History), Professor. Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. Honorary worker of the diplomatic service of the Russian Federation. Author of a number of scholarly publications, including the books: *Persian Gulf in Plans and Policies of the West* (Persidskiy zaliv v planakh i politike zapada) and *Close Tunisia* (Blizkiy Tunis) and others. Professor Popov is decorated with the Order of Friendship.

There are no practical results. Unfortunately, the Iranian project 'Dialogue of Civilizations' is stuck, too, though once it was actively supported by the United Nations. Then there was another project, a very good, indeed, 'The Alliance of Civilizations', a Spanish-Turkish initiative. But, regrettably, its result is not very impressive either. Why? The point is that now we are living through a very complicated transitional period: the system of international relations built after the second world war has grown outdated. Obviously, it needs reforming or a new one has to be created. But it is a very painful process, which also falls in the phase with the crisis of the Western civilization that has been dominating for a long time. Other civilizations are coming to the foreground — Chinese, Indian, Latin American. The Islamic civilization happened to be at the cutting edge of relations with the West, although professor Huntington, the author of the 'clash of civilization' concept, claimed that we are to anticipate the paradigm 'The West against the Rest'. He turned out to be right in part. This process has become more obvious: every day we can witness that international relations in the whole world are aggravating, especially between the West and the Islamic world. This is the basis for all future conflict situations, and for most of the present-day ones. For example, in one of the leading military academies in the USA students are taught that Islam is a hostile religion, that is why, sooner or later, Americans will have to bomb sacred cities of the Muslim world. Such a point of view does not encourage rapprochement of civilizations.

We constantly came across manifestations of terrorism. If in the Islamic world there are radicals who consider that all issues should be resolved by means of violence, the same radicals can be detected in the Western world, and their number is growing. Some time ago they were marginal forces, but now they are going to the mainstream, which is certified by the recent success of neo-Nazi party 'Golden Dawn' in the elections in Greece. Very symptomatic in this respect is the incident of Andreas Breivik from Norway, who shot 77 of his fellow countrymen. We have analyzed texts of his manifests and found out the following thing. He thinks that Europe is under the threat of Islamisation, that is why is it necessary to unleash the civil war and to win it by withdrawing everyone who mollifies the Muslims. This is a frightening ideology. But more frightening is the fact that Breivik has many advocates who approve of his actions.

How do we establish cooperation of civilizations and cultures? I consider that the only efficient way is to change the norms of international law. There is no other way. We should exclude war as a means of resolving conflicts out of the life of society. Such decisions should only be taken together, and in this case we have a chance to succeed. Russia serves a good model in this area, because we have achieved the situation when different peoples and confessions co-exist peacefully, and I hope that we will solve the problem of migrants. At least, the idea of partnership of civilizations steps over the bounds of academic discussions and at the threshold of the real politics. Unless we become aware that we should undertake practical measures to change the norms of international law, especially considering the rise of political Islam, in the nearest future we may witness a great number of new crises.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Mr. Moiseyev, the floor is yours.

A. A. MOISEYEV¹: — The necessity to alter or reject the current international laws is quite a widespread idea, but, to my mind, it is rather dangerous. Let me give you a few examples. Until the adoption of the UN Charter the principle of the state sovereignty respect existed in the world. But the UN Charter of 1945 introduced another principle — of sovereign equality. That seemingly trifling change was made because colonial system had vanished from the world arena, and international legislation ranged itself on the side of the weakest states. Subject to that principle all states received equal rights and obligations — the situation that was unprecedented under the League of Nations. Also, even now the UN Charter is not fully exercised, to be more precise its potential is not widely open. Suffice it to remember that the Military Staff Committee, which according to the Charter should command the united military forces as necessary in order to ensure force impact under the resolution of the Security Council, has not started its operation yet, and we are aware that its functions are performed by other organizations, military unions that do not always act legitimate.

As to the topic of our discussion today, I totally support professor Naumkin: the problems do exist. The issue of resolving them depends on the same old legislative mechanisms. Because in some cases the algorithms offered are related to supranational functions. To what extent is it practical and legal in the system of supranational states to create and empower international organizations to take decisions mandatory for the states? In is an ambiguous issue. Supranational issues often seem suspicious and frightening to sovereign states.

It is a well-known fact that in the member-state of the European Union many functions operate on a supranational level. Everything seems to be done in favour of the people who can freely travel within the EU and get some political rights. However, we can witness a growing crisis. It might be related to the fact that on the European Union level an adequate governance is not established and national states can perform this function better.

It is not a secret that the UN Charter is based on the concept of national states interests. But I consider that the world community cannot escape the phenomenon of supranationality that manifests itself in the fact that international organizations get a chance to take decisions mandatory to the states. Nevertheless, it does not affect the nature of the state and does not belittle national sovereignty which is kept to the full. It seems that supranationality is a progressive form of development of humankind. Speaking about tendencies one should admit that the criteria of defence of national state interests are succeeded by the criterion of defence and protection of human rights. International legislation advances in this direction. The criterion of legitimacy of norms in every case is human rights rather than interests of national states, it is exactly this process that we witness today.

¹ Dean of the Department of International Law of the Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, LL. D., Professor. Vice-President of the Russian Association of International Law. Author of a number of scientific publications, including: *Supranationalism in Modern International Law* (Nadgosudarstvennost v sovremenom mezhdunarodnom prave), *Sovereignty of State in Modern World. International Legal Aspects* (Suverenitet gosudarstva v sovremenom mire. Mezhdunarodno-pravovye aspekty), *Sovereignty of State in International Law* (Suverenitet gosudarstva v mezhdunarodnom prave), *International Financial Organizations (Legal Aspects of Activities)* (Mezhdunarodnye finansovye organizatsii (pravovye aspekty deyatelnosti)), and others.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — The floor is given to Professor Wiatr.

J. J. WIATR: — A colleague of mine, president of law school, says that the issue of balance between multiculturalism and politics has two aspects: the first is relations between states and the second is relations between people and institutions inside one state. Do not forget that this process has been developing for about 50 years. Huntington warned us against imposing our cultural values on others because it is the shortest way to a disaster. His words are proved by facts. A democratic country unleashed the war against Iraq under the motto 'Crusade for democracy!' Now the UN admits that such policy is inefficient, but we should see all the details in the right magnitude. The issue of national sovereignty is not very up-to-date, because the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted more than 60 years ago by all UN members, set certain criteria of behaviour. That is why we cannot justify ourselves with principles of national sovereignty in the emergent circumstances. Sometimes, in one country or another, intolerable violations of human rights can be detected, right down to genocides. Those are the extreme cases which international community can interfere in. But I'd like to emphasize: only in extreme cases, otherwise international politics will turn to chaos. Another issue is relations between the state and the minorities who migrated there. Immigrants have their own cultural standards, but they come to a foreign country and have to follow its laws, although these laws do not always correlate to their cultural traditions. For example, in the countries where the majority worship Islam there are certain rules of relations between a man and a woman, but these standards do not fit the norms of democratic countries. So, behaviour of the Muslims who come, for example, to Europe, is regulated by the laws of the hosting country and they should obey these laws. But if the same people reside 'on their own territory', that is where they have dwelt for centuries, the attitude towards them should be different: we should respect their cultural values. Though it happens that inside those communities some conflicts arise, and then we should attract such categories as tolerance and principle of peaceful co-existence of different cultures.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Thank you, Professor Wiatr. You have expressed interesting and sharp ideas, but to my mind, there are some contradictions in them. On the one hand, we should not impose our cultural values, for interstate relations it is an obvious principle. On the other hand — there is a problem of respect of rights of ethnic groups and their obligations to respect the laws of the country of their current residence. We can observe different policy towards migrants. For example, French policy of assimilation is based on a partial motive of immigrant communities to adopt cultural values of the hosting country. However, it does not work: in France some diasporas have been formed that do not wish to accept the norms of behaviour that dominate in the country. This model of multiculturalism differs from British or Canadian. I think, it is an ambiguous issue, just as the ration between sovereignty respect and validity of interference from the outside in emergency cases. Who will distinguish emergency cases from non-emergency ones? Was the case of Lebanon an emergency? Perhaps, it would be correct to say that Kaddafi had no friends, because no one actually supported him. But what do we see as the result of interference that

was performed in the name of democracy norms rule and human rights defence? The country is in chaos, thousands of people are subjected to the tortures in Lebanon jails. As Henry Kissinger said in a private talk: 'Kaddafi was a son of a bitch, but at least he was able to keep the country as an integrate union.' So the issues of sovereignty and interference from the outside are very ambiguous.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Professor Schneider, you are welcome.

E. SCHNEIDER¹: — Cultures' interaction problems arise in particular when representatives of different religions live in the country. There are known cases of Muslims' aggression that took place in Iraq, Egypt and Nigeria that led to Christian shrines demolition, injured people and even casualties. At present Christians all over the world are being persecuted more often than representatives of other religions.

Opposing views of different flows of one religion, if this religion dominates in the country, represent no lesser problem. For example, Shiite flow of Islam is typical for Iran, Iraq and to some point for Syria, Sunni – for Saudi Arabia and others Persian Gulf countries. Shiite-Sunni confrontation is accompanied by the worsening of the interstate relations and violent actions up to armed conflicts. Are interconfessional confrontations the reason of tense political relationship of these countries or the consequence or both?

V. V. NAUMKIN: — I give the right to speak to Mr. Guerra.

R. GUERRA: — Professor Vitaly Vyacheslavovich Naumkin has touched upon a very timely topic for France. As far as immigration is concerned, it is a well-know fact that France has accumulated a large experience. Let us not go into historical details — I would like to point out just a few facts of the 20th century. Many people would come to France from Italy, but it was an economical immigration that fundamentally differs from a political one. Italians are our southern neighbours (mind you, I myself come from Nice). We have common culture, common religion, and quite naturally, no tensions arose between us. We also lived through Polish immigration which, again, was economical: the Poles would come to work on mines in the north of France, and were highly respected for their diligence. Though they were made fun of due to their alleged weakness for vodka. In France we even have a set expression 'drunk as a Pole'.

However, after 1917 the White émigré were political refugees. Those were the ones who could not accept the new regime, who did not want and for mane reasons could not stay in the Soviet Russia and preferred to leave their Fatherland. They were leaving voluntary — apart from cultural figures, deported by Lenin from the Soviet Union in autumn of 1922 on the famous 'philosophers' ship', which did a great favour to Russian and world culture. Bunin, Shmelev, Zaitsev, Remizov, Osorgin, Berdyaev, Frank, Lossky, Vysheslavtsev and many other exiles — figures of the Russian élite tied up to the shores of France kept

¹ Professor of Political Science at the University of Siegen (Germany), Ph. D. Dr Schneider is an expert on domestic policy of Russia and the former USSR. Author of more than 12 books, including: *Das politische System der Russischen Föderation* (The Political System of the Russian Federation), *Das politische System der Ukraine* (The Political System of the Ukraine) and more than 100 scholarly articles. Member of the Advisory Board at the Independent Centre of European-Russian cooperation 'EU-Russia' in Brussels.

servicing Russian culture and greatly enriched culture of the hosting country. They were held in respect, but during the crisis of late 1920s early 1930s they experienced hardships, as they still were foreigner. Also French Left intellectual community looked at them awry: on their fatherland communism and the bright future is being built, and these renegades do not want to participate in this great deed! Only in the end of perestroika period the heritage of those great outcasts returned to their Fatherland! Thank God!

Later, after Russian, Spanish and Polish immigration waves, in the 1960s economical immigrants from Portugal flooded into France, and this process did not cause any problems; as it as immigration from a European country.

France used to be a colonial empire. Its former colonies are Tunis, Morocco, Algeria and others. After they set themselves free, many Algerians, Moroccans, Tunisians started to arrive from Northern Africa. But they all spoke French, so there were no language barriers. Nevertheless, the problems of assimilation started to appear, and as everyone is aware, they were related to an alien culture and religion. Professor Naumkin was right to mention that policy of France in respect to immigrants is integration, assimilation. But do the descendants from these countries want to be assimilated?

Being a native of Nice, all my life I have been observing these processes in the south of France. I advocate free travel, I have always communicated with émigrés and immigrants from Eastern Europe. Once, a Moroccan friend of mine asked me: ‘Why does France accept everyone? Are you crazy?’

So, we can speak about multifaceted type of policy in France in respect to counteraction with various cultures. Nevertheless, we are facing a very complicated period, in particular, it concerns the attempts to Islamize our country. I do not know how it may end, but the latest presidential elections showed that we do not only face this problem, it is going to grow more and more.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Do you think that Ms. Marine Le Pen will win the next elections?

R. GUERRA: — Time will show. But I am surprised that she got about 20 per cent of votes, many people expected her to get 40 per cent.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Mr. Prodanov, the floor is yours.

V. PRODANOV: — I think that the problem discussed today is much more complicated than some can imagine. International and domestic institutions are too weak to solve it. About 20 years ago I had the opportunity to discuss it with two outstanding experts in this area — Samuel Huntington and Immanuel Wallerstein. Huntington said Bulgaria is an alien body for the Western civilization. Just like Greece. We now all know what kind of problems Greece is facing today. Wallerstein claimed that today a great number of people are moving from the periphery towards the centre of the world capitalist system. As a result, the contradictions between the centre and the periphery that have existed for centuries are shifting within the centre and threaten to blow it apart. That is happening because the basis of all these phenomena are deeper processes, related first of all to globalization and the erosion of sovereignty of nation states.

My colleagues at the Plenary session said that nation states are gradually fraying, which means that national identities, starting with the most fragile ones, will follow them. Many

examples throughout the 20th century history confirm it. By the beginning of the First world war there were 60 states in the world, nowadays there are more than 200. In particular, on the Balkan Peninsula some 20 years ago there were 6 states, now there are 13, and 20 years from now there might be 30. The process goes very quickly, because globalization results in a tide of new local identities. There is no knowing about the destiny of Scotland — whether it will remain in the United Kingdom. Or, for example, Belgium — there is a chance that it will be split into two parts. I repeat that these processes are a result of globalization and manifestations of new national identities.

But there is another process progressing in the world, which to my mind, it is more important. Social and economical inequality among different territories is rising. Wallonia and Flanders have long been parts of Belgium, but social and economic gap between these communities is growing, and as a result the state is becoming less strong. The same could be said about many other countries.

Also, social and economic contradictions are growing between various ethnic groups. Immigrants in France, Germany and other countries are increasingly facing them. Ethnic differences are intensified and amplified by social and economic ones. Thus arises a crisis of identity. So, national identity is not absolute, it is constructed in the process of various cultural interactions. In terms of social and economic inequality such a construction is accompanied by acute conflicts. I think, these problems cannot be solved by legislative means, as they are very deeply rooted.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — I accord the right to speak to Professor Tolochko.

P. P. TOLOCHKO¹: — Although the topic of our conference is dialogue of cultures in the context of globalization, this actually means dialogue of culture carriers. The mode of this dialogue, as a rule, is determined not by culture figures, but rather by politicians and public authorities. They are governed not by cultural interests of communities, but by political, economical, territorial and other interests. As the result equal dialogue cannot be arrived at, as one of the parties always dominates.

If history is any guide, in the process of such dialogues some cultures and their carriers vanished from the face of the globe (it was especially typical of ancient times), others due to military power became empires and civilizations. The latter, in their turn, entered into unequal dialogue with similar institutions and suffered casualties. At that, conflicts existed not only between culturally different civilizations (for example, the Turks and Byzantine or the Mongols and Russia), but between allied ones, which is exemplified

¹ Director of the Institute for Archaeology of the National Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine, academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine, a foreign member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor. Author of more than 300 scientific publications, including 25 books: *Historical Topography of Ancient Kiev*, *Ancient Kiev (Drevny Kiev)*, *Ancient Russian Feudal Town (Drevnerussky feodalny gorod)*, *Historical Portraits*, *Chronicles of Kievan Rus*, *St. Vladimir to Yaroslav the Wise*, *From Rus to the Ukraine*, *Ancient Russian People: Imaginary or Real Community (Drevnerusskaya narodnost: vobrazhemaya ili realnaya)* and others. Chairman of the Ukrainian Society for Protection of Historical and Cultural Landmarks, member of the Academy of Europe (London), corresponding member of the Central German Institute for Archaeology, member of International Union of Slavonic Archaeology. Laureate of the State Award of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in the field of science and engineering, of the State Award of the Ukraine, of M. S. Grushevsky Award of the National Academy of Sciences of the Ukraine.

by the tragic confrontation between Catholic Rome and Orthodox Byzantine.

Is it good or bad? The answer is not evident and ambiguous. We can only say that it is an objective reality that exists in the modern life. And, unfortunately, it can hardly be corrected, which can be seen through the example of difficult relations of Europeans and the migrated outlanders — the Turks, Arabs, Hindus, black Africans. The authorities of Germany and France concerned with this issue have started speaking about the crisis of multiculturalism. They actually meant a different thing — ruin of European illusions on the possibility to ‘civilize’ and assimilate millions of foreign migrants. It can be said that multiculturalism in Europe does not fall apart at all, but on the contrary, is established. Of course, in contradictions and conflicts.

Classical multiculturalism that is basic for most of the countries is not free from these contradictions. They are caused by inequality of economical development in the regions, in the lack of equal access to the governance of the state, in hierarchies of cultural values. However, apart from internal factors, there are also external ones that destabilize inter cultural and inter communal peace, in particular, imposing of democratically developed countries to the rest of the world their ideas of freedom and democracy — mostly, by means of provoking the so-called coloured revolutions, but also by means of military force, as it took place in Yugoslavia, Iraq, Lebanon and is now happening in Syria. Having broken the traditional life style of Arabian East, the West has aggravated the situation with multiculturalism that grows in European countries, and its consequences can be the most diverse.

Another destabilizing factor of intercultural and inter ethnic cooperation is, paradoxical as it may seem, recognition by the international community the right of the nation for the national identity. I think, the time has come to re-consider this provision, or else the world will sink into the chaos of indefinite fragmentation.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Now I give the floor to Ms. Bagdasarian.

N. G. BAGDASARIAN¹: — Professor Popov said that the norms of international legislation should be changes, but

¹ Professor of the Chair of Social and Cultural Studies of Moscow State Technical University named after N. E. Bauman, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), honorary fellow of higher professional education of the Russian Federation. Author of more than 160 publications, including the following books: *Professional Culture of an Engineer: Mechanisms of Mastery* (Professionalnaya kultura inzhenera: mekhanizmy osvoyeniya), *Cultural Aspects of Technological and Engineering Activities: possibilities and limits* (Kulturologiya tekhniki i inzhenernoy deyatelnosti: vozmozhnosti i granitsy) (with co-authors), as well as a range of articles such as *Dynamics of Career Guidance of Students* (Dinamika professionalnykh orientatsiy studentcheskoy molodezhi), *Value of Education in Modernizing Society* (Tsenost obrazovaniya v moderniziruyushchetsya obschestve), *Net Communication: A Knot of Relations and Price of Issues* (Setevaya Kommunikatsiya: uzel otosheniya i tsena problema), *Concept of Culture in Engineers' Competence* (Kontsept kulture v kompetentsiyakh inzhenerov), *Technical Engineering Education as a Guarantee of Social Progress* (Inzhenernotekhnicheskoye obrazovaniye kak garantiya sotsialnogo progressa), *Cosmos and Logos of Love in the System of Culture* (Kosmos i logos ljubvi v sisteme kulture), *Cultural Studies in Educational Systems: Gnostic Value and Methodological Potential* (Kulturologiya v sistemakh obrazovaniya: poznavatel'naya znachimost i metodologichesky potencial), *Culture as Medium for Survival: The Butterfly Effect and Window of Decision-Making* (Kultura kak sreda vyzhivaniya: effect babochki i 'okno prinyatiya resheniya'), *Social and Humanitarian Academic Discourse in Information Landscape of Culture* (Sotsialno-gumanitarny nauchny diskurs v informatsionnom landshafte kulture), *Global Cultural Space: Gaps of Modern Age in Tendencies and Paradoxes* (Globalnoye prostranstvo kulture: raznyye sovremennosti v tendentsiyakh i paradoksakh). Member of the Expert

I think, bearing in mind that law is, surely, significant, that the main task now is not law, but the issue of responsibility of intellectual elites. Firstly, modern intellectual elites are not able to present a well-reasoned scenario of cooperation. Without doubt, it should not be a universal plan that could suit all cases for France, Great Britain and Russia. We need various scenarios that will adequately reflect political, economical, cultural peculiarities of every country. Undoubtedly, it is a complex task. Two months ago at the Expert Council under the federation Council we were discussing the issue of multiculturalism. We arrived at the agreement that it would be good to come back to the idea of internationalism. Right, let's go back, but how?

Secondly, what is happening to education in Russia? The reform that is being carried out now is originally based on conflictogenity.

And thirdly, some considerations on extreme cases. Recently, the Russian society was agitated by the statement that it would be a good idea to introduce Sharia courts for Muslims living on the territory of Russia regardless the region. But three years ago in Great Britain there was held a similar discussion between governmental authorities and the clergy. The London Centre for Islamic Pluralism made an opinion poll: how do Muslims themselves treat the idea of Sharia courts? And you know what? The split was not between Shia and Sunni, but on completely different criteria. Many Muslims said that the had been living in great Britain for a long time, got used to observing the laws of that country and consider themselves Europeans. Another argument was that even in the countries where Islam dominates, Sharia law is not always the only legislative basis.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — I would like to clarify one thing. As far as I know, none of the states in the world call upon introducing sharia norms as the basis of legislation. What is meant here is just some elements referring to personal status, as the Archbishop of Canterbury stated. In our country in the early '90s the Minister of Justice of the Russian Federation supported by a number of Islam experts offered the same thing. Namely, to allow the Muslims to use sharia laws in the sphere of personal status, for example, regulations of property inheritance. That is, if the Muslims want to have it this way, why not introduce it, there is nothing dangerous in it, no one offers to punish for theft by cutting of hands.

Nevertheless, the legal system of the state must not be ruined, as I think, even if a armless norm is meant. If it is a secular state, it should be remained secular. But, anyway, one shouldn't overestimate the role of such claims. Colleague Guangcheng Xing, the floor is yours.

G. XING²: — Dear friends, I consider that the topic of our discussion is very burning, because we live in the

Board at the Committee on International Affairs of the Council of Federation of the Russian Federation.

² Deputy Director of the Centre for History and Geography of Border Regions of China (the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences), LL. D., Professor. Author of more than 100 scholarly publications, including the books: *Relations of China with New Independent States of Central Asia* (Otnosheniya Kitaya s novymi nezavisimymi gosudarstvami Tsentral'noj Azii), *The Rising Central Asia* (Podnimajushchajasja Tsentral'naja Azija), *Process of Making Decisions by the Soviet Authorities over 70 Years* (Protsess prinjatija resheniya vysshim sovetskim rukovodstvom na protjazhenii 70 let), *On Russia's Parliaments* (O parlamentah Rossii); articles: *Shanghai Cooperation: Promising Directions* (Shanhajskaja organizatsiya sotrudnichestva: prioritetye napravlenija) and others. Vice-Director of the Research Centre of Shanghai Cooperation Organization at the Academy for Social Sciences of the People's Republic of China.

age of economical globalization that has both positive and negative elements. Various cultures face new challenges. In this respect an important question arises: where does the world civilization go to?

The first thing: In the contest of economic globalization will various cultures all over the world establish a new common culture or will preserve their own specific culture and develop under the dialogue?

I think it is a big problem. It seems too me that economical globalization is a factor of formation of a unified culture, the differences between cultures cannot be totally destroyed.

Secondly. Economical globalization is accompanied by attempts to drive original cultures to a universal model and impose this model to the whole world, but I think that it is, at least, not reasonable. There is no unique standard on culture in the world. It is important for developing countries to keep their national peculiarities.

Thirdly. I presume that cultures cannot be split into leading and backward ones, they differ only in special features. Our world is so diverse because various cultures and civilizations exist.

Fourthly. Co-existence of various cultures is determined by historical necessity and it should be encouraged. Culture is the core of national mentalities and a major gene that distinguishes one people from other. Every people of the world has its own cultural specific features and its own impulse of development. Despite a dynamic growth of the Internet, it cannot substitute national culture.

Fifthly. We need to establish a dialogue between different cultures. The best model of relations between cultures is dialogue and exchange. We should consider this issue in the global context, and all cultures of the world should take their part in analyzing and solving global issues, motivated by the principle of unity in diversity in human culture. We should also acknowledge that existence and development of various cultures reflect a common value of humanity. We should respect various cultures, should not oppress or treat other cultures as rivals or potential enemies. To search for common features preserving differences is the best way for various cultures to co-exist.

Sixthly. China, as an ancient civilized country, has two basic concepts of the development of culture. Firstly, we should study and cultivate remarkable traditions of national culture; secondly, to implement effective elements of foreign world countries, and establish and cultivate an advanced culture with specific Chinese features.

Sevently. I think that in the course of globalization, under rapidly changing international circumstances, China and Russia should cooperate actively, and combine efforts to face challenges. Our countries have many areas of common interest, and I consider it to be an important and effective factor. On the whole, economic globalization is a historical tendency. As a result of cooperation of various countries and peoples the world becomes smaller, and a dialogue develops between various cultures, and every day it is growing more and more topical.

A. A. MOISEYEV: — I would like to make a comment. I guess, none of us present here doubt that international law is an achievement of the world culture. When I deliver lectures, I always start with the fact that all state are different — in geography, economy, religion, and so on, but

at that, a universal international law consists of the norms common for all states. We can look for other ground for interaction, but I want to emphasize it again, international law is an achievement of world culture and it is the basis to build cooperation between states upon.

N. G. BAGDASARIAN: — The law is sacred. I have never infringed the sacred character of law.

V. V. POPOV: — I fully agree with my Chinese colleague. He stated true ideas, but how to put them into life? In this respect, I would like to draw your attention to Professor Prodanov's speech.

It is true that in terms of globalization we are moving towards a greater isolation — ethnic, religious and so on. We should take it into account. In this regard a new strong school of political experts was formed that support putting tough restrictions of the right of nations for self-identification and treat possibility of creating new states with a larger care.

Otherwise, as Professor Prodanov remarked, Scotland might be on the verge of declaring its independence, then Corsica will follow it and so on. This tendency should be taken notice of.

I also consider a very important remark made by Professor Bagdasarian: the academic community has not found the answers to these questions yet. But if scientists cannot find the solution, the results can be drastic, because nowadays governance is becoming an extremely difficult thing, politicians cannot catch up with too fast rate of changes in our speedy century. What it might lead to was exemplified by the so-called Arabian spring.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — You are welcome to speak, Abdumalik Nysanbayevich.

A. N. NYSANBAYEV¹: — Dear colleagues! Almost in all reports of the participant of this Likhachov Conference the issue of multiculturalism is raised in one way or the other, and is considered in its diversity and unity of its philosophical world-outlook, conceptual-methodological, social and political and other aspects. At that, various opinions are states. I would like, firstly, to speculate upon Kazakhstan's attempt of multiculturalism and upon some ideas and evaluations made at plenary and section meetings.

Secondly, I would like to formulate the problematic semantic context whose study can serve as a trigger to philosophically and politically relevant statement of the problem of multiculturalism in the current conditions.

In the modern world there are plenty of multicultural states, for example, in Kazakhstan in peace and consensus there reside 130 ethnic groups, 46 confessions and the same number of national cultures. How can we achieve peaceful

¹ Academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Adviser to the Director of the Institute for Philosophy and Political Science (the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan) (Alma-Ata). Author of over 587 scholarly papers, including 39 monographs: *Philosophy of Mutual Understanding* (Filosofija vzaimoponimanija), *Kazakhstan: Cultural Heritage and Social Transformation* (Kazakhstan: kul'turnoe nasledije i sotsial'naja transformatsija), *Globalization and Problems of Cross-Cultural Dialogue* (Globalizatsija i problemy mezhkul'turnogo dialoga) and others. President of the Academy of Social Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan, member of the National Council under the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Professor Nysanbayev is honorary worker of science and technology of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Laureate of the State Award of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic.

co-existence and concord in such a state? It is a great challenge, because every ethnos, every religion has its own interests, and we should combine them in order not to affect interests of other people.

Population of Kazakhstan is about 17 millions people; among religious confessions Islam and Christianity dominate. The dominative ethnos is Kazakhs (67 per cent) and Russians (about 30 per cent). That is why concord between Russians and Kazakhs provides peace and security. In our country we have created and are putting into practice an effective model of inter ethnic and inter confessional cooperation, a philosophy of mutual understanding as the basis of spiritual concord of a poly-ethnic community.

Kazakhstan's multiculturalism demonstrates positive results. For almost 20 years we have been existing as a sovereign unitary state. Undoubtedly, we have experienced problems, but they can only be solved in the context of all-national unity and inter-confessional cooperation. If the society is not united from the inside, and consolidated, it will not be able to solve the problems it faces. We have got a reasonable governmental politics in terms of development of multiculturalism.

It is a well-known fact that multiculturalism as a political phenomenon has its own historical forms. The former apprehension of this term has grown outdated, and at present its new forms and potential are being discovered. Kazakhstan attempt shows that so far it has been the most prospective form of people's cooperation in poly-ethnic state.

50 mln people live in Central Asia. It is a vast region with a great amount of natural resources, and on its territory countries with different levels of social and economical development are located. How do we provide a peaceful mechanism of their co-existence and cooperation?

At home in Kazakhstan great attention is paid to the development of every ethnos, and at the same time, to the enhancement of intercultural communication and integration. One cannot state that such politics is put into practice easily, without hindrances, but we try to overcome our problems. 15 years ago a special public organization was established — Assembly of Peoples of Kazakhstan. Now it is renamed into Assembly of People of Kazakhstan, because we think that all ethnic groups residing on our territory make one single community. This assembly has become nowadays a constitutional body, and 9 deputies are elected to the Parliament from the Assembly to protect interests of minority ethnic groups. We consider that they have to work in the legal environment.

In the end of May this year Astana hosts the fourth Congress of leaders of the World and traditional religions. This platform gives profound opportunities for a constructive dialogue. It has a great importance for development of multiculturalism and inter-confessional dialogue. The state national politics is performed on the basis on large and careful academic researches. Since 2004 a strategic national project 'Cultural Heritage' has been implemented.

Putting this state programme into life, we have succeeded in studies of cultural heritage of all ethnic groups of Kazakhstan and in revival of the spirituality of Kazakhstan people, on the whole.

Multiculturalism is targeted at transformation of cultural, political, social status and other ethnic competitions

in the area of cooperation, dialogue, counterpoint. That is why Australian, Canadian, Swiss and other models of multiculturalism do not compete, but can mutually complete and enrich each other and so on.

Multiculturalism must be accompanied by integration processes. Alongside with that, in political practice and humanities discourse an interpretation of multiculturalism that ruins its core and essence is very wide spread.

The world attempts to put models of multiculturalism into life shows that the politics of privileges for the minorities (ethnic, confessional, linguistic and so on) does not solve original tasks, for the sake of which those steps are taken. On the contrary, such exclusiveness only provokes tension and separation of modern multiethnic communities and prevents their integration into political nations.

In the last decades of the 20th century ethnic background transformed from cultural phenomenon to legitimate (based on the concept of collective, group rights) instrument of exercising political, social, economical interests of individuals.

Acceptance of the model of local ethnic cultures as a model of building a nation inevitably turns into one or another form of ethnocracy, that is, ethnos is instilled with the status and mode of a political subject.

Political ideas that grow from ethnic and confessional separatism are actively used by extremists in order to ruin civil (political) nations, modern states and corresponding institutions and ideas. Negative aftermaths of those processes manifested themselves in political turmoil and demonstration for ethnic identity, in multiple ethnic conflicts and wars.

In many countries ethnic communities gain more and more facilities and possibilities to preserve into cultural identity, inclusive various political and legal mechanisms. Summarizing the results of a great number of social polls, we can make a conclusion that on the whole mass consciousness of the Kazakhstani supports the idea that formation of all-Kazakhstani identity has to be performed on multicultural basis.

At that one can say that multiculturalism is an attributive feature of the Eurasian mentality.

But alongside with that an understandable and natural concern for preserving your own ethnic cultural identity often leads to self-isolation of ethnic groups, to intensification of processes of ethnic self-identification to the detriment of and to the contrary of all-Kazakhstani civil identity.

In this respect, one of the most burning challenges, both theoretically and politically practically, is the issue of relations of two concepts of nations, and correspondently, two strategies of national and state development.

The problem determined by A. A. Gusseinov, J. Wiatr, V. Prodanov and a number of other participants of the Likhachov Conference is a matter for discussion in Khazakhstanian academic and expert community. In my book *Obschenatsionalnaya Ideya Kazakhstana: Opyt Filosofsko-Politologicheskogo Analiza* [The All-National Idea of Kazakhstan: An Attempt of Philosophical Political Analysis] (2006) I marked out that there exist two basis strategies of national and state development and two respective dominative models of interethnic concord.

The first strategy is aimed at forming a unified Kazakhstani nation from a multiethnic society, which is

treated not as just a legal record of civil background, but as a high level of civil self-identification of representatives of various ethnic groups. This approach got the name of civil nationalism.

Advocates of an alternative strategy of national and state development presume that creation of a unified (civil) nation in Kazakhstan is impossible, because ethnic self-identification of an individual will always dominate over his civil identity. That is why, with respect to a special role of the Kazakh nation in the state development, the basis of culture in Kazakhstani community should be the Kazakh culture, around which cultures of all national diasporas will be united. This approach is called 'ethnic cultural nationalism'.

The supporters of these two models argue on a range of issues: the issues of citizenship, representation of ethnic groups in governmental bodies, language issue and others. In theoretical sphere, the argument comes down to the problem of how to resolve contradictions between civil and ethnic and cultural concept of a nation. Considering 'pros' and 'contras' of both sides, we can draw a conclusion: it is necessary to use both concepts of a nation — civil and ethnic-cultural ones rather than rely upon one of them, it would be detrimental not only for general situation in the national sphere, but for the destiny of the whole state.

Kazakhstan as a unitary state endeavours to solve the dilemma of civil and ethnic-cultural models, of unification of communities of compatriots and civil society by means of compromises, attempts of rapprochement and reconciliation of the extremes. This strategy, on the one hand, has demonstrated its effectiveness, but on the other hand, state national politics is inevitably subject to criticism from both sides.

Adducing an argument in favour of the integration of civil and ethnic-cultural concepts of national consolidation, Kazakhstani researches emphasize the fact that behind all those concepts and their political implications and differences in the strategies of national and state development, deriving from them, lie fundamental differences in comprehension of social ontology and methodology of social cognition, as well as differences in the system of political values.

An ethnic-cultural concept of a nation as of a naturally evolved solidarity community (a primordialist paradigm) correlates to autocratic political regimes, to conservative ideology and republican concept of politics, while the civil concept refers to liberal ideas.

But if this is the point, then in the task of unification of the civil and ethnic cultural models, in the strategy of achieving inter-ethnic concord implicitly there is a problem of integration of two fundamentally different types of ontology and semantics of social political reality. That is why discourse and praxis of multiculturalism is naturally, in its core, related to the issue of philosophical ontological grounds of the concept of synthesis of civil and ethnic cultural identities. However, crudity and ambiguity of such grounds should not become an obstacle for practical confirmation of the unification of civil and ethnic cultural identity as an imperative for national and state development based on the principles of multiculturalism.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Ambassador Marc, the floor is yours.

J. A. MARC: — The whole world faces nowadays an economic crisis with dramatic ups and downs in the performance of many countries. People look for a fix structure that could give more security but it is important to understand that it is in the inexistence of fixed structures that we have found the strength for the fast developments of recent years. To understand it, the case of the Dollar Crisis in 1974 could be useful. It is thus important to analyze what happened with the dollar crisis and the end of the Bretton Woods system in 1974. What happened then to the dollar? Before the crisis, Dollar value was fixed in relation to gold and by that to the other currencies. However a fix parity involved such a rigidity that in order not to sacrifice development it was decided to cut the link. From certainty — but development blockage — to free floating — and fast development — was the moto. It was decided that in the future just trust would fix the value. Dollar value was fixed for the future in relation to the market not to the gold; and his only support was trust! But the dollar did not collapsed and the speed of world development increased!

The same situation should apply in politics and economic future at global level today. What should world stability be based on? On the same thing as the value of the dollar; only in trust in our decentralized model, just trust in the fact that the system can continue to exist and develop through the pattern of decentralization and diversity. The main value of the new model is diversity. It is based in the relationships between an increasing number of cultures that keep trading by free initiative not by regulation. The world base is obviously diverse and inconsistent but as it is expanding... the world continues to grow. And this diversity of cultures is the key pillar as it is the best vaccine vis a vis any attempt to impose nothing by any particular power. People in different countries and communities should defend fiercely the value of freedom and defeat any threatening credos or programs (like fascism, imperialism etc) by the strength of the soft power, it is to say by the capacity of keeping them always in a minority position. Our strategy should be never to prohibit but always to keep any possible threat as a non-dominant tendency. I guess that we all have to take efforts to make all people realize how important diversity is and how complex the world is in the new century. We cannot exclude the evil, but we should try to prevent it being dominant. People should become aware that to create is very difficult and to ruin is very easy. For example, the opulent and magnificent Hermitage has been created for centuries by the work and dedication of many people, but one bomb would be enough to fully destroy it. We should understand that by betting massively for the positive we can keep the world developing for the best. This is what I mean by a "world based on the paradigm of trust on the strength of the diversity" Vs a world organized under the paradigm of fixed rules and rigid structures. This is in my view the parallelism between the 1974 Crisis in the monetary dimension, — with the free floating of the dollar and the existing crisis in the economic dimension in the whole, — with the free floating on the economies only supported by the trust in its future! By being many pushing the economy we have a chance to keep it going in the most solid and safe way. Thank you.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — The floor is given to Professor Astafyeva.

O. N. ASTAFYEVA¹: — Much of what we have heard here is very soundly formulated, to my mind. It correlates to my basis idea: there are plenty of models of multiculturalism in the modern world. Moreover, one can trace evocation and dynamics of these models. Speculations on managing future models are included in political and social-cultural discourse. All that has been said today, actually, is related to creating national cultural identities in the modern world.

And in this respect the issues of right and values are equivalent. However, as we speak of the common target — to enhance civil identity — the issue of right becomes primary. Especially when we concentrate our attention on the co-existence, that is to say, collective participation in the life of the state, which is based on cultural values. In my opinion, it is a very complicated and interesting issue. As Russia faced the challenges of its national cultural identity, it would be wrong to ignore a personal, individual identification level, as well. Just as one cannot state that identity is created by a single person, so one should not forget about elements of philosophy and ethics of collective self-identification. In this respect, social structuring (I support my Bulgarian colleague here) serves as a significant rational governing element. But what are we going to construct? What model shall we long for? Sociological pools show that one part of the Russians are inclined to rebirth and enhancement of national cultural identity based on traditional values, while the other, on the contrary, are oriented on innovations and modernization.

It results in clashes of collective identities. And Huntington's question 'Who are we?' is natural, it concerns not only America, but any other country in the modern world, including ours.

So, what type of identity would we like to construct? A dominant one that is based on the law, on the created hierarchy of values? Then it will be a collective civil identity based on corporative grounds, and cultural human rights will become a key point, which is poorly developed in the modern Russian discourse. Civil identity will be dominant, and social structuring will be a mechanism for its enhancement. To construct this model of cultural diversity is hard, but possible. In this sense, Canadian attempt is very positive. But if we are going to construct and hold a certain free, 'liminal' type of multiculturalism as a model of national identity, then let us think that this is a flickering, i.e. situational, identity that a person chooses (or get the right to choose) in any case, and it becomes a typical feature of a transitional period towards stable identification forms. Or shall we look to a new type of integrative model of identity? Actually, this is the focal point of cultural politics.

¹ Director of the Civil Society and Social Communications scientific and educational centre at the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration under the President of the Russian Federation, professor of the Department of UNESCO at the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), honorary higher education worker of the Russian Federation. Author of over 250 scholarly papers, including books: *Cultural Politics as a Theoretical Notion and Management* (Kul'turnaja politika kak teoreticheskoje ponjatie i upravlencheskaja dejatel'nost'), *Cultural Studies. The Theory of Culture* (Kul'turologija. Teorija kul'tury) (in co-authorship), *Synergetic Approach to Research into Social and Cultural Processes: Possibilities and Limits* (Sinergetičeskij podhod k issledovaniju sotsiokul'turnyh protsessov: vozmožnosti i predely) and others. Editor-in-Chief of the online 'Journal of Cultural Research' (Kul'turologičeskij žurnal), Deputy Editor-in-Chief of 'Personality. Culture. Society' journal (Lichnost'. Kul'tura. Obščestvo), Chair of Moscow branch of Scientific and Educational Society for Cultural Research, member of the Union of Composers of Russia, member of the Russian Philosophical Society.

One example from a practical aspect. Russian authorities have been actively developing the law on culture for the last five years. During this time a new issue in the form of an article was included in the project: definition of cultural diversity, multiculturalism. A question arises: wasn't multiculturalism typical of Russia in its history? It is our basic feature! The matter is how we formulate it and what we want to gain in the result of instrumental work and dealings with legal acts. Will the laws encourage enhancement of integrity, will it pass the model of collective identity an excessive instability? We should be sure in it when we adopt this law.

One more issue. Civil society in Russia is at its origination stage. It is quite obvious. In this respect I would like to point out that we haven't discussed the matters concerning activities of ethnic cultural communities that are represented in the form of civil society institutions in Russia. Nowadays on the vast discursive political area they withdraw into the background. And this background often determines strategy of national and cultural policy of the country.

Diversity of Russian culture with its best practices (like in Orenburg region) and attempt to preserve ethnic cultural diversity in various regions of the country correlates to philosophical ideas that have long become classical, saying that is terms of the trials with globalization and openness Russia is looking for its 'cultural identity targeted at the future'. We should strengthen the present keeping us from acute conflicts by means of the model based upon diversity in unity, and that is a hard task. That is why crises and resistance that we have already faced with and are still coming across are quite natural. To reject the return to philosophical re-thinking of multiculturalism is untimely and politically short-sighted, I suppose.

E. N. SHAPINSKAYA²: — I would like to add to what has been said by Professor O. N. Astafyeva and touch upon another aspect of cooperation and interaction of cultures. The point is that the models offered at the official level often fall far beyond success. What is really formed, in particular, conflict situations, to a large extent depends not on what is offered by the intellectual élite or politicians, but on the image that is created in the mass consciousness, namely 'the image of an alien', that is always the image of a carrier of a foreign culture. In Russia we more and more often face it — new migration processes, modernization, etc. In Russian consciousness the image of the ethnic 'alien' has traditionally been negative, it was an unorthodox, or a German and so on. And he has always been treated suspiciously. Later, in the process of Europeanisation and openness of Russia to other countries, another tendency emerged — to worship a western 'alien' as a hard-to-follow example. As a result, everything got mixed up in the people's consciousness. What image of the 'alien' really exists in the

² Chief Researcher of the Russian Institute for Cultural Studies, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author of 120 scholarly publications, including: *Discourse of Love* (Diskurs ljubvi), *Outlines of Mass Culture* (Očerki populjarnoj kul'tury), *Image of the Other in the Texts of Culture* (Obraz Drugogo v tekstah kul'tury), *Interaction of Cultures — Interaction of People* (Context of Multi-Culturalism) (Vzaimodejstvie kul'tur — vzaimodejstvie ljudej (kontekst mul'tikulturalizma)), *Cultural Discourse after Post-Modernism* (Kul'turologičeskij diskurs posle postmodernizma), *Structure of the Image of the East in the Texts of Culture: Policy of Representation* (Konstruktsija obraza Vostoka v tekstah kul'tury: politika reprezentatsiji), *Travel to the East as an Escape from Routine: Phenomenon of Touristic Escapism* (Puteshestvije na Vostok kak begstvo ot povsednevnosti: fenomen turisticheskogo eskapizma) and others. Member of Moscow Society for Cultural Research.

mass consciousness? One can clearly trace two tendencies. On the one hand, it is a traditional detachment, in particular, of a new phenomenon — mass migration that floods Russia. On the other hand — adoption of the ‘alien’ that goes unconsciously, at a popular level. Our everyday life accepts more and more artefacts, tastes, fancies, fashions and other things that appeared elsewhere, and people often do not know where, but they take it as something interesting, as a part of multicultural picture of the modern world. Music, clothes, food recipes, entertainments are the areas in which the ‘alien’ is adopted, but without the meanings that were originally typical of a certain level of the ‘alien’ culture.

The image of the ‘alien’ is constructed by a very powerful source — mass media. This image depends on the media images that we see in traditional and new mass media that have much more influence on minds and hearts of the mass consumer than the most noble thrives of the intellectual elite. Researches of media image of the ‘alien’ are highly developed in the West, where they are performed through movies. To my mind, it is a very important direction, without which no harmony between cultures and civilizations can exist.

So, who is this ‘alien’? Who are ‘we’ and ‘they’? It is traditionally supposed that ‘I’ is a certain carrier of the mainstream culture, and the ‘alien’ is a certain minority. However, if we take into consideration the number of those who migrate all over the world... recently I have seen a documentary about an English town, where there are only 10 per cent of the native residents, and 90 per cent are immigrants who came from Pakistan, China, countries of Northern Africa. In this case, who is the ‘I’ and who is the ‘alien’? An unprecedented process is happening here: ‘we’ that considered themselves ‘I’ are becoming ‘aliens’ in respect to the majority. A poll was made in Norway that showed 80 per cent of children in Norwegian schools are non-Norwegians. So, who are those Norwegians that are only 20 per cent left? A Norwegian is an ‘alien’ in respect to the newcomers who have not identified themselves and are not carriers of laws.

So, in the modern world the opposition ‘I’ — ‘alien’, ‘we’ — ‘they’ is very flexible. Apparently, we should estimate the situation in a realistic way and consider it when we work out some measures and policies. Are law-makers really law-makers or they are objects of completely different relations? And who manages those processes?

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Mr. Asadullin, the floor is yours.

F. A. ASADULLIN¹: — This year international public forum ‘Dialogue of civilization’ will celebrate its 10th birthday, that is why when we talk about successes of the

¹ Deputy Chair of the European Russian Spiritual Governance for Muslims. Leading researcher of the Institute for Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), Candidate of Science (Philology). Author of over 100 scholarly publications on the issues of development of Arab culture, history of Islam, Muslim religious doctrine and inter-confessional relations, including: *Islam in Moscow* (Islam v Moskve), *Outline of the History of Libyan Literature of the 19th–20th centuries* (Oчерк istoriji livijskoj literatury XIX–XX vekov), *Muslim Moscow* (Moskva musul'manskaja), *Russia's Main Mosque* (Glavnaja mechet' Rossii), *Muslim Religious Organizations and Associations of the Russian Federation* (Musul'manskije dukhovnyje organizatsiji i objedinenija Rossijskoj Federatsiji). Co-Chairman of the Information and Analysis Centre of Russian Muftis Council. Sheikh. Honoured Culture Worker of the Republic of Tatarstan. Mr Asadullin is Laureate of S. F. Oldenburg Award (the Russian Academy of Sciences). He is decorated with the medal of the Order for Services to the Fatherland of the 2nd degree.

concept of multiculturalism and about greater problems of development of inert-civilizational dialogue, I suppose, we should distinctly realize that all those international projects are recent institutions. Nowadays the items of the agenda for international community are being just formed. Undoubtedly, it is advancing. It reminds me a famous saying: ‘Historical process is not like the pavement of Nevsky Prospekt’. Naturally, there are a lot of hindrances on this way: temptations to turn to other roads of a chance to fall into a ditch.

Allow me to give an emblematic example. I am sure, you are aware of the decision of the Second Vatican Council that for the first time in many centuries of co-existence of Christian and Muslim civilizations at last, in 1965, came to the conclusion that the Christian world, namely, its Catholic part, had realized the importance of the Muslim religion to the humanity. For the first time hierarchs of the catholic church had accepted Islam as a non-Biblical form of monotheism. In fact, when we speak about the crisis of multiculturalism, I suppose, we mean just the crisis of our narrow-minded ideas. What is multiculturalism? For instance, in Spain of the 15th century there were such centres of Islamic civilization as Granada and Andalusia. Even now when you visit some catholic temples of Spain, you can understand by the decorations that once it used to be a Muslim temple.

Of course, the interior has changed, but the stylization and the pictures suggest it being an Islam cult building.

I read the report presented by academician Kudelin and thought that he illustrates well what we are discussing now. When we read ‘West-Eastern Divan’ by Goethe, the great German poet, we constantly come across obvious reminiscences of the Quran. He says that West and East belong to the Great Creator, and it is a direct reference to the Quran. Moreover, in one of his poems he has something like this: ‘If Islam is a monotheism, consider me a Muslim.’ All this signifies that fact that human civilization is a multi-layer synthetic institution, and everything depends on the level of our competence. Scholars of oriental studies can unveil and manifest these cultural layers.

A problem of mosques construction has become very acute nowadays in Moscow, bearing in mind that an active migration from the south to the north brings forth the issue of Muslim prayer houses. And when we watch live TV broadcast of religious festivals, a question arises: why should Muslims perform their religious ceremonies on a cold pavement and even on the snow in the minus 20 degrees temperature? In this regard I would like to touch upon the issue of responsibility of not only an intellectual, but political élite as well, that is, of people who are obliged to resolve such problems by the nature of their occupation. Impossibility to practise one’s religion freely either drives its adherents to the underground, or produces a larger problem — extremism that we face today. The same can be said not only about Islam, but about other religious traditions. They all demand an adequate treatment and concern of political and intellectual elite of the country.

Recurring to the presentations of our Chinese colleague, I would like to point out that in Beijing, subject to the official statistics, there are 70 mosques for 250 thousand of Muslims residing there. Communist China sets the model of how the problem of co-existence of different religions should be solved. Mind you, that it is a country of highly

developed traditions of Shinto, Confucian philosophy, but the political elite of that country pays attention to the importance of an Islamic element.

The final point. In many publications we can detect the term 'struggle for existence'. But 'struggle for existence' should be transformed into the concept 'struggle for co-existence', that is, we should understand that we live in one common home. Representatives of completely different religious and cultural traditions don't go along a royal road, get stumbled and run into hindrances, but there is no other alternative on this way towards each other.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Thank you. The remarks made by Farid Abdullovich show that the capital of our country lacks mosques. But there are other problems. We often speak about intolerance of some Muslims, and it can really be traced in certain directions of modern Islam. But do not forget about intolerance of other confessions, including the Orthodox. A couple of days ago Mr. Nassir Abdelaziz Al-Nasser, the Chairman of the General Assembly of the UN, a Qatari, got an honorary degree in the Institute for Oriental Studies. His visit included a trip to St. Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius. He was met by the archpriest, they had dinner together and the archpriest was telling about the Lavra. After that to my astonishment, on one of the Orthodox sites I read a very angry comment targeted against the archpriest. Further on there was a quotation from the Bible that heretics should not be admitted to the temple. The author of the comment recalled that some time before ambassadors from a Catholic state had visited Lavra and called on getting down with this disgrace. So, among our Orthodox fundamentalists there is a tendency of intolerance. These people consider that the concept of tolerance was imposed on us by the western liberal tradition, and that it is alien for Russia because it prevents from defending our spiritual values.

Another example. Some years ago there was a meeting between a number of important figures of the Russian Orthodox Church headed by the present his holiness Patriarch Cyril (the then metropolitan) and scientists. My colleague Ibrahim Taufik, a scholar of Orient Studies, and I were invited to this meeting. One of the topics of the meeting was the concept of the Russian Orthodoxy in relation to Islam. We did not go into the theological wilds; it was implied that the God was one for all — Muslims, Christians, adherents of Abrahamic religions. It seemed to be a simple issue, at least for me. However, we did not arrive at a unanimous conclusion.

And the last example, on of the problems related to migrations. In the late 1980s — early 1990s when religion experienced the re-birth in our country, we witnessed a great outburst of Muslim identity, i.e. identification of people subject to their belonging to the Islam religion. Many people began to go to mosques, where the service was conducted in Tartar, because most of Muslims in the central and eastern areas of Russia are Tartars. But today most of the adherents in the cities of central and eastern Russia are not Tartars and Bashkirs, but Uzbeks, Tajiks, Azerbaijanis who come from the outside of Russia, and also natives from the regions of the North Caucasus. There appears a collision concerning a language, and it is not just a philological one. The services are conducted in Russian, which causes a certain discontent of the Tartar adherents, because it is treated as a breakaway from the identity that is related to the usage of their native

language. So, we have plenty of problems, and it is not always easy to solve them.

And now I give the right to speak to my colleague Kostina.

A. V. KOSTINA¹: — Dear colleagues, the problem in focus today is everybody's concern; and this problem is not purely philosophical or sociological. Its nature is political and it has to do with community life within and among countries. Above all, I would like to specify the two terms that are highly current in our discourse — 'multiethnicity' and 'multiculturalism'. Multiculturalism, as a notion, has been in use in science and politics for about ten years. It was then when we used to decipher multiculturalism as multiculturalism, and that kind of understanding seemed appropriate. But, the term 'multiculturalism' actually represents some definite policies and practices to support ethnic minorities who are experiencing pressure from the majority. This policy was born in the successful post-industrial America. But, also, it was the time when migration was not an acute problem yet. The situation started to get worse as globalization was unfolding.

Usually, each country (even not so vast, like Spain or Sweden) is home to different nationalities. At the same time, it would be inappropriate to mention multiculturalism, because all these nations have a long history of side-by-side life in harmony through the use of some functional interaction. They were brought to this by their common goals — collaborated economical activities, defence against hostile neighbours. Such practices result in multiethnic enclaves that are long-term and that make up the foundation to such multiethnic states we are talking about today.

But practicing multiculturalism is quite a different story. It is precisely that what started with the unfolding of globalization, and is connected with migration waves, labour migration for the first place, and with the influx of ethnic communities that allocate themselves within national states and make up cultural enclaves outside a common culture. It was this very situation that gave rise to numerous comments from European state leaders; the most eloquent were Angela Merkel and Nicholas Sarkozy who indicated that making up some enclaves with their own cultural content within states was unacceptable.

A very true point has been made by some of the speakers here — misunderstanding starts from religion. I would rather use a wider notion of 'culture' instead. It's not only religion that hinders understanding, but also everyday traditions, mentality, habits — everything that contributes to the content of our life. And such misunderstanding,

¹ Head of the Chair of Philosophy, Cultural and Political Studies at Moscow University for the Humanities, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Associate Professor. Author of over 150 scholarly publications, including 26 monographs, study guides and teaching aids: *National Culture–Ethnic Culture–Popular Culture: 'Balance of Interests' in Modern Society* (Natsional'naja kul'tura–etniceskaja kul'tura–massovaja kul'tura: 'balans interesov' v sovremennom obshchestve), *Correlation of Traditionality and Creativity as a Basis of Socio-Cultural Dynamics* (Sootnoshenije traditsionnosti i tvorcestva kak osnova sotsiokul'turnoj dinamiki), *Cultural Policy in Russia of Today: Correlation of the Ethnic and the National* (Kul'turnaja politika sovremennoj Rossiji: sootnoshenie etniceskogo i natsional'nogo) (in co-authorship), *National and Cultural Identity as Problem of Development of Today's Russia* (Natsional'no-kul'turnaja identichnost' kak problema razvitiija sovremennoj Rossiji), *Russia as a Poly-Ethnic State: Peculiarities and Problems of Modern Development* (Rossija kak polietniceskoje gosudarstvo: osobennosti i problemy sovremennogo razvitiija), *The Crisis of Modern Identity and Dominating Strategies of Identification Within Ethnos, Nation, Masses* (Krizis sovremennoj identichnosti i dominirujushchije strategiji identifikatsiji v granitsah etnosa, natsiji, massy). Full member of the International Academy of Science (IAS, Innsbruck).

sometimes in everyday life, prevents us from becoming a single community. All mentioned above leads to one major question: is there any opportunity to unite? We say that a national state is a dated issue; universal human rights are becoming the basic world structure principle. Naturally, times are changing, and now we can ascertain the validity of these points. However, national cultures, basically shaped at the Age of Enlightenment, were being generated as formation that could unite people through common content. That is why I believe that national cultures are still a topical issue nowadays. Speaking about a national culture, I don't mean any particular ethnos. A national culture is based on nationality; therefore it comprises different kinds of content. Yet there are also common kinds of content. When Professor Bonnenberg stated that the nation states are becoming a thing of the past, he also mentioned that we need to rally. Nations and national cultures should discover things that will rally them. That is, say, two nations should find some third meaning, transparent to both of them. If it is a question of religion or national traditions, then there should be some points that are common for their confessions and traditions. And I believe it is an absolutely unacceptable situation when, within a single state, there are local groups that live by their own content which is not a part of a common national culture.

The foundation of modern national cultures differs from the 18th-century standards onward; however a common nationality urges all citizens of a country to pursue a common path. Therefore, let me recap it again, there should be something that would unite all. It can be simple symbols connected to a state history, or cultural figures important for a nation etc. The unity should be discovered in 'the third' element that unites 'the first' and 'the second'.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Our next speaker is Anatoly Andreyevich Gromyko.

A. A. GROMYKO: — It is so difficult to take the floor after a lady, because ladies are always more interesting than gentlemen. Why so? It is because women are just better than men. I will be speaking here on some of my concerns.

The honourable Ambassador Juan Antonio Marc said that a new paradigm should be worked out, that the 21st century is not the same as the 20th century. This is common knowledge. I agree with him: an update paradigm might appear, and we will have to work it out — together with governments, public organizations, scientists, politicians and diplomats. However, this scheme cannot be brand-new. We should borrow the best from what the collective mind of the past created. Is it only ruins of the world wars that we inherit from the 20th century? No! The 20th century has left us with the most democratic global organization — the United Nations Organization. The most democratic international charter is the UN Charter, because it holds the principles that cannot be demolished by any historic drama. These are the principles without which the mankind will perish. For instance, the principle to maintain international peace and security without the use of force — is democratic development of international relations possible without it at all? Or non-interference in the domestic affairs within the domestic jurisdiction of any State? The UN principles are closely uniting. Without them, international relations will dissolve, become chaotic and turn into permanent conflicts

between different parties. International law will actually disappear.

I share the point that history is a single process. It cannot pursue only one-way road forward. History can slow down, take a U-turn or a by-path... But history is the thing that we have to cherish. It should not only be a depressing factor, but also an inspiration. A new law and order should rely on international law. And international law is only possible without double-standard environment and with the principle of human rights priority applied to everyone. Adopted in 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is one of the basic 20th-century documents and should be observed by all states. The human race cannot progress when it doesn't comply with human rights. But when we put together 'individual' human rights and get the rights of thousands and millions of people, we also get the right of nations. And what is the fundamental right of a human and of a nation? The right to life! That is why, it is impossible for the rights of a couple or even a hundred of people to encroach the rights of thousands, when their life is put to danger.

Now I will get back to another topic that was touched upon before. Mister Guerra told us about migrants coming to France. Walking along the Elysian Fields a while ago, I noticed that the place looked absolutely different from the Elysian Fields I had seen 40 years before! It leaves a strange impression to see no ethnic French people on the central streets of Paris. Who can be against multiculturalism nowadays? But, excuse me, if Moscow stops to be a Russian city, by and large, I would feel somewhat unhappy. And this scenario is pretty realistic — Moscow is taking the same course as Paris.

I started my speech here with the 'woman issues' — it was no coincidence. One day about ten years ago, I found myself among the demonstrators under the leadership of Mr. Le Pen. The demonstration was taking place near the Louvre. Demonstrators were marching and singing French songs (which might have been nationalistic). All of a sudden, with a lot of feeling, they started the Russian 'Katyusha'. Apparently they believed that this song was in unison with their sentiment. What can I say? After Ms. Thatcher and Ms. Merkel, we might see a woman as President of France.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Thank you very much, Mr. Gromyko. I share your concerns. However, let us remember that ethnic Russians make up 80 per cent of Russia's population. This number is really high if we compare it with European statistics. Besides, a lot of us have roots of different origins. However, this is a different story.

And your interest to women has brought me and Piotr Dutkiewicz to a press-conference with our ex-Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin. A woman-journalist asked him: 'Mister Chernomyrdin, why didn't you have any women in your government?' And he answered: 'We had other fish to fry.'

A. A. MOISEYEV: — I have a little comment to make on the topic touched upon by Anatoly Andreyevich, — about the gradual disappearance of law and order and sovereignty. When we are faced with different offences, including criminal cases, we don't think that criminal code will vanish. The same is valid for international law. At

the same time, law is not a stiff dogma — it is changing, though not fast — the latest drastic changes go back to 1967. Nevertheless, the change is in process, and I have even highlighted the tendency today.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Mr. Dutkiewicz, you are welcome.

P. DUTKIEWICZ: — At the beginning of my speech I would like to tell you a few words about Canada. We are still in the experiment. Three groups — indigenous people, the British and the French — make up the core of the country's population. Nevertheless, immigration is going on, and about 40 per cent of the population are immigrants. Three years ago, at this very conference, Immanuel Wallerstein said dialogue is only possible between peers. No parity — no dialogue. In practical terms, in multicultural content parity has the only meaning: more weight and importance should be attached to minor groups of population.

I was surprised to find out the number of representatives of national minorities in the Parliaments of Canada and France: the French Parliament has no members of Libyan and Algerian origins; by contrast, representatives of national minorities make up about 15 per cent of the Canadian parliament. Besides, they are also encouraged to take part in business — they own 30 per cent of the country's businesses. They are also given privileges in education and employment, including different recruiting agencies. If we don't treat national minorities as our peers, we will fail.

My second point is about our common background — the point made by my colleague a while ago. Law and language are sacred. Immigrants to Canada must know at least one of the two state languages. Also, they must observe our law. The two of these conditions are default. We insist that no other laws, including Sharia Law, are possible throughout Canada. Canadian Law is also subject to change, since the social context itself is changing. Nevertheless, it is a fundamental requirement to observe the law.

There is that question that we often hear: where are we actually going? A lot of people really doubt that multiculturalism is worth the funds spent on this ongoing experiment — since mass media should be supported, immigrants educated, and national minorities privileged. All of these need funds. Can we afford to keep on spending money on these? This is a very complicated issue.

At the same time, there are concerns about closed diasporas being shaped in our country. Many Canadians believe that multiculturalism policy is in conflict with the concept of the single nation that it's washing off the feeling of nationality. Discussions of multiculturalism also bring a lot of doubts to the surface. Canadian model is said to be non-existent; there is a set of different ever-changing political techniques. Indeed, in the 1960s there was one policy in practice, while in 70s–80s — there was another. It has been changing for the last decade also. Nowadays, it is more focused on assimilation than it used to be. In 1960–70s the main problem on the agenda was to recognize the fact we actually had national minorities. In the second half of the 1970s, another issue became urgent — which policy to stick to in the sphere. Then, in the 1990s, the background started to emerge to peacefully coexist within one country. And there is no ultimate solution to this problem, only new challenges. How to block manifestations of extremism?

For different groups have both — fundamentalists and extremists; and, for the last three or four years, these problems have been most current. Thus, a powerful core should be shaped — that is the only way to block extremism and fundamentalism spread among immigrants.

Last year, at one of the forums we were discussing the issue of minorities. It was a bad surprise for me: the chairman of this forum, who openly declared his democratic views, hadn't invited the people who could propose something positive about multiculturalism. All the participants were speaking against minorities and multiculturalism, making references to Germany and France. In contrast, Australia, a very successful country this way, was never mentioned. Now, I will get back to Immanuel Wallerstein's words: speaking about minorities, we should consider the cultural aspect, and it should be a dialogue between peers.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Igor Fyodorovich, you are welcome.

I. F. KEFELY¹: — Dear colleagues, I would like to turn your attention to a possible model for multiculturalism, the model that I would call 'Eurasian'. This kind of model is being shaped within the Eurasian environment. Professor A.N. Nysanbayev illustrated this model with the case of Kazakhstan; and I totally agree with him. However, I see it as a vaster sphere, and I think, in our understanding of it, we should address philosophical and historical background that goes back to the Russian thinkers, who worked in emigration at the beginning of the 1920s in Sofia, Prague and Paris. I am referring to the Eurasians, who, from another angle, were watching Russia develop in a new Soviet format, and thinking on how this geopolitical space was fitting into the Eurasian frame. These thinkers were Pyotr Savitsky, Georgi Vernadsky, Nikolai S. Troubetzkoy etc.

As early as 1920, Savitsky in his 'Europe and Eurasia' introduced a new term 'Eurasia' and defined the frame of the Eurasian world and divided the whole Eurasian continent into three 'sub-continent': Europe, Asia and Eurasia proper. If we refer to the conceptual framework, introduced by Savitsky, Vernadsky and, later, by Lev Gumilev (who called himself 'the last Eurasian'), we may trace a certain sequence not only in philosophical and historical, but also in geopolitical thought. The notion of 'symbolic identity' used to describe geopolitical space (that had no special term attached to it in the times we are talking about), which was the illustration of multiculturalism. I would also like to remind you of Professor Akayev's words we heard yesterday — about the necessary and natural character of making the Eurasian union. This union, mostly keeping within the former USSR borders, will have to take into consideration the Eurasian model, introduced by the aforementioned scholars. As I see it, this model should

¹ Head of the Chair of Cultural and Global Studies of the Baltic State Technical University 'Voenmeh' named after D. F. Ustinov (St. Petersburg), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, honorary fellow of higher school of the Russian Federation. Author of more than 150 scientific publications, including: *Ideological Landmarks in Social and Cultural Space of Russia* (Ideologicheskiye orientiry v sotsiokulturnom prostranstve Rossii), *Destiny of Russia in Global Geopolitics* (Sudba Rossii v globalnoy geopolitike), *Philosophy of Geopolitics* (Filosofiya geopolitiki), *Geopolitics of Eurasia* (Geopolitika Evrazii), *Global Geopolitics* (Globalnaya geopolitika). Chief Editor of the 'Geopolitics and Security' journal (Geopolitika i bezopasnost). Member of Editorial Boards of the 'The Arctic and the North' journal ('Arktika i sever'), 'The Age of Globalization' ('Vek globalizatsii'), 'Bulletin of Moscow University' ('Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta') (series 'Globalistics and Geopolitics'), 'Social Humanitarian Knowledge' ('Sotsialno-gumanitarnye znaniya').

become the backbone of the culturological paradigm for a future Eurasian union. I think, this idea is being implemented, and we have no other options but to accept it. Therefore, all discussions on multiculturalism, or notions unfolded as integral conceptions and theories, should be dedicated to the making of the Eurasian union.

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Mr. Marin has the floor.

A. MARIN¹: — As far as our Conference is named after Dmitry Likhachov, I would like to remind you of some of his ideas about Bulgaria. In his address to the young people of Bulgaria, he said: ‘Remember that you are the most ancient European nation. You, Bulgarians, are not only what remains of the ancient culture. You are also a constituent part of the future. A modest nation like yours may become the cornerstone for Europe’s future culture. Remember that!’ I can only say, that this address was made in 1997, but those people who listened to Likhachov, seem to have forgotten his words. And some people didn’t hear him at all.

‘Bulgaria is the state of spirit’ — was the second point that Likhachov made. This spirit is made up by spoken and written language and literature — they used to save the state in hard times, when Bulgaria was invaded and enslaved by aggressors. And the third point. When asked a question about the mission of every nation, Dmitry S. Likhachov answered: ‘The nation that lives up with its traditions, remains independent and keeps its national traditions, is successful with its mission. And this nation also has respect for other nations.’ I think this is the most important part.

I am not an expert in cultural issues. However, as a person with experience in many spheres of social life, I believe it is great when such discussions take place among people with occupations not immediately related to culture, because when they discuss problems in a private circle of experts, they seem to isolate from reality and lose its touch. Therefore, prior to discussing a dialogue of cultures, in whichever sense, I would like to introduce another question: what is globalization? It should be clear, that we are talking about the globalization where we live and work. However, it is one story when globalization unfolds as the Americanization of the world, when the world’s system is being tuned up to a single state, the USA in our case. But it’s a completely different story, when globalization unfolds in a multipolar world with the dominating role of China, Russia, India, Brazil, Latin America, South Africa and the Arab world, and when the importance of any nation and state are taken into account. I was impressed to know that experts see a connection between globalization and the rate of national resistance in the conditions of identity crisis. Among other facts, it’s not a rare situation when foreign achievements are worshipped, while the achievements of one’s own nation are neglected and even abdicated. Under the pretext of globalization, the world and regional powers are organizing the system that suits them to the detriment of less powerful and smaller states and poor nations. If we pursue this path, we will have to recognize Napoleon and Hitler as the most prominent globalists of their times. Apparently, we speak on the globalization that preserves diversity. Can you imagine a dialogue of cultures if they have no difference? There will be not a dialogue but a monologue of a single artificial culture or civilization. Globalization presupposes equal rights. I believe

that the dialogue of cultures should be cultural — how could it be otherwise?

Now I would like to turn to the Bulgarian model for different ethnic groups to coexist. I do share the opinion that we should talk about a policy rather than a model. However it’s common practice in Bulgaria to talk about an ethnic model, meaning the practice of a certain policy. Our model works; we don’t have any clashes between ethnic groups. All of them are taking part in Bulgaria’s social life. However some insignificant episodes happen that are somewhat disturbing. Let me illustrate this with an example. Being the Vice President, I delivered a speech about the so-called ‘National Revival’ targeted at the change of Arabic names to Bulgarian. Some people did so voluntarily, some — under pressure. My speech happened to be on the day when Orthodox Christians ask for forgiveness. At this point I should say that at the end of the 19th century the city where I was born witnessed the clashes where 5,000 people, who rebelled to liberate Bulgaria, were brutally assaulted. I have blood relation to almost all of them. Later on they were canonized and beatified by the Orthodox Church of Bulgaria. However, giving my speech, I asked all the Turks of Bulgaria to forgive us for what they had to go through when they were forced to change their names. You cannot imagine what followed — I had no support whatsoever! Why should have I asked them to forgive us? They used to practise violence against us! After 500 years under the oppression of the Turks, we have granted them all privileges. What happened a long time ago is not the fault of the living; they cannot be responsible for that. Where will it get us if we see each other as the enemy every time? My story only shows that even when everything is calm and quiet, there is a lot to be done. We need patience, and the Bulgarian nation shows it.

I believe (and I’m not alone, I guess) that the dialogue of cultures is not the goal and is not the way, it’s only the steps to the world collaboration. I don’t mean to act as the advocate of politicians. They are often get quite fair reproaches. But we should confess that there are responsible people among statesmen. I had a meeting with Xi Jinping, China’s Vice President, and Nursultan Nazarbayev, Kazakhstan’s President. So, Nazabayev claims (and I agree with him) that partnership of cultures and civilizations is the highest form of collaboration to solve global problems. And this is the foundation for the 21st century multipolar world. I hope that the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference will contribute to our progress on the way. Good luck!

R. GUERRA: — I largely agree with Professor Gromyko and Piotr Dutkiewicz, my colleague from Canada. But I would like to remind you that France is the country that has always been trying to put no restrictions on the rights of immigrants; this country set an example of tolerance; it has always proclaimed and tried to follow the principles of mutual understanding and respect. French politicians and public figures have always believed that immigration is, by all means, a positive factor that enriches a host country. But still, can you say, why refugees from, for instance, East Asia make no problem, but get only respect and sympathy, and, at the same time, North African expatriates make so many problems? And in this respect, it’s significant that, despite the respect and interest to cultures of other countries,

¹ Public and military figure, Vice President of the Republic of Bulgaria (2002 — January 2012). Author of the book *The Last War*.

France has been showing for a long time, the situation with 'coexistence' of diverse cultures and their interaction in France is alarming. But I would like to express the hope that we will work it out eventually...

F. UNGER: — I would like to thank all of you for this very interesting discussion. We have participants from countries of different continents. Our topic — 'Dialogue of Cultures' — implies that a dialogue should be practised in the culture, in relations between nations and continents. I would like to make some comments. I will start with some facts from history. I come from Austria that used to be part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire for a long time. 46 languages were spoken throughout the Empire. German was the state language, but all people could speak their own mother tongue. It means that the state policy allowed people to live a comfortable life. In the 1880s, with the inflow of Muslims, that same policy was practised towards them. Austria recognized the Islam as an own religion. I believe this sets a good example for us today.

At the Conference, a lot has been said about the international law and order. As a doctor, I often have to deal with the international law, which does not often seem to be fair. I had a meeting with the Archbishop of Basra some years ago. He had to leave Iraq because he faced personal attacks from the environment. The Christians are seen as the foes by the Muslims, so the life of the Archbishop was endangered.

Yet another example. There is a wonderful country in Africa, with beautiful nature, rainforest and exotic fauna — Cameroon. But a lot of its rivers are polluted with oil waste and people cannot eat their own fishes — as basic ingredient of their diet. In this context Europe faces a lot of immigrants

from Africa in this connection too. The Europeans are taking their soil for their own products and are polluting the environment of Africa. What is happening? The white men make up disastrous waste diasporas. I believe, the basic thing to be done now is to work out international laws that will make life for all together possible. Thank you!

H. BONNENBERG: — Thank you very much for giving me the floor to end up our extraordinary discussion. I would like to speak on the basic issue which that labour has to be found, labour that creates valuable thing by entrepreneurs which makes up the core of any community. Entrepreneurs pay taxes; this money is used to create infrastructure, to render social services, to carry out any social activity. The basic problem in Greece, for example, is the lack of labour force for creating valuables for paying taxes and the existing of subsidized employment. If we turn to China, India, America or Europe, we will see a different approach to the same problem. Let me repeat it again, we need labour that produces values with the help of technology. I propose our next discussion should be focused on the issues how to develop education, science and technology — the cornerstone social problem, solving which will enable us to create labour to produce taxies. I suggest that we discuss these issues the next time we meet. Thank you very much!

V. V. NAUMKIN: — Dear guests, I would like to thank all the participants for most interesting ideas. I think we won't be making any summaries or adopt any statements. The exchange of views has been open and constructive — in the vein of the International Likhachov Conference. I believe it opens the doors of the next Conference, and I hope to see you here again and again.

INDEX OF NAMES

- Akayev A. A. 17, 24
Asadullin F. A. 40, 50
Astafyeva O. N. 40, 49
Bagdasarian N. G. 40, 45, 46
Bonnenberg H. 17, 29, 40, 55
Chang X. 17, 26
Dmitriyev A. V. 17, 38
Dulinov M. V. 17, 27
Dutkiewicz P. 17, 25, 40, 53
Gatilov G. M. 17, 21
Gromyko A. A. 17, 30, 40, 52
Guerra R. 17, 28, 40, 43, 44, 54
Guseynov A. A. 17, 22
Hajiyev G. A. 17, 23
Kefely I. F. 40, 53
Kleiner G. B. 17, 31
Kostina A. V. 40, 51
Likhanov A. A. 18, 33
Makarov V. L. 18, 27
Maksimov A. S. 18, 28
Marc J. A. 18, 36, 40, 48
Marin A. 40, 54
Michael of Kent 18, 20
Mironov V. V. 18, 32
Moiseyev A. A. 40, 42, 46, 52
Naumkin V. V. 40–46, 48, 50–55
Nysanbayev A. N. 40, 46
Popov V. V. 40, 41, 46
Prodanov V. 18, 37, 40, 44
Reznik H. M. 18, 33
Schneider E. 40, 43
Shapinskaya E. N. 40, 49
Smirnov A. V. 18, 38
Styopin V. S. 17, 19
Tolochko P. P. 41, 44
Toshchenko Zh. T. 18, 30
Tretyakov V. T. 18, 34
Unger F. 17, 21, 40, 55
Wiatr J. J. 18, 26, 41, 43
Xing G. 41, 45
Zapesotsky A. S. 17, 18, 20–39, 41
Zinchenko Yu. P. 18, 35

Scientific edition

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES UNDER GLOBALIZATION

Volume 2. Discussion materials
of the 12th International Likhachov Scientific Conference
May 17–18, 2012

(ДИАЛОГ КУЛЬТУР В УСЛОВИЯХ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИИ
XII Международные Лихачевские научные чтения
17–18 мая 2012 года
Том 2. МАТЕРИАЛЫ)

Выпускающий редактор И. В. Петрова
Художественное оформление В. Б. Клоков
Технический редактор А. Ю. Ванеева

ISBN 978-5-7621-0694-8



9 785762 106948

Подписано в печать с оригинала-макета 02.08.12. Формат 60x90/8
Гарнитура Schoolbook. Усл. печ. л. 7. Тираж 300 экз. Заказ № 82

Санкт-Петербургский Гуманитарный
университет профсоюзов
192238, Санкт-Петербург, ул. Фучика, 15