

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 AND PARTNERSHIP OF CIVILIZATIONS THE MAKING OF A GLOBAL CULTURE

Volume 2. DISCUSSION MATERIALS
OF THE 10TH INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

May 13–14, 2010

*The Conference is held in accordance with
the Decree of President of Russia V. V. Putin
“On perpetuating the memory
of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov”
N° 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 18th in number
and the 10th in the status of the International
Likhachov Scientific Conference*



St. Petersburg
2010

ББК 72

Д44

Scientific editor of the discussion materials of plenary session

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

Scientific editor of the discussion materials of the workshop 1

A. V. Yakovenko, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador

Recommended to be published by the Editorial and Publishing Council of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, minutes No. 18, dated from 02.07.10

Д44 **Dialogue of Cultures and Partnership of Civilizations: the Making of a Global Culture. Vol. 2 : Discussion materials of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 13–14, 2010, St. Petersburg :** SPbUHSS Publishers, 2010. — 64 p., il.
ISBN 978-5-7621-0572-9

The digest presents the proceedings of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference that took place on May 13–14, 2010, in Saint-Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences in accordance with the Decree of V. V. Putin, the President of the Russian Federation “On perpetuating the memory of D. S. Likhachov”.

The Conference was attended by prominent Russian and foreign scientists, academicians, and corresponding members of the Russian Academy of Sciences and Russian Academy of Education, and namely O. T. Bogomolov, A. A. Guseynov, V. A. Lektorsky, A. G. Lisitsyn-Svetlanov, V. L. Makarov, E. I. Pivovarov, M. B. Piotrovsky, V. S. Styopin, A. S. Zapesotsky, N. D. Nikandrov (President of RAE), and many others, heads of academic institutions, and research centers; famous politicians, public officials, clerisy representatives, and namely a writer D. A. Granin, Chairman of the Central Election Commission of the Russian Federation V. Ye. Churov, Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia M. V. Shmakov, Deputy Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation A. A. Golutva, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation A. V. Yakovenko, Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO E. V. Mitrofanova and many many others. The digest also presents speeches of distinguished historians, men of law, economists, diplomats from every corner of the globe; among the guests from abroad are Rolf Torstendahl, a member of the European, Swedish and Norwegian Academies, Rene Guerra, a French Slavist, Armand Cless, the Director of the Luxemburg Institute for European and International Research, etc.

The speeches of the 10th Likhachov Conference participants are devoted to the burning issues of a modern age. These are the establishment of a global culture, world’s economics trends, and globalization of education, labour relationships, international law, and modern mass-media.

A digest represented by the Conference participants has been separately published in English before.

The role of the Conference was highly estimated by President of the Russian Federation D. A. Medvedev, who has pointed out that the scientific results and “recommendations will be practically applied and serve for realization of attractive International projects in the field of humanitarian sciences”.

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



**GREETING OF PRESIDENT
OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION
DMITRY MEDVEDEV
TO THE PARTICIPANTS
OF THE INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV
SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE**

**To the hosts, participants and guests
of the 9th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

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. A. MEDVEDEV

May 13, 2009

**To the participants and guests
of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

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. A. MEDVEDEV

May 12, 2010

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

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

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

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

V. Putin

President of the Russian Federation

May 21, 2001



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

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

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

V. Putin

President of the Russian Federation

May 20, 2004



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

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

V. Putin

President of the Russian Federation

May 25, 2006



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 Sergeyevich 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.

V. Putin

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

May 22, 2008



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!

V. Putin

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

May 11, 2010

COMPLIMENTARY SPEECHES TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE 10th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

To the participants and guests of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

Dear Friends!

I'd like to extend my cordial congratulations to you with the opening of the remarkable scientific Forum!

The best representatives of the cultural and scientific world of our country meet in St. Petersburg these days. Famous scientists, teachers, politicians from different countries are taking part in the Forum work. This event is extremely pleasant for me because it is connected with the name of Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov who is deeply respected by me, and because the Forum is taking place in my beloved St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. Exactly here 15 years ago the academician Likhachov with the group of his colleagues, the University scientists, has created the document — The Declaration of the Rights of Culture. And the debates today are about the culture protection, protection of the different national cultures. We cannot divide people, ethnoses, cultures into the top-quality and the second-grade groups. All cultures and nations are equal in the world. The keynote of the Conference are tolerance and comprehension of global problems.

I believe that discussions at the Conference will be interesting and useful. I sincerely wish to all participants of the Conference the optimistic mood, wonderful state of health, carrier achievements and long life!

Film Director, People's Artist of the USSR, Doctor *honoris causa*
of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences
E. A. RIAZANOV

To the participants and guests of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen!

On my opinion the International Likhachov Scientific Conference that has been holding in St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences annually became one of the most large-scale and resonant event in the calendar of the world scientific and cultural élite.

I do not know any other scientific forum holding in our country, that would gather such impressive, really all-star participants, forum that would investigate such multi-faceted and complicated problems of the modern world.

The humanistic spirit of the Likhachov Conference is very closed to me as well as it's social significance, respectful attitude to different scientific and social opinions.

It is pleasant to note that year in year out problems concerning modern art development are discussing at the Conference from different points of view — the culturological, economic, legal.

I wish to the Conference participants constructive work, prosperity, success and happiness!

Art Director of the St. Petersburg State Academic Ballet Theatre, People's Artist of Russia,
Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences
B. Ya. EIFMAN

To the organizers, participants, and guests of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

Dear organizers, participants, and guests of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference!

I am happy to see you, scientists, politicians, cultural and art figures, representatives of public authorities arrived from various cities, universities, and scientific centers of Russia and elsewhere for the sake of discussing a series of focal and complicated issues.

This dignified scientific Forum constantly takes place in the native city of our prominent Russian academician, D. S. Likhachov, with a venue at the Saint-Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences.

I am sure that the integration of science and culture, technical and humanitarian knowledge should enable to thoroughly and constructively approach the solution of the issues faced by Russia and world community in the XXI century.

I really hope that the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference greatly contributes to the implementation of the D. S. Likhachov's cultural and intellectual wealth, searching for appropriate responses to the challenges of the modern age, creation of a required scientific source for the further progressive development of our country.

I wish you fruitful work for the benefit of Russia and expansion of the International cooperation!

Chairman of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation
B. V. GRYZLOV

To the Organizing Committee of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

Dear colleagues!

I am glad to greet the organizers and participants of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference!

It has been a cherished tradition to conduct the Scientific Conference named after the academician Likhachov at the Saint-Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences. The Conference that was personally pioneered by Dmitry S. Likhachov both favors the memorization of the remarkable scientist, and presents a significant scientific and social event.

The humanitarian and cultural context of the wide range of modern universal issues to be typically discussed at the Conference guarantees their successful settlement. The gradually expanding scope of the Conference, as well as national and international participation of scientists, politicians, cultural and arts figures, indicates constant growth of their potential for the solution of theoretical and practical tasks.

I wish fruitful work, interesting communication, and every success to the participants of the Conference!

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

To the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Saint-Petersburg Intellectuals Congress, Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, academician A. S. Zapesotsky

Dear mr. Zapesotsky!

On behalf of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation I would like to greet you personally, and the organizers, participants, and guests at the opening of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

The name of the academician Likhachov is intimately connected with the history and culture of Saint-Petersburg. Today we do understand that the Russian culture would have been different without D. S. Likhachov, an influential thinker, researcher, and cultural figure who played an essential role in the destiny of Saint-Petersburg. Dmitry Likhachov diligently strengthened the priority of culture in the public as a supreme value, as a sense of a personality, folk, country to exist. He believed in antecedenence, and in some specified sense in materiality of the Word; he also reasoned the truth of this belief during all of his life and with all his efforts. We owe to Likhachov the rescue of many cultural monuments.

This Forum is a remarkable continuation of his Concept of life, significant contribution to the Russian culture and science. It pays tribute to the prominent Russian scientist, and gives compliments to the value and perspective of his humanistic ideas. Moreover, it is a deeply ingrained tradition of an annual address to the memory of the symbolic image of a Citizen and a Scientist.

It is also crucial that the Conference really contributes to the development of a dialogue between different cultures and cooperation of civilizations.

I wish fruitful work, interesting meetings and all the best to the participants of the Conference.

Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation
A. A. AVDEEV
May 12, 2010

To the Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the Conference, academician A. S. Zapesotsky, participants, and guests of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

Dear participants and guests of the Conference!

Congratulations on the opening of the unique scientific forum at the Neva Riverside that has become a tradition!

It is the tenth time that the Conference takes place! This Anniversary is especially important today when the country is keenly seeking for innovation ways of its further modernization. In this respect the role of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference is hard to exaggerate. The topics of the plenary meeting and sections of the Conference precisely reflect the most urgent issues of our development. The discussion of these issues by the participants of the Conference will undoubtedly facilitate their settlement.

Our Ministry is looking forward to introduction of the findings and recommendations of the Conference in relation to the further development of the cultural dialogue to the activity of the Conflict Management Faculty established last year in the Saint-Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences by the order of the Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation, V. V. Putin.

I hope, indeed, for the strengthening of the cooperation between the Ministry with the Saint-Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences that was progressing during last years. I wish new achievements to the participants of the Conference!

Health and Social Development Minister of the Russian Federation
T. A. GOLIKOVA

**To the organizers, participants, and guests
of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

I am sincerely glad to see the organizers, participants, and guests of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference!

The Likhachov Conference has for years been a unique 'platform' for the discussion and exchange of views on fundamental issues of the globe that touch upon main trends in the field of culture, education, humanities, and foreign politics. This is attended by prominent figures of the intellectual and cultural elite from all over the world.

Today, the world is facing a need to consolidate efforts of all responsible members of the International community in searching for efficient solutions to the common global challenges and threats. A positive and integrating agenda of the Conference strengthened in the international relationships backs up a priority importance of their harmonization on the basis of convergence and interpenetration of different economic and cultural styles.

The Russian Federation actively contributes to the development of comprehensive intercultural and intercivilizational dialogue. Our strategy is grounded on the centuries-old experience of peaceful coexistence of different confessions and cultural traditions. A need is obvious to combine approaches to the focal international problems with basic spiritual and moral values.

I am sure that the results of your discussions should support the efforts intended for elaborating coordinated approaches to the settlement of the today's actual problems.

I wish you successful and fruitful work, and all the best!

Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation
S. V. LAVROV
May 12, 2010

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, A. A. Kokoshin, A. B. Kudelin, V. A. Lektorsky, I. I. Lukinov, D. S. Lvov, 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, V. A. Tishkov, J. T. Toshchenko, V. A. Chereshev, A. O. Chubarian, N. P. Shmelyov, 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. Kineliyov, I. S. Kon, A. S. Kondratyev, V. G. Kostomarov, V. V. Krayevsky, A. A. Likhanov, 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, 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'.

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

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).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Decree of President of the Russian Federation 'On Perpetuating the Memory of Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov' | 3 |
| Greeting of PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION Dmitry Medvedev to the participants of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference | 4 |
| Greetings of Vladimir Putin to the participants of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference | 5 |
| Complimentary Speeches to the participants of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference | 7 |
| About the International Likhachov Scientific Conference (Information) | 10 |
| Plenary Session: DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND PARTNERSHIP OF CIVILIZATIONS: THE MAKING OF A GLOBAL CULTURE | 13 |
| PARTICIPANTS OF THE DISCUSSION: | |
| A. S. ZAPESOTSKY , Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Saint-Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, academician and member of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Education, President of Saint-Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, head of Philosophy and Cultural Studies chair, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Deputy Chairman of the Board of Rectors of Saint-Petersburg universities, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation, Honoured Actor of the Russian Federation..... | 14 |
| M. B. PIOTROVSKY , Chairman of the Saint-Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Director of the State Hermitage, Corresponding Member of RAS, Full Member/Academician of the Russian Academy of Arts, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor | 15 |
| V. S. STYOPIN , Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Scientific Supervisor of the Institute of Philosophy of RAS, Head of the Philosophic, Sociological, and Legal Section of RAS of the Department for Social Sciences of RAS, Head of the Chair of Philosophic Anthropology and Human Sciences of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Doctor of Philosophic Sciences, Professor | 16 |
| N. D. NIKANDROV , President of the Russian Academy of Education, Academician of RAE, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor | 18 |
| A. V. YAKOVENKO , Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador | 19 |
| Ye. I. MAKAROV , assistant of the Accredited Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the North-Western Federal District..... | 20 |
| A. A. GOLUTVA , Deputy Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Honored Arts Worker. Prize winner of the Russian Cinematography Academy 'Nika' | 20 |
| A. A. GUSEYNOV , Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute of Philosophy of RAS, Head of the Chair of Ethics of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Doctor of Philosophic Sciences, Professor, Doctor honoris causa of SPbUHSS..... | 21 |
| D. A. GRANIN , writer, cofounder of the Saint-Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Hero of the Socialist Labour, Honorary freeman of Saint-Petersburg, member of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation, Doctor honoris causa of SPbUHSS | 22 |
| A. Yu. MANILOVA , Vice-Governor of Saint-Petersburg..... | 23 |
| Yu. N. SOLONIN , Dean of the Philosophy Faculty of the Saint-Petersburg State University, Head of the Cultural Studies Chair, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Honored Science Worker of the Russian Federation..... | 23 |
| W. BERGMANN , Deputy General Secretary of German Academic Exchange Service, Professor, Ph.D | 24 |
| E. V. MITROFANOVA , Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO, Permanent Representative of Russia to UNESCO, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador, Dr. Sc. (Economics)..... | 25 |
| M. M. JOSHI , Member of Parliament of the Republic of India, Ph.D | 26 |
| J. A. MARK , Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation | 26 |
| V. Ye. CHUROV , Chairman of the Central Election Commission of the Russian Federation, Professor of SPbUHSS | 27 |
| M. V. SHMAKOV , Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, President of All-European Regional Council of Trade Unions of the International Confederation of Trade Unions, Honorary Professor of SPbUHSS | 28 |
| V. L. MAKAROV , Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of RAS, Dean of the Economic Faculty of the State Academic University of Humanitarian Sciences of RAS, Director and Organizer of the State Management Higher School of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Professor, Honorary Professor of MSU | 29 |
| A. G. LISITSYN-SVETLANOV , Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for State and Law (the Russian Academy of Sciences), LL.D., Professor | 29 |
| E. I. PIVOVAR , Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, President of the Russian State University for the Humanities (Moscow), Head of the Chair of History of the Near-Abroad Countries, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor..... | 30 |
| A. PEREZ BRAVO , Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the United States of Mexico to the Russian Federation | 31 |
| R. GUERRA , Head of the Chair of the Russian Language and Literature of the State University of Nice (France), Ph.D in Philology, collector and researcher, President of the Association for Preservation of the Russian Cultural Heritage in France..... | 32 |
| W. GIGER , Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the Swiss Confederation to the Russian Federation, Ph.D | 32 |

| | |
|---|----|
| R. TORSTENDAHL , member of the European, Swedish, and Norwegian Academies, Professor of the Uppsala University (Sweden), historian..... | 33 |
| M. KLESTIL-LÖFFLER , Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the Austrian Republic to the Russian Federation, Dr. Sc. (Philology) | 34 |
| O. T. BOGOMOLOV , Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Counselor of RAS, Honorary Director of the Institute for International Economic and Political Research (the RAS), Supervisor of the Research Project of RAS “Interaction of Economics and Society”, Head of the Chair of International Economics of the State University of Management, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor | 34 |
| M. G. DELYAGIN , Director of the Institute of Globalization Problems, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Class II Full State Counselor | 36 |
| M. SCHEUER , Director of the Secretariat of Alliance of Civilization of the United Nations Organization..... | 37 |
| V. K. MAMONTOV , President of Izvestiya Newspaper Office, OJSC | 38 |
| G. B. KLEINER , Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Deputy Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of RAS, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor..... | 38 |
| A. CLESSE , Director of the Luxemburg Institute of European and International Research, Doctor | 40 |
| A. E. KIBRIK , Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of the Chair of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Head of the Department for Linguo-Cultural Ecology of the Institute of International Culture of MSU, Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Honorary Figure of the Russian Higher School..... | 40 |
| I. PEČI , Doctor of Law of the Utrecht University (Netherlands)..... | 41 |

Workshop 1

NATIONAL STATES AND WORLDS INSTITUTES:

| | |
|---|----|
| TOWARDS THE MAKING OF A GLOBAL CULTURE | 44 |
|---|----|

PARTICIPANTS OF THE DISCUSSION:

| | |
|---|----|
| A. V. YAKOVENKO , Deputy of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador..... | 45 |
| E. V. MITROFANOVA , Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO, Permanent Representative of Russia to UNESCO, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador, Dr. Sc. (Economics) | 45 |
| G. ANASTASSOPOULOS , Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of the Republic of Greece to UNESCO | 45 |
| V. V. NAUMKIN , Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies of RAS, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor..... | 47 |
| M. M. JOSHI , Member of Parliament of the Republic of India, Ph.D | 47 |
| T. YAMAMOTO , Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Japan to UNESCO | 48 |
| T. A. ZHDANOK , Deputy of the European Parliament (Latvia), Doctor of Mathematics | 49 |
| K. MUSHAKOJI , Director for the Centre of Asia-Pacific partnership of the University of Economics and Law (Japan), Vice-Chancellor of the UNO University of Regional and International Research, Professor | 50 |
| V. V. POPOV , 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 Historical Sciences, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador | 51 |
| J. RADVANYI , Director of the Centre for French-Russian Research (Moscow), Professor of the National Institute of Eastern Languages and Civilizations (Paris, France), Doctor of Geography | 51 |
| P. DUTKIEWICZ , Director of the Institute of European, Russian, and Eurasian Research in Carlton University (Canada), Professor | 52 |
| J. de GLINIASTI , Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the French Republic to the Russian Federation | 52 |
| K. YAO YAO , Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Cote d'Ivoire to UNESCO | 53 |
| M. EL ZAHABY , Permanent Delegate of Egypt to UNESCO..... | 54 |
| F. PETITO , Professor of the University of Sussex (Great Britain), Doctor | 54 |
| M. SANAI , Director of the Centre of Study Russia and Eastern Europe in Teheran University (Iran), Member of the Kazakh Academy of Social Sciences, Professor, D. S. (Political Science) | 55 |
| M. TLILI , Founder and Director of the New York University Centre for Dialogues, Diplomat..... | 55 |
| M. KATAGUM , Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Nigeria to UNESCO | 56 |
| V. B. KUVALDIN , Head of the Chair of Social and Humanitarian Disciplines of the Moscow School of Economics of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Professor of the Moscow State Institute for International Relations (University) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, Doctor of Historical Sciences | 57 |
| O. SUEBSITH , Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Thailand to UNESCO | 58 |
| M. R. MAJIDI , Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran to UNESCO, Doctor, Bachelor in the field of electronics, Master in the field of management | 59 |
| V. M. DAVYDOV , Director of the Latin America Institute of RAS, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor | 60 |
| M. RAVA , Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Estonia to UNESCO..... | 60 |
| F. A. ASADULLIN , Head of the Department for Science and Relations with Public Services of the Russian Federation of the Moscow Islamic High Council, sheikh, Candidate of Philological Sciences | 60 |
| K. V. SHUVALOV , Ambassador-at-large of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, Special Representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia in cooperation with Alliance of Civilization, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador..... | 61 |
| P. ROELL , President of the Institute for Strategic, Political, Security, and Economical Consultancy (Berlin), Ph.D | 61 |
| INDEX OF NAMES | 63 |

Plenary Session

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND PARTNERSHIP OF CIVILIZATIONS: THE MAKING OF A GLOBAL CULTURE

Theatre and Concert Hall of SPbUHSS, May 13, 2010

Plenary session is conducted by:

- D. A. GRANIN** writer, cofounder of the Saint-Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Hero of Socialist Labour, Honorary freeman of Saint-Petersburg, member of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation, Doctor *honoris causa* of SPbUHSS
- A. S. ZAPESOTSKY** Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Saint-Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, academician and member of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Education, President of Saint-Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, head of Philosophy and Cultural Studies chair, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Deputy Chairman of the Board of Rectors of Saint-Petersburg universities, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation, Honoured Actor of the Russian Federation
- M. B. PIOTROVSKY** Chairman of the Saint-Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Director of the State Hermitage, Corresponding Member of RAS, Full Member/Academician of the Russian Academy of Arts, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor
- V. S. STYOPIN** Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Scientific Supervisor of the Institute of Philosophy of RAS, Head of the Philosophic, Sociological, and Legal Section of RAS of the Department for Social Sciences of RAS, Head of the Chair of Philosophic Anthropology and Human Sciences of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Doctor of Philosophic Sciences, Professor
- A. V. YAKOVENKO** Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador

Participants:

- W. BERGMANN** Deputy General Secretary of German Academic Exchange Service, Professor, Ph.D
- O. T. BOGOMOLOV** Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Counselor of RAS, Honorary Director of the Institute for International Economic and Political Research (the RAS), Supervisor of the Research Project of RAS "Interaction of Economics and Society", Head of the Chair of International Economics of the State University of Management, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor
- V. Ye. CHUROV** Chairman of the Central Election Commission of the Russian Federation, Professor of SPbUHSS
- A. CLESSE** Director of the Luxemburg Institute for European and International Research, Doctor
- M. G. DELYAGIN** Director of the Institute of Globalization Problems, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Class II Full State Counselor
- W. GIGER** Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the Swiss Confederation to the Russian Federation, Ph.D
- A. A. GOLUTVA** Deputy Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Honored Arts Worker. Prize winner of the Russian Cinematography Academy 'Nika'
- R. GUERRA** Head of the Chair of the Russian Language and Literature of the State University of Nice (France), Ph.D in Philology, collector and researcher, President of the Association for Preservation of the Russian Cultural Heritage in France
- A. A. GUSEYNOV** Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute of Philosophy of RAS, Head of the Chair of Ethics of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Doctor of Philosophic Sciences, Professor, Doctor *honoris causa* of SPbUHSS
- M. M. JOSHI** Member of Parliament of the Republic of India, Ph.D
- A. E. KIBRIK** Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of the Chair of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Head of the Department for Linguo-Cultural Ecology of the Institute of International Culture of MSU, Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Honorary Figure of the Russian Higher School
- G. B. KLEINER** Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Deputy Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of RAS, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor
- M. KLESTIL-LÖFFLER** Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the Austrian Republic to the Russian Federation, Dr. Sc. (Philology)
- A. G. LISITSYN-SVETLANOV** Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for State and Law (the Russian Academy of Sciences), LL.D., Professor
- Ye. I. MAKAROV** assistant of the Accredited Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the North-Western Federal District

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| V. L. MAKAROV | Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of RAS, Dean of the Economic Faculty of the State Academic University of Humanitarian Sciences of RAS, Director and Organizer of the State Management Higher School of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Professor, Honorary Professor of MSU |
| V. K. MAMONTOV | President of Izvestiya Newspaper Office, OJSC |
| A. Yu. MANILOVA | Vice-Governor of Saint-Petersburg |
| J. A. MARK | Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation |
| E. V. MITROFANOVA | Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO, Permanent Representative of Russia to UNESCO, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador, Dr. Sc. (Economics) |
| N. D. NIKANDROV | President of the Russian Academy of Education, Academician of RAE, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor |
| I. PEÇI | Doctor of Law of the Utrecht University (Netherlands) |
| A. PEREZ BRAVO | Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the United States of Mexico to the Russian Federation |
| E. I. PIVOVAR | Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, President of the Russian State University for the Humanities (Moscow), Head of the Chair of History of the Near-Abroad Countries, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor |
| M. SCHEUER | Director of the Secretariat of Alliance of Civilization of the United Nations Organization |
| M. V. SHMAKOV | Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, President of All-European Regional Council of Trade Unions of the International Confederation of Trade Unions, Honorary Professor of SPbUHSS |
| Yu. N. SOLONIN | Dean of the Philosophy Faculty of the Saint-Petersburg State University, Head of the Cultural Studies Chair, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Honored Science Worker of the Russian Federation |
| R. TORSTENDAHL | member of the European, Swedish, and Norwegian Academies. Professor of the Uppsala University (Sweden), historian |

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY¹: — In the name of the Organizing Committee I would like to greet all the participants of the Conference and wish good luck in our work. I would also like to remind that the history of this Conference started here at this University in 1993 on the initiative of a Great Russian and Soviet scientist in humanities, Dmitry Sergeyeovich Likhachov; before 2000 this Conference took place under the title “Days of Science”. It is important that it has traditionally been confined to the Days of Slavic Written Language and Culture, to May 24th, when we remember prominent educators, founders of the Slavic written language, holy Cyril and Methodius, Equals-to-the-Apostles. After the demise of the academician Likhachov me and Daniil Alexandrovich Granin addressed to the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin with a request to issue a decree on memorization of Dmitry Sergeyeovich Likhachov. And here is one of the decisions contained in the decree of Vladimir Putin in 2001 that reads as follows: to

¹ Academician of the Russian Academy of Education, member of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Education, President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Head of Philosophy and Cultural Studies Chair, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), professor. He is Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia; Deputy Chairman of the Board of Rectors of St. Petersburg universities.

Academician Zapesotsky is the author of over 1400 scholarly papers. He is a script writer and film director for more than 30 popular science films and for more than 300 shows on television. He sits on editorial boards of the journals: *Pedagogica* [Pedagogy], *Voprosy Kulturologiyi* [Issues of Culture Studies] and *Literaturnaya Uchoba* [Literary Education].

He was awarded the Russian Federal Government Prize in Education, Laureate of the Gorky Literary Prize. Decorated with Leo Tolstoy Big Gold Medal of the International Association of Writers and Essayists. He is Doctor *honoris causa* of universities of the USA, Ireland and the Ukraine. Dr. Zapesotsky in *Scientist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation and *Artist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation.

assign status of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference to the Days of Science at the Saint-Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences.

From the very beginning, since 1993, the Days of Science were conducted with the active participation of the Russian Academy of Sciences and Russian Academy of Education. Last four years the Conference has also been organized under the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. It also seems quite crucial to me to note that the agenda of the Conference has since then contained the International Likhachov Forum of Senior Pupils. Tomorrow, over 700 schoolchildren from different cities and towns of Russia will gather together here, at the Grand Theatre Hall, to participate in the All-Russian competition of school essays devoted to the scientific and moral heritage of D. S. Likhachov. Thus, the total number of the Conference participants is about one and a half thousand people, 50 of which are ambassadors of their countries with more than 20 ambassadors of different countries in UNESCO. 234 participants from 50 countries made their presentations that were then published in our digest. Of the participants of the Conference are over 50 members of the Russian Academy of Sciences and Russian Academy of Education, over 40 heads of large scientific and research centers from all over the world and over 30 chancellors of leading Russian universities.

Tomorrow we are expecting to have a very busy and interesting day with the meetings of 8 sections; each section is essentially a large conference on the topical humanitarian issues of today. In my opinion, we can be proud of the fact

that Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov's initiative, established at end of 1992, has now become a large-scale event. Dozens, if not hundreds of papers from the Conference digests are republished in Russian scientific journals.

I would particularly like to greet the representatives of mass-media present here who help us to popularize the Conference activities. Let me once again thank in the name of the Organizing Committee all the participants and wish them every success. The Jubilee X International Likhachov Scientific Conference is opened by the Chairman of the Saint-Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Mikhail Borisovich Piotrovsky. Please.

M. B. PIOTROVSKY¹: — Dear colleagues, I consider it an honour to open our regular Conference in memoriam of the academician Likhachov. We are happy that the Conference continues, and the precepts of Dmitry Likhachov remind us of what we still have not done, and it is even much to do. This year we have resumed the meetings of the Saint-Petersburg Intellectuals Congress since we felt like the time has changed, and there is a need of intellectuals who have a specific approach to what is going on in the country and all over the world.

Dmitry Likhachov left us one very important precept that we still have not realized. This is the Declaration of Culture's rights. We all know that this outstanding document continues a great Russian tradition that was commenced by the Roerich's (Rerih's) pact. The Declaration is devoted to a crucial issue, and namely privileges of culture, since culture should have special rights such as the other fields of activities. It is pity however that culture loses its privileges, while the recent laws simply evade these. There is a distinct and conscious abolition of cultural agencies' rights, and then of culture itself. Moreover, Law #73 on the objects of cultural heritage with amendments lobbied by the Construction Sector and destroying the essence of protective archaeology, notorious Law #94 on the placing of orders that does not allow for the peculiarities of cultural agencies, and the law on the autonomous institutions, all of these laws have the same ideological purpose, and namely to abandon competitive advantages of public cultural agencies over the other fields of activity, conventionally speaking, in culture. We all know what happens if there is no specified guarantees for culture. Particularly, the theatre transforms into show business. Meanwhile, it is only required to single out some cultural agencies. And we struggle for many new rules to bear an inscription with 'Except for museums, archives, and libraries' since the infrastructure of culture does not render services, but performs key public and national function in preserving and developing the cultural heritage. This principal difference is inserted into the Declaration of culture's rights, and I do believe we should seek for this to be completely understood.

¹ Chairman of the St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Corresponding Member of RAS, Academician of the Russian Academy of Arts, Director of the State Hermitage, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor. Author of over 200 research works; these are *On the Muslim Arts*, *Historical legends in the Koran*, *Koranic legends*, *Supermuseum in the time of the ruin of the Empire (museum as a evolutionary factor)*, *Muslim Arts: between China and Europe*, *Legend of the As'ade al Kamil*, *the King of the Himjara Kingdom*, *South Arabia in the Early Middle Ages*. Establishment of the medieval society, etc.

Deputy Chairman of the Arts and Humanities Council under the President of the Russian Federation. Chairman of the Russian Museum Union, Editor-in-Chief of the *Christian East Journal*, Chairman of the Guardian Council of the European University in Saint-Petersburg.

Two words that are being widely used at the moment are 'modernization', and 'innovation'. Fortunately, these correctly reflect the essence of events. But 80 % of words and terms that have recently become very popular, for example, names of political organizations like 'Ours', or of a rocket like 'Bulava' (mace in English), are linguistic blunders. A mace cannot fly!

Well, let me come back to the wonderful and precise terms 'modernization' (foreign word with a Russian ending) and 'innovation' (Russian word). It is clear that we need progress of technologies, but at the same time we should not forget about evolution of humanities. It is necessary to have some kind of a humanitarian Skolkovo. This is crucially important; otherwise no technology can ensure innovations. At the recent joint Presidium of the Cultural Council, Scientific Council, and State Council in Istra the President of the Russian Federation said that it was not known which fields of activities the today's junior schoolchildren would work in. This concerns approximately half of the junior schoolchildren. And we simply do not know which fields of industry, science, and culture are going to appear in one or two decades. Therefore, we do not know how to train experts. It is only possible if we develop a humanitarian component of education and parenting. Only culture can create people who are able to comprehend brilliant ideas and invent brilliant solutions. Culture teaches us that the geni are an ordinary part of the human culture, and that they should be surrounded by the infrastructures that culture can create.

Certainly, we are facing the XXI century, a century of a humanitarian knowledge, when arithmetic does not solve problems even in economics, where much depends on inspiration, esthetics and other similar categories. Culture and dialogue can scarcely be overestimated as a mechanism operating within culture since culture alone does not exist. This actually composes our main task and the precept left by Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov. We keep on discussing the topics that he touched upon. I would hope that we have achieved something in the practical sphere, but this is not enough just because the issues are sharp and should be considered from a wider viewpoint.

My presentation at the Conference deals with migrants as an element of dialog of cultures. The message thereof is that the state, society, and mass-media treat the issue of migrants, legal and illegal, welcome and unwelcome, with some hysteria. Turn on TV, and you will see it. It is a crucial cultural problem, indeed; the mankind has been evolved due to migration of people. There are positive and negative examples of the migration effects. But the main thing is that the today's world has become global, and this will stay the same due to migrations. I am very happy to see so many prominent contributors to culture here today. This means that we have a community that has done so many good things, and is able to act even better in future.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Dear colleagues, it was planned that the Jubilee Likhachov Conference should have been opened by the President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Yury Sergeevich Osipov. But a few days ago it was decided to conduct a meeting of the State Scientific Council today, and Yury Osipov should be there. Thus, the Russian Academy of Sciences is represented today by the academician Vyacheslav Semyonovich Stypin.*

V. S. STYOPIN¹: — Today we are discussing an issue of modernization, innovation, and cultural dialog in the context of global evolution. This is multidiscipline topic, where it is important in my opinion to distinguish priorities.

Modern globalization resulted from modernization processes, which originated quite long ago. These are related to the adoption of western technologies by the traditionalistic communities. Along with technologies, their parental strata of culture, which are transplanted into the traditionalistic ground, were inherited. In this connection I usually remind the Gertsen's statement concerning the first Russian modernization, or the Peter the Great reforms. Gertsen wrote that Russia reacted to the Peter's reforms quite distinctively. It responded thereto with a genius of Poushkin in more than a hundred years ago. This is really true. Collision of different cultures always causes innovation splash and great works of art.

Modernization shifts the traditionalistic communities to the path of anthropogenic evolution, preserving fragments of traditionalistic culture, and generating problems of their adaptation to new values. It was in the history of Russia, Japan, and China. These peculiarities can be recorded in the latest history of India, Brazil, and other countries where modernization processes are active.

When we talk about modern globalization, it concerns interaction of countries with different types of civilization. In addition, there are countries where traits of traditionalistic type dominate, and there are communities that generated anthropogenic type of evolution (West), and essentially progressed therein, and there are countries shifted to this way of evolution due to modernization processes (Russia, Japan, China, India, and partly Latin America).

Today, the anthropogenic type of civilization evolution defines the globalization strategy. And it is worth keeping in mind that it resulted in global crisis.

The globalization processes are developing against a background of escalation of these crises. Finding a way-out requires new evolutionary strategies. This, in turn, poses a question about the values that underlie the modern type of evolution and should be modified.

In this situation the dialogue of cultures undertakes some kind of a supertask that includes search for new value guidelines that would favour withdrawal from global crises.

It is possible to distinguish two approaches to the dialogues of cultures. The first is focused on defining the

common in the different cultural traditions. It is assumed that the presence of a universal component provides the dialogue of cultures. But the case is that the universal in different cultures has its own specific interpretations. It is fused with those strata of senses that characterize historical specificity of any cultural tradition. And the attempt itself to separate the common from the specific in culture collides with opposition since people identify themselves as a folk, ethnos, social group exactly in connection with the traits that differ them from people of another cultural tradition.

The dialogues of cultures in this approach imply boundaries of mutual influence where peculiarities of each culture should be recognized, and should find proper treatment. In this case the prerequisites for mutual understanding of cultures, but no possibilities of changing basic values separating cultures are perceptible.

The second approach to the dialogue of cultures defines boundaries of peculiarities contouring the unique identity of cultures as historically variable, and traditions — as reviewable. In this case the analysis concentrates on distinguishing trends of varying traditions. And in this connection a question arises on the formation prerequisites for growing points of new values as a condition of overcoming global crises.

In the modern changes of the globalizing world two interrelated processes are of key importance. These are scientific and technological innovations and economics. Therefore, it is crucial to reveal trends of varying basic values of the anthropogenic civilization.

The technological innovations vary the type of economic structure. At present these are defined by the status of the developing science. Main trends of the scientific and technological research are outlined when elaborating a package of convergent technologies (nano-bio-information and cognitive ones).

Objects of scientific research giving rise to the convergent technologies (nano-science, genetics, and genetic engineering, informatics, and cognitive science) are referred to as complicated autogenic systems. These systems include human and human activity as a component. I designate these as man-sized systems. Treatment of such systems assumes the identification of system developing scenarios and evaluation thereof from a viewpoint of threats and risks for the mankind. Such evaluation is made through socio-ecological examination. It is included into the procedure of scientific knowledge validation. An essentially new situation arises when the internal ethos of science is insufficient for realizing main purposes of the scientific research (creation of straightly true knowledge and accretion of such knowledge). It is necessary to additionally specify principles of scientific ethos through correlating them with humanistic values. This additional control does not only contradict the objective character of science, but also causes such objective character. In this case one of the principle values of the anthropogenic culture is adjusted, and this is the ideal of the inherent worth pertinent to technological innovations that always counters traditionalistic cultures where innovations have been controlled by the tradition and tolerated only within the tradition.

There was the time when the New-European science rejected pictures of the traditionalistic cultural world as contradictory to the scientific view of the world. But today

¹ Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Scientific Head of the Institute for Philosophy (the Russian Academy of Sciences), Head of the Department of Philosophy, Sociology and Law (the Russian Academy of Sciences) of Social Sciences Branch at the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of Chair for Philosophical Anthropology and Human Sciences at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), professor. Mr. Styopin is the author of over 400 scientific works, including 21 monographs: *Filosofskaya antropologiya i filosofiya nauki* [Philosophical Anthropology and Philosophy of Science], *Filosofiya nauki i tehniki* [Philosophy of Science and Technology], *Epoha peremen i scenariyi buduschego* [The Age of Changes and Scenarios for the Future], *Teoreticheskoye znanie* [Theoretical Knowledge], *Filosofiya i universalnyi kul'tury* [Philosophy and Culture Universals], *Novaya filosofskaya entsiklopediya* (v 4 t.) [The New Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (4 vols.)], *Filosofiya nauki: obshchiye problemy* [Philosophy of Science: Common Issues], and others. He is President of the Russian Philosophic Society. Member of the Council for the analysis of critical situations and drafts of governmental decisions under the Government of the Russian Federation. Mr Styopin is a foreign member of National Academies of Sciences of Byelorussia and the Ukraine, 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), a standing member of the International Institute (Academy) for Philosophy (Paris). Laureate of Russia's State Award in the field of science and technology.

when the science forefront is dominated by investigations of complicated historically evolving systems, new situations arise.

Usually I distinguish here three main points. First, Eastern cultures (just as a majority of traditionalistic cultures) always proceed from the notion that the natural world surrounding the human being is a life form, and not an impersonal non-organic field that can be replowed and reclaimed. A great while the New-European science treated such ideas as vestiges of a myth and mysticism. But after the development of modern notions of the biosphere as a global ecosystem it became clear that the immediate ambience really represents a whole organism which includes a human being. These ideas have already started to in a sense resonate with organismic images of nature pertinent to ancient cultures.

First, the objects that represent evolving man-sized systems require specific strategies of activity. These systems are endowed with synergetic features where non-power interactions based on cooperative effects are beginning to dominate. At the bifurcation points a minor impact can drastically change the status of the system, giving rise to new possible paths of its development.

Setting of an active power transformation of objects when employing such systems is not always efficient. When simply increasing the external power pressure the system can reproduce the same set of structures and does not produce new structures and levels of organization. But in a state of instability at the bifurcation points even an insignificant action, such a hit into a specific spatiotemporal locus can generate (due to cooperative effects) new structures and levels of organization. This method of exposure resembles non-violence strategies that were developed in the Indian cultural tradition, as well as actions in accordance with the Old Chinese principle 'wu-wei' that regarded minimum impact applied in accordance with the understanding and sense of the world as ideal.

Third, in the strategies of activity with complicated man-sized systems a new type of truth and morality integration appears. In the Western cultural tradition reasonable explanation was considered as the basis of ethics. An essentially different approach was typical of the Eastern cultural tradition. This treated moral perfection as a reason and basis for comprehending the truth. The same hieroglyph 'dao' designates law, truth, and moral way of living in the Old Chinese culture.

A new type of rationality which is presently being approved in science and technological activity, and immanently includes reflection over values resonates with the ideas about the connection of truth and morality so typical of the traditional Eastern cultures. New aspects of functioning science as a factor of the modern cultural dialogue appear.

Problematic situations effecting basic values of the anthropogenic culture arise today also in the field of international economics.

In the second half of the XX century the economically developed western countries faced a specific modification of capitalism, or a consumer society. Main principle of this society's economics runs as follows: the more we consume the better economics feels. The consumption gives rise to demand, and demand inspires a new phase of economic development. A retroactive system appears. Satisfac-

tion of demand generates new demand that promotes economical growth.

In the middle of the XX century the western market analysts, sociologists, and philosophers substantiated this principle as an expression of justice. The well-known D. Rolse concept compared the idea of regulating socio-economic disparity with increasing level of 'lower society stratum' consumption and possibility of pulling them up to the level of the middle class due to the new cycle of the social wealth accretion.

Market ideologists proposed mechanisms of increasing consumptive demand. V. Lebov, one of the researchers and propagandists of a free market, as far back as in the middle of the XX century wrote that we needed a specific system of human mind oriented to the increase of consumptive demand. Along with and within the expansion of advertisement, it is necessary to continuously change fashion for things. V. Lebov suggested changing the market propaganda in mass-media in a way to train people to consume, deteriorate, and replace things at an increasing speed. This is profitable for economics. By the way, today this setting has virtually been realized. Many producers of goods deliberately simplify technologies in order that goods faster deteriorate, and consumers have to purchase new products.

It is clear that such an economic system can evolve only through swallowing more and more natural resources and increasing scales of environmental contamination.

The second mechanism of increasing demand is related to the expansion of low-interest credits. This means life by installment, life on trust.

In the second half of the XX century crediting not only individuals, but also corporations, and countries gained in scope. The expanding currency exchange and stock jobbing have transformed money into a special commodity. An exchange intermediary of this new commodity, or a world currency appeared. This is the United States dollar. And the production of this new commodity has become a source of income. A huge money supply that is not supported by goods and services had emerged at the market. With increased emission of dollars and issue of government securities the United States of America have acquired a chance to credit themselves continuously increasing the level of consumption. And here we have a phenomenon of a superpower with a great military strength that lives by installment. Today, the debt of the United States is more than 11 trillion US dollars. Nevertheless, this state continues adhering to the policy of growing budget deficit through piling up expenses and ensuring the rise in consumption.

However, living on credit means living at the expense of the future generations. As a result, the principle 'the more we consume the better economics feels' is not fair any more. As a regulator of economic development it was legalized by the logic of the anthropogenic culture. However, today, this principle is being strongly revised.

It essentially underlies the transformation of the financial realm into a specific kind of economics that is not tightly connected to the production of goods and services. The modern financial crisis is generated by separation of these two spheres of economic life. And until it exists and deepens, crises will occur again and again.

The prominent futurologist, E. Laslo, in his book 'Macroshear' (Russkoe Izdanie — M, 2004) considers the principle 'the more we consume the better economics feels' as

a path to ecological disaster. He notes that new evolutionary strategies for civilizations should associate with refusal to this principle. But in that case a new problem arises. What such sweeping changes can bring? Here, a special analysis of those changes in the structure of modern economics that can be introduced by economics of knowledge, growth of information consumption and resources of new energy-saving technologies. It is important to notice prospects of introduction of new design into production. In accordance with this approach, a thing-commodity association is projected as a system that has a long-term qualitative core and its shell of renewing accessories that varies in accordance with changing fashion. Such an approach can result in serious resource conservation.

It is also important to analyze possibilities of varying financial market structure on the way of international control over world currency.

Of course, all these processes concerning fundamental principles of modern economics organization will affect culture. And we need a special analysis of what possibilities come to light through this scenario for enhancing the dialogue of cultures.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *I give the floor to Nikolay Dmitrievich Nikandrov.*

N. D. NIKANDROV¹: — The topic of my presentation reads as follows: Globalization and global culture: one myth gives rise to another. A lot has been written on globalization so that it seems hardly to add something. The earliest publications date back to the Classical times since even at that time cultural exchange took place. But in the middle of the XX century quantitative changes turned into qualitative ones, and today exactly this period is related to the actual beginning of globalization as a process that covered the whole planet and almost all fields of activities.

The concept of globalization was introduced by the American sociologist and politician, Daniel Bell. He said that ideology is necessary in spite of the fact that one of his books is titled as 'End of ideology'. It would seem that the scientist contradicted himself, but if you carefully read his works, it becomes clear that contradictions are absent. Those years when the concepts of globalization, ideologization, deideologization appeared, I studied different foreign languages. In order to listen to them in the original I was trying to tune in various radio stations in English, German, French, Italian, and Spanish. And even if I was not that interested in political and ideological issues I was an ordinary soviet patriotically-minded human, and

¹ President of the Russian Academy of Education, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Education), Professor.

Author of more than 300 scientific papers including the following books: *Russia: Socialization and Education at the turn of the millennia* (Rossiya: sotsializatsiya i vospitaniye na rubezhe tysyacheletiy); *Development of Values: Russia's Version* (Vospitaniye tsennostey: rossiyskiy variant); *Prospects of Education Development in Russia* (Perspektivy razvitiya obrazovaniya v Rossii); *Education and Socialization in Modern Russia: Risks and Opportunities* (Vospitaniye i sotsializatsiya v sovremennoy Rossii: riski i vozmozhnosti); as well as the following course books: *General Foundations of Pedagogy* (Obschie osnovy pedagogiki, with co-authors); *History of Pedagogy* (Istoriya pedagogiki, ed.); *Didactics of Higher Education* (Pedagogika vysshey shkoly); *Organization of Teaching and Education Process at a Pedagogical Institute* (Organizatsiya uchebno-vospitatel'nogo protsesssa v pedagogicheskom institute); *Introduction into the Speciality* (Vvedeniye v spetsial'nost').

Member of the Committee of the Russian Federation on UNESCO. Laureate of the Award of President and Government of the Russian Federation in the field of education.

arrived at a conclusion that once cannot talk about a single agitprop on a global scale. I never believed in the world government (and do not believe now), but it turned out so strange that not only many arguments, but also examples made in broadcasts often coincided. It was found that irrespective of the broadcasting country and broadcasting language there were definite messages mainly the same and concerning our country.

What kind of messages? The first is that the evil dominates over the good in the world. This effect is simply attained if the negative prevails in the flow of information, especially in brief news. The second is that our world is a world of violence, physical, military, sexual, psychological, and of opposition and competition. And this is natural. The third is that the sexual instinct really underlies everything. It is hard to define the rate of information availability, but in accordance with a pool of data we go in front of the whole planet in this respect. And also regarding the fact that many conclusions are drawn from this information, and they are not sexual at all. The fourth is that the cult of a beautiful life, wealth in general and money in particular is, of course, necessary. Education of reasonable needs is a communistic caprice, and supreme nonmaterial needs arise either as a result of tenuity or foolishness. The fifth message is that the market rules the world, and not only in economics, but also in the field of human relations. This is quite important that the attempts to project laws of one field of activity onto our whole being were made. The sixth is that the competition for benefits and resources is natural, and the mutual assistance and much less altruism are exceptions, the share of eccentric and holy persons with the main motto 'enjoy life to the full'.

The seventh message concerns Russian specificity. This is often the topic of Russian and foreign mass-media reports: Russian authorities of all levels do not care of the people, and are to a high degree corrupt. The Russian army, police, and all-level law enforcement agencies are anti-national, cruel, and venal. The civil patriotism in Russia was possible, for example, during the Second World War, but now the character of the people-power relationships is such that patriotism is not actually possible. The man's rights and freedoms in Russia are not protected and deliberately violated by the power and people relative to each other; this takes place more often than in so-called civilized countries. The clerics of the Orthodox Church in Russia have stained their good names in the past with the cooperation with KGB, and recently — with shameless usage of market mechanisms for obtaining profits, and at the same time the state unilaterally supports exactly the Orthodox Church. The development level of Russia is extremely low. There are fundamental contradictions between the CIS countries. The Russian power is also ineffective because the country is split, and there is an unconquerable contradiction between the centre and the regions, between the branches of government, and in the Medvedev-Putin tandem.

All these ideas are usually communicated proficiently in the following way: true — true — lie — truth. I personally disagree with the majority of these ideas. There is a so-called silent majority, generally quiet and relatively satisfied, and a noisy minority that can however impose its opinion on the majority and namely for this reason.

But in this case a question arises whether the global culture is really possible, and what we can expect in this

field. I believe that it is possible to expect a relatively peaceful coexistence both in the field of culture and human relations, partially as a result of globalization, intensification of exchange and communication, and partially due to the commonly accepted fact that if the accumulated destruction potential is applied, it will wipe everything off the face of the earth. No one will survive.

Thus, tolerance is quite important, and here we have a great deal to do. The dialogue of cultures is possible and certainly necessary. In this connection I would like to remind a witty remark of Bernard Shaw that says the following: if I have an apple, you have an apple, and we exchange our apples, each of us will have one apple; if you have an idea, and I have an idea, and we exchange our ideas, each of us will have two ideas. Accordingly, mutual enrichment of cultures is possible, but a real global culture — not. If a thesis on the global culture is followed to its logical end, we will arrive at the need of a global language. I am fond of the Russian language, have a fairly good command of some other languages, and believe that I have a right to talk about it. Well, movement towards a universal language is not only possible, but also undesirable, as well as the establishment of global culture.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Nikolay Dmitrievich. I think it is quite disputable. And now I would like to give the floor to Alexander Vladimirovich Yakovenko.*

A. V. YAKOVENKO¹: — Dear participants of the X Jubilee Likhachov Conference!

First of all, I would like to send greetings from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Sergey Viktorovich Lavrov.

The subject of the Likhachov Conference is interesting not only for the Russian external policy, but also for the international relationships in general. It is indicated by the fact that in addition to the traditional audience composed of great Russian scientists and politicians, this year the Conference is for the first time attended by the representatives of the UNESCO Executive Council headed by the President of the Council, E. V. Mitrofanova. It is important that the group of distinguished foreign diplomats accredited in Moscow has also arrived at Saint-Petersburg in order to commonly discuss the issues of cross-cultural dialogue.

Relevance of the Likhachov Conference is high. Some time ago we witnessed the onset of a large financial and economic crisis. And we all see that there is one more dimension where the world is interrelated, and search for the solutions of global problems in this world should be made jointly. Those threats that we are facing, such as terrorism, spread of drugs, environmental problems, and climatic changes, all demand consolidated responses. Since the bipolar directory of a cold war became a thing

of the past, the cultural and civilization diversity of the modern world has increasingly been asserting itself, it exerts an increasing influence upon the generating processes of modern, fair, and efficient polycentric system of global management. The same is perceptible in the United Nations Organization. The imperative becomes as follows: intercivilization harmony, coexistence of cultures and religious traditions, recognition of evolutionary model multiplicity, and equal rights for different systems of values. And if we acknowledge that the multiplicity of the governmental development trends exists, this can help us to find the desirable solutions.

The establishment of the multipolar world structure is accompanied by emergence of the intercivilization split risks, and increase of a conflicting potential on an ethno-confessional basis. Among the main reasons is the expansion of globalizing processes beyond the scope of the western civilization. As a result, the value qualities and evolutionary models have become the subject of competition within the intercivilization scope. And the statement seems not reasonable that the system itself and the competitiveness of cultures and civilizations contain seeds of discord. The world has never been homogeneous or uniform. It would seem that it consists in the protracted and morbid farewell of the West with the illusion of its eternal dominance in the world.

Under the conditions of globalization and in the face of new challenges and threats, the dialogue between folks is more than ever essential. This is clearly understood by UNESCO and UNO. This also emerges at our every Forum. With the advent of new technologies (we have already heard about that today) the globalization rate is accelerating. This means that the people of different cultures gain more opportunities to exchange opinions and ideas, to better learn each other, to study another way of thinking and another lifestyle. Globalization, however, can have an opposite effect, generating no transparency, but a feeling of rejection when the people start to push away those who is different, has other values and culture. This takes place when globalization is perceived as a threat of identity, especially in such an important field as religion; when people are found to be unprepared to new means of communications due to lack of knowledge and understanding of other cultures and beliefs. This causes intolerance and conflicts.

The religious differences should not become the factor of rejection. In this connection we support the approaches of UNESCO that pays equal attention both to freedom of expression and respect of religious beliefs and symbols in its programs and activities. Striving for the dialogue between civilizations, cultures, and folks underlies the mandate of this international organization. And we believe that the development of the dialogue in the name of peace and strengthening of the ideas of piece in human's mind, are the cornerstone of the UNESCO mission.

There is no doubt that we are verging towards so-called cultural globalization. Today, more and more countries are being involved into this trend. But cultural globalization occurs not only due to the technocratic world evolution, but also due to the cooperation between states, and increasing migration of people between different countries.

To conclude I would like to note that intercultural dialogue is an actual issue for every corner of the world. Intercultural dialogue plays an essential role for maintaining

¹ Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, LL.D., Professor, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador.

Since 1976 Mr. Yakovenko has taken various diplomatic positions in the central office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs including Foreign Policy Planning Department and Permanent Mission of the USSR to the UNO in New York. At present he supervises Russia's participation in international organizations, international law issues, international economic, humanitarian cooperation, as well as human rights.

Author of monographs: "International Space Station", "Progressive Development of International Space Law", "Current Space Projects: the International Legal Problems", "Space Projects: International Legal Problems", a series of articles on international law and foreign policy, co-author of the textbook "International Space Law" and others.

peace and safety in the world. The preventive potential of such a dialogue that can both preclude and whittle down the emerging international tension is high. I am confident that the international dialogue is a key instrument of peacemaking and peacebuilding. This dialogue is one of the conditions of progressive development of states and regions, just like a key to the successful decision of global human problems.

Many of the modern conflicts are not underlain by conflict or collision of cultures, religions, and civilizations. These are caused by misinterpretation and sometimes by unintelligent stereotypes. In certain cases this refers to a trend of using different cultural and religious stereotypes in the election platforms of political parties and movements in some countries. It is necessary to actively struggle for creation of positive image of different cultures and rejection of any negative label.

It is necessary to oppose attempts to associate individual religions or cultures with such global threats as terrorism and transnational organized crime.

Lack of options in organizing the international dialogue on the basis of principles of equality and mutual respect implies consideration of historical, political, religious, social, and other features of those participating in such communication. And, of course, recognition of universal values is an indispensable condition of successful intercultural dialogue.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Now I ask Yevgeny Ivanovich Makarov to speak.*

Ye. I. MAKAROV¹: — Let me first read out a telegram of the President of the Russian Federation to the address of the participants and guests of the today's event:

'Dear Friends! I am sincerely pleased to see you in Saint-Petersburg and send my compliments towards the opening of the X Jubilee Likhachov Conference. This forum traditionally brings representatives of scientific and arts communities, famous politicians, and experts from Russian 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. A. Medvedev'.

On this occasion, staying at the platform now I would also like to add some words to the address of the Saint-Petersburg Intellectuals Congress and University of Humanities and Social Sciences. From year to year the Likhachov Conference becomes more and more important for discussing humanitarian ideas, having stepped over the boundaries of the city, being not only All-Russian, but also international. It is indicated by the ambassadors from UNESCO attending the today's Conference. I would like to thank the organizers of the Conference who really do their best to im-

part the ideas of Dmitry Sergeyeovich Likhachov a complete and well-organized image that does not seem easy under the modern conditions of the world crisis. Look, how careful and diligent they are preparing publication of presentations, and how these become available for the participants before the Conference has started. It should be noted that the technological findings which are being used in preparing and conducting the Conference can really be regarded as an example of careful approach to the implementation of the Presidential Decree 'On memorization of D. S. Likhachov'. I would like to thank the University of Humanities and Social Sciences and the Saint-Petersburg Intellectuals Congress for your efforts.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Now I am calling Alexander Alexeevich Golutva.*

A. A. GOLUTVA²: — I cannot but comment on the speech of Mikhail Borisovich Piotrovsky. He has touched upon a serious problem related to the amendment of the Russian legislation and effect thereof on the activities of the cultural agencies, and on the whole national culture. Indeed, it is facing a serious problem that demands comprehension and support on the part of national scientific and cultural community. There is a trend (and quite reasonable) towards the standardization of our lifestyle. And the associated procedures should also be standardized. The more carefully this is formulated the easier control over all the processes of economic and social evolution will be in our country. But there is such a notion like a 'limit', and at a given time the aspiration to standardization enters into contradiction with the peculiarity of cultural activity. The limit is destroyed to such a degree that the interests of culture become depressed. Mikhail Borisovich has mentioned a series of laws where we face this phenomenon. Unfortunately, the efforts of the Ministry of Culture do not always give desirable results. The cultural community is uncoordinated, and by no means properly and adequately responds to these challenges. Due to weak support our culture sustains a defeat. This problem should be carefully addressed, especially as the trend we are talking about contradicts with the overall trend of the world evolution that concerns increasing role of culture in the settlement of global civilization problems.

We state an increasing role of culture in the modern society and, naturally, approach the nuclear problem of the Conference, the dialogue. At present the cultural potential is activating in all social groups, and the dialogue is crucial. The dialogue is a new basis for the interaction both between people, and between civilizations. It is a means of opening their cultural potential. It is especially relevant for the multinational Russia. When we talk about the increasing role of culture, about the ideology replaced by culture, and about a need of dialogue, we should not confine ourselves only to the Russia typical of the splitting time of the old political system at the end of the XX century. Our country is an important unit in the world cultural process. The emergence of the Bolshevik ideology was in many aspects caused by the transition of the mankind from pre-industrial to industrial civilization. In Russia this transition was known to be retarded. The decomposition of the traditional society resulted

¹ Assistant of the Accredited Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the North-Western Federal District.

² Deputy Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Honored Arts Worker. Prize winner of the Russian Cinematography Academy 'Nika'.

in the mass scale of all social life manifestations. The unprecedented discord has generated the solution of the issue of communal solidarity on the supranational and transpersonal basis.

Today, the world is facing the situation of a new transition to the post-industrial civilization. And again the problem of communal solidarity becomes actual for all the folks and civilizations. First of all, it should be acknowledged that virtually globalization is a necessary and organic process for history that started not today and not yesterday. Many feel the threat of globalization because it tends to return everybody to the supranational unity typical of the epoch of totalitarian regimes. Due to the spread of western standards, including those for consumables, and daily life conditions differences in external manifestations of life are erased. Unification and diversity are opposite and threaten each other. But does globalism really present a fatal threat to culture if understood this way? Everyday life is the most conservative keeper of cultural traditions, but it possesses its own creativity. Creativity consists in free choice of lifestyle, in how one can furnish his home, cook dinner, which suit one can buy, etc. Freedom of choice is an obvious value of democratic society. But freedom also consists in refusing the traditions that a man and a society accept as unviable. So, in the modern world (I can clearly see it by the example of Russia) we are increasingly encountering a phenomenon when the free choice results in favoring western standards of life, pragmatic values which are born by global market by means of advertising, hypermarkets, etc.

I believe that globalism is mainly promoted by lack of education or human insensibility in cultural respect. A man sensible to culture always asks himself about the sense of any phenomenon, including that is presented as a brand-new thing of the western civilization. Culture itself varying towards pragmatism if it takes place freely throws no scare, but globalism will pose a real threat if national humanitarian education where education on the field of arts should play an important role decays. Exactly this is the guarantee that society preserves the capability to create unique cultural values. This is also the guarantee of respect for the cultural traditions, capability to recognize and preserve timeless values.

Introduction of different cultures into the single sphere of communication is a noble purpose, and this is what we should see in the process of globalization. But the drama of the modern epoch consists in divergence between actual globalization and this purpose. Why is such deviation possible today? In my opinion it is related to the absence of a dialogue between the conflict-inducing civilizations. At the beginning of the XXth century, Oswald Spengler made an attempt to comprehend the fact that the universal interaction of civilizations follows the principle of not a dialogue, but monologue. We have forgotten that the First World War, in the opinion of the contemporaries, was a respond to another violent phase of globalization as westernization. The turn of the XIX and XX centuries seems to have indicated the onset of a quite optimistic epoch, realization of classical ideas of humanism and freedom which the West imagined to be the heir to. It seemed that the world was more than ever uniform. Are we in the same situation right now? The scientists wrote that the XIX century was the time of transition that brought the mankind to the threshold of a new uniform world. But why did this noble-aimed unification

process result in a terrible conflict and destruction? Probably the case is that globalization that should have evolved in the form of dialogue when every civilization preserves its voice and freedom of expression in reality occurred in the form of monologue? We should never forget about the following danger: monological nature of the international cultural policy is fraught with imperial sets which can cause conflicts.

But if we get back from political models to culture, it is against all odds necessary to continue performing our heavy duty on the basis of a belief that only culture can help every nation to attain its true self-expression and dialogue between different civilizations. Any suppression of the national cultural development is fraught with conflicts. Activity of cultural and academic figures strives for a noble aim as to deepening into unique cultural worlds of every nation, into examination and advocacy thereof. It is necessary to breach those mental barriers that accompany the monologism of great cultures. Exactly this circumstance should favor the strengthening of a dialogue within globalization; this is the recipe for success of that great movement of the mankind towards the unity that nowadays seems to be a universal and global process. And this is the mission that we who are more or less involved in the development and preservation of culture should be perceived in its entirety.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you very much, Alexander Alexeevich. I give the floor to Guseynov Abdusalam Abdulkermovich.*

A. A. GUSEYNOV¹: — Our Conference is devoted to the establishment of global culture, and it seems to me that one could hardly invent a sharper and cockier formulation. Now I would like to dwell on the term ‘global culture’, its legitimacy, and conceptual fullness, especially because the academician Nikandrov clearly formulated his attitude of impossibility of global culture. When the subject of our today’s meeting was already defined, and my mind was geared up for the topic, I stumbled across the essay of Victor Hugo ‘Paris’ written for the opening of the World fair that took place in Paris in 1867. Earlier I did not know about this essay, and was highly impressed with it. Let me read some extracts aloud. *Citing*

‘An extraordinary nation will exist in the XXth century. This will be a great nation that is still able to be free. It will be a celebrated, rich, intellectual, and peaceful nation amicable towards the rest of the world. It will be more than a nation, it will be a civilization. It will be better than a civilization. It will be a universal family. Common language, common money, and common code of laws. There will be no fetters. Everywhere is seeking for a universal pattern.

¹ Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for Philosophy (the Russian Academy of Sciences), Head of Chair of Ethics at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), professor, doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. Author of more than 400 publications including: *Sotsialnaya priroda npravstvennosti* [Social Nature of Morality], *Zolotoye pravilo npravstvennosti* [The golden Rule of Ethics], *Velikiye moralisty* [The Great Moralists], *Yazyk i sovest'* [Language and Conscience], *Filosofiya, moral', politika* [Philosophy, Ethics, Politics], *Antichnaya etika* [The Ethics of Antiquity]. Managing editor of the yearly *Eticheskaya mysl* [Ethical Thought], editor of a series ‘Biblioteka eticheskoy mysli’ [The Library of Ethical Thought], editor of *Social Sciences* journal (the English edition), member of the editorial board of journals: *Filosofskiy nauki* [Philosophical Sciences], *Voprosy filosofiy* [Issues of Philosophy], Vice-President of the Russian Philosophical Society. Laureate of Russia’s State Award in the field of science and technology.

Forthcoming light is near, and this is the great hope of our whole life. Hurry up to catch sparks from the all-absorbing fire of progress. It will be called 'the Single Europe' in the XX century, and afterwards, in a few hundreds of years it will be more transformed and called 'the Humanity'. It is a marvelous and blood-stirring phenomenon, a nation that is a nation no more, but something dissolved in brotherhood. Oh, France! Adieu! You will be France no more, you will be the Humanity. You will be France no more, you will be omnipresent. Resign to your immensity. Adieu, my people! I welcome you, a man!⁷

As I can understand, it was a universal belief in the second half of the XIXth century and at the beginning of the XXth century. It should be recognized that Victor Hugo is a great romanticist of the Age of the Enlightenment, a vocal of the French Revolution, had such an influence in the world that no other cultural figure has ever attained. It is amazing how his genius was sadly mistaken! The XXth century went in a diametrically opposite direction. Our life is founded on the following: incredible globalization in the field of economics, technology, communication medium, and information networks is accompanied by increasing isolationism in the field of culture, boom of identities, return to archaism, in some respect even to the Medieval. And it is not clear how to overcome this discrepancy that is able to blow up our civilization.

We say that the dialogue of cultures seems to be the way-out. Dialogue can surely reveal common foundations for different cultures, demonstrates possibilities of their mutual enrichment, interaction. It represents a real alternative to the apocalypse of the civilization conflict. But it does not withdraw the rupture we are talking about. Dialogue is a process of recognizing the difference of cultures as well. Dialogue even enhances this recognition of differences, and reveals such 'pages' in cultures that cannot be interpreted into another language, reveals individuality and self-identity of every culture. Culture associates with cult. Dialogue of cultures is good and essential for the approval of the cultural diversity, but it cannot result in creation of one culture. Here arises a question: What about the further evolution? What a global man will be like not as a subject of economics, technology, scientific and technical advance, but as a subject of free activity in his humanitarian practice? From the one hand, I agree with the academician Nikandrov in that global culture is impossible. It seems like culture is treated as a phenomenon of the kind that cannot exist in the singular, as well as states and nations. Thus, one can admit that global culture is impossible. But on the other hand no one can do without it! It is necessary (and generally speaking it is really visible) that the prospect of global human community establishment exists, and it concerns human existence and awareness beyond the above-mentioned scope of economics, technology, etc. I think it would be reasonable to name this new global community not a 'Global Culture', but a 'Global Superculture' (or postculture/ metaculture). This is a tiny change, and it may seem that I am dipping into scholasticism, but it changes much. And namely, if we use the term 'superculture' (in the absence of a better one), we at least record that this global community emerges not instead of cultures which enter into a dialogue between each other, but is built over them. It does not demolish the existing cultures in their diversity, but somewhat supplements them, emerges as a new reality.

I can judge that this kind of movement of a humanitarian practice is a normal approved way by the following analogy. It is known that at the very beginning of history human communities grouped on the principle of blood relations. Kin, a big family was the basis. Then, consolidation took place on the other, territorial, principle, and family and kin lost its function as a basis, giving the way to a nation united by other relations. But the transition to a higher level of human community, folks and nations did not withdraw the preceding stage of the kindred people consolidation. Family as a form of community did not disappear; it exists within people, and being modified as a minor family still remains one of the most important motivating forces of our behavior. Just as the multiplicity of families does not prevent people from being united as members of a common nation, common nationality, one can think about such a possibility when the multiplicity of national cultures can and should combine with a kind of single supercultural community that is going to become global. And this can be named 'Superculture' (or something else, but this should certainly be another term than 'culture').

From this point of view, as it strikes me, for the cultural analysis this attracts the most interest that happens in the relations between people at those levels of dialogue which may exist only as interaction of different cultures. This refers to the levels, or platforms, where representatives of different cultures can not only meet, but which surely predetermine such meeting. Typical examples of such multicultural formations are different international organizations, congresses, tourist centers, airports, etc., that is everything that cannot by definition function differently than as an aggregate of representatives of different nations. Such platforms exist, have their own regulatory and mental mechanisms. Probably exactly here rudiments of this supercommunity form? Indeed, mentally compare these two pictures. If we in the native city under ordinary conditions see exotically dressed people who behave unusually, represent different race and continents, this attracts our attention, and when they become many, this creates discomfort and serious problems even for such tolerant people as the Europeans. And now imagine that you see the same at the international airport. Here this is accepted as quite normal. We understand that in the first case these people representing different races and continents were regarded as round pegs in square holes. And in the second case they suit the place and their right to be there and who they are is by no means less than ours to be ourselves.

Thank you for your attention.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *I invite Daniil Alexandrovich Granin to the platform.*

D. A. GRANIN¹: — Recently I has an occasion to see the movie of Alexander Sokurov 'Blockaded book'. Since

¹ Writer, cofounder of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Hero of the Socialist Labour, Honorary freeman of St. Petersburg, member of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation, Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

Mr. Granin is the author of books: *Iskateli* [Those Who Seek], *Idu na Grozu* [Going Inside a Storm], *Eta strannaya zhizn'* [This Strange Life], *Klavdiya Vilor* [Claudia Vilor], *Blokadnaya Kniga* [The Blockade Book] (in co-authorship with A. Adamovich), *Kartina* [The Picture], *Zubr* [Bison], *Begstvo v Rossiyu* [Escape to Russia], *Vechera c Petrom Velikim* [Evenings with Peter the Great], *Intelegendy* [Intelegends], *D. A. Granin — Universitietskiye vstrechi. 33 teksta* [D. A. Granin — University meetings. 33 texts], *Prichudy moyey pamyati* [Quirks of My Memory], *Kak rabotai' geniyem*

I took part in preparation of this book, it attracted my attention. This movie is special. Sokurov made an amazing discovery. Different people read extracts from 'Blockaded Book'. Nowadays literary events are poorly attended, especially is a book was published long ago. But the cinema hall was overcrowded; people stood along the walls. Why did they come? This surprised me a lot.

I liked the movie very much. But the main thing was that the people cried. Why? Because we got out of the habit of crying. Present is rational, pragmatic, and cold time. It is the time intended not for tears, but for calculations, for business people. Tears are odd, they bother.

Chekhov has the short novel 'Student' that he considered his best work. Let me remind it in short. A seminary student goes in bad weather across wet meadows, sees a fire, and comes up to have a warm. The fire is surrounded by peasant women. The student recollects the Biblical parable of Peter who three times betrayed the Christ, and starts to tell it. The women cry. The student leaves them and thinks of why they cried. What for? For the Saint Peter who lived (if really lived) 2000 (two thousand) years ago? A warm and wonderful feeling seizes him because he understands that they cried because of compassion for Peter, who failed to withstand, to overcome, and had to betray and three times betrayed the Master. These illiterate women from the Chekhov's novel are able to compassionate, and these are the people of the highest culture for me.

We live in a society free of holy people. After Sakharov and Likhachov died, who serves an example for us? A feeling of compassion, love for another person, miserable, offended, or lonely is what any of us needs, but it is also what culture longs for too, otherwise no culture exists. We do not speak about it; we do not include this into the list of our cultural demands. Are we right? I do not know.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Alla Yurievna Manilova, please, it is your turn to speak.*

A. Yu. MANILOVA¹: — Dear friends, on behalf of the Governor Valentina Ivanovna Matvienko and Municipal Government I would like to greet you all in Saint-Petersburg, the city where our great scientist, thinker, humanist, and educator Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov lived and worked. How can we save his heritage? It seems to me that it is only possible if we keep on interpreting and promoting his ideas in the society, excluding their transformation into a valuable museum piece, into just an evidence of the past, even if recent. It is, that is quite surprising, because the more intensively our society develops, the more actual the ideas of the academician Likhachov and the platform where he expressed and bequeathed them to us become. It is important that this mission in Saint-Petersburg was taken up by the Likhachov Conference, and, of course, Daniil Al-

[How to Work as a Genius] [collection], *Mesto dlya pamyatnika* [A Place for a Monument], *Skrytyy smysl* [A Hidden Meaning], *Vse bylo ne sovsem tak* [Everything was a little different] and others. Daniil Granin is decorated with the Order of Lenin, Order of the Red Banner, Order of the Red Banner of Labour, the Order of the Patriotic War of the 1st Class, the Order of Friendship of Peoples, the Order for Services to the Fatherland (Degree 3), Service Cross (the 1st Degree) — Officer's Cross (FRG), the Honorary Badge of the Order of St. Andrew and others. Laureate of State Prizes of the USSR and Russia, the Russian Federation President's award in the field of literature and art, St. Petersburg Government Prize in literature, art and architecture, Heine Award. Mr. Granin is the Laureate of the International award for development and consolidation of humanitarian links in the countries of the Baltic region 'The Baltic Star'.

¹ Vice-Governor of Saint-Petersburg.

exandrovich Granin who is dedicating today all his life and activity of the Academician Likhachov Fund to the realization of this mission. Daniil Alexandrovich asked us about who after the death of the academicians Sakharov and Likhachov means moral leadership and spiritual authority to us, and said that there was no question. But it is not true; the academician Granin is the answer.

The Likhachov Conference is aimed at discussing the dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations, and this astonishingly tunes with the genesis of Saint-Petersburg. Three hundred and seven years ago the Great Emperor, and I would add the Prominent Innovator, Peter the Great established a city that had never existed before in order to turn Rus into Russia within the historically short tie span. To turn the country in the course of a few years in the giant historical way would have not been possible without importing knowledge, and Peter the Great promoted that. Knowledge and cultural traditions came here to Saint-Petersburg and from Saint-Petersburg to the rest of the country. Walking down the old streets of our city you will certainly see the signs of France, Italia, Germany in the architecture of houses and palaces, in monuments, and so forth. In the whole cultural context a dialogue with Europe is clearly observed. It is entirely built on this dialogue, on the genetic relation of cultures. And the words of Poushkin 'All flags will pay us a visit' are related to Saint-Petersburg.

And, probably, it is not by chance that exactly in the City on the Neva River a multidisciplinary integrated governmental program that we shortly call 'The Tolerance' has functioned for almost five years. Saint-Petersburg was recently honored with the UNESCO award for the promotion of tolerance ideas that was handed over to the City Governor Valentina Matvienko. This is not only a prestigious and valuable honor for us, but also a great obligation. I also want to greet you all in our city, and say 'Welcome' in order that the Conference would be interesting for all of us. And, of course, I wish you enjoy the meeting with one of the most beautiful cities of the world.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Alla Yurievna. I give the floor to Solonin Yuri Nikiforovich.*

Yu. N. SOLONIN²: — I would like to touch upon some specific issues. By virtue of my education and occupation I used to pay particular attention to the scientific manner of

² Dean of the Philosophy Faculty of St. Petersburg State University, Chair of Cultural Studies, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation.

Author of the following books: *What Philosophy Do We Need?* (Kakaya filosofiya nam nuzhna?), *The Subject of Philosophy and Grounds of Science* (Predmet filosofiyi i obosnovaniye nauki, with co-authors), *Science as the Subject of Philosophical Analysis* (Nauka kak predmet filosofskogo analiza), *The 20th Century Paradigms of Historical Thinking: Essays on Modern Philosophy of Culture* (Paradigmy istoricheskogo myshleniya XX veka: ocherki po sovremennoy filosofiyi kultury, with co-authors). Compiler and author of multiple collected papers on burning problems of the society and philosophy.

Member of the Council of Federation of the Federal Assembly of Russia (Representative of the State Executive Body of Khabarovsk Territory); First Deputy Chairman of the Commission of the Council of Federation on the issues of development of a civil society institutions; member of the Education and Science Committee of the Council of Federation; member of the Informational Policy Commission of the Council of Federation. Member of the editorial boards of the following journals: 'Ethno-socio' (Etnosotsium); 'Bulletin of the Russian Philosophic Society' (Vestnik Rossiyskogo filosofskogo obshchestva); 'Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Series 6' (Vestnik SPbGU. Ser. 6), editor-in-chief of the Digest of Russian Philosophy and Culture 'Veche' and others. Chairman of St. Petersburg Philosophic Society, Vice-President of the Russian Philosophic Society, member of the Board of St. Petersburg Society for Culture Studies.

the academician Likhachov, and now I would like to share me observations with you. First of all, it is necessary to notice his utmost clarity, clearness, and simplicity of thinking. It mainly concerns his works that are free of heavy terms, unnecessary, absurd, senseless, and have scientific concepts only where these are quite necessary, really enrich his scientific message, and naturally suit the style of his speeches and scientific papers. And once introduced these become universally meaningful and adopted in the academic community.

This phenomenon can be well exemplified by the term 'ecology of culture' that has significantly promoted not only the theory of culture, but also the practice thereof, and is used in texts of laws and other documents. Another similar scientific novelty is the concept of literary etiquette that helps to comprehend many literary events of different times and nations. In this scientific manner of the academician D. S. Likhachov I see the manifestation of educational clarity attached to the Russian culture with a crystal clear text by Poushkin that has survived through the former Russian education till the present. Moreover, I think that this is the manifestation of that great, but a bit naïve idea consisting in the belief that each subject of investigation (of course, theoretically) correspond to one true theory irrespective of its complexity. What we are doing now in the field of culture theory is diametrically opposed to this pure guiding thought. We are watching the contaminated language, infinite number of intellectual fictions which imitate sense, but do not possess it, shocking judgments, emergence of people in the scientific community who have nothing to say since they lack research grip, but they speak, compose texts, and we are getting mixed up in barren, but extremely troublesome dialogue with them.

I believe that we deal with specific scientific thought crisis phenomenon in the field of culturology that means abundance of texts and minimum progress in problem cognition. One of the reasons thereof is oblivion of methodological culture. It also concerns globalization issues. And I was very happy to have heard today what the acadeciain Guseynov said. I would not give estimations, but I suppose that his careful introduction of the term 'superculture' apparently needs sympathetic perception. This as it seems to me has a definite fruitful basis.

I believe that we are going through the time of methodological nihilism when the responsibility for the said is lost, and a word does not mean anything today, so much it does not bear any scientifically accountable sense. One can try to explain this. I am going to mention only two reasons. First, I suppose that we are the victims of negative consequences of a methodological revolution that used to make specific sense in due time and introduced dichotomy that divide sciences into natural and humanitarian. To some extent it was a reasonable statement of a question that considered the presentational and methodological peculiarity of cultural sciences. But it seems to have unfettered culturologists and made their adherence to the principles of scientific ethics, rational discourse optional. Culturology is now considered as a special type of knowledge that roots rather in the internal core of a human, his intellect, state of mind, intuition than in an object subject to research. Therefore, return to some kind of methodological strictness and academic respect of a subject you are studying is one of the indispensable requirements. Second, we are facing the crisis of the systems and synergetic approach that against our ex-

pectations has hardly extended the science of culture. Professor Styopin has told that all we are handling presents living systems, or integrities. But integrity is not depicted by structural nomenclature. Philosophy, methodology of integrity should enter the subject of methodological, theoretical thoughts, studies in order to develop a language which helps us to create a new theory of culture, and to clarify what globalization really is. I suppose that when talking about globalization we also deal with theoretical tricks. That mainly means theoretical fictions. Indeed, the term 'globalization' is not completely clear. This is a mysterious bowl, and if we remove the cap we will see there the processes which cannot at all be explained by globalization. The terms 'dialogue', 'conflict', and 'struggle of civilizations' are not clear. These mean some derivations that have intuitive similarity with what is going on in the social sphere, but do not reflect real process in culture. I would even say that our theoretical thought has the same track being pushed on by unclear motivations, and the cultural process goes its own other way. And we always encounter something strange and surprising for the scientific anticipation. I think that the scientific community should come back to the problem, or it is better to say, to the situation of scientific honesty and to understand that the subject for study is something different from that scientific self-will in the field of culturology which is presently dominating and is, generally speaking, destructive.

At the end of my presentation I would like to note the following, implying the issue of a dialogue. The dialogue is carried on by concrete persons, for example, between you and me. To what extent are we entitled to represent the civilizations or cultures we belong to or believe to belong? But to what extent are we authorized to suppose that our dialogue represent a dialogue of cultures? It is an extremely important, tender, delicate question! What our representation is guaranteed with? And what is the conflict of civilizations? Is there the conflict today? This is a kind of fiction comfortable probably in political or other relationships which, however, make no fundamental sense. The correlation of civilizations is not built on the correlation model of social systems or states.

If we talk about the real cultural process we encounter some kind of diphasism. It happened that the self-definition of the cultural movement exhausted in the XXth century since it was defined by value structures as it was reported by the prominent writer Daniil Granin. Today, determination of what we have traditionally been calling a 'culture' is given on the basis of external, extracultural determinants, which are pragmatics, utilitarianism, customer moods. A praxiological mechanism of development of what we automatically call a 'cultural life' emerged. I am not going to give estimations, but would like to state a scientific fact and describe it, and to probably disprove some hypotheses. This is what the Likhachov Conference should also be involved in.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Yury Nikiforovich. I am asking Wilfried Bergmann, our guest from Germany to speak now. Please.*

W. BERGMANN¹: — Dear colleagues, dear friends! Let me greet you on the behalf of the German administra-

¹ Deputy General Secretary of German Academic Exchange Service, Professor, Ph.D.

tion of the Saint-Petersburg, and on the behalf of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts. In my short presentation I would like to state a few ideas.

Today all the TV channels and other mass-media speak about the economic crisis, but I think that this crisis is not as economic as systems. What are its main factors? First, I see a huge problem in demographic development in the world. In the beginning of the XXth century the population of Europe was three times much than that of Africa, but in 15 years there will live three times more people in Africa than in Europe. The average age of the Africans and Asians will have been approximately 20 years by that time, while that of the Europeans — 55. How the migration processes will evolve in this connection? I do not think that the Europeans would like to erect a Berlin Wall in the Mediterranean Sea that fences them off Africa, as well as Russia would hardly build such a wall at the border with China. Some time ago at one of the scientific conferences in my motherland I posed a question how our life in Germany and culture of Germany vary if one third of our country is not Germans any more? The same question is on the agenda in Russia and many other countries, especially European. Migration processes are directly related to the climatic changes on the planet. If global warming continues people will not be able to live in 20–30 years where used to, and people will violently move northwards, and to Europe, Asia, and North America. That is why we should think how to prevent possible problems related to the enhancement of migration. The political management of Germany is still not ready to solve these issues, even if scientists have already proposed his ideas.

Another problem consists in natural resources and fuel. Russia is rich with minerals, but these are nonrenewable resources, and we have to think of the future without waiting for them to exhaust. Germany and Russia effectively cooperate in the field of efficiency of resource exploitation, and this work should be kept on. One should define the energy saving policy in cities. What is this about? In Moscow, Saint-Petersburg, Paris, elsewhere in large cities we watch immense traffic jams. First, it is very dangerous for the health of the citizens; second, it promotes huge waste of fuel. Some interesting projects in this field have already been implemented, though, not in cities. For example, Moscow and Saint-Petersburg is not connected by a high-speed train. This is very good since trips by air for such short distances do not justify themselves. In Europe little planes fly between Germany and France, passengers prefer high-speed trains. Within the framework of the Saint-Petersburg dialogue we are going to talk about a new idea of a magnetic train between Moscow and other cities, for example, Berlin, and, probably, Saint-Petersburg. Scientists insist that such a train accommodating 700–800 passengers can cover the distance between Berlin and Moscow for 4 hours. A plain takes on less people, but costs more expensive. And this is only one example of solving logistic issues for the benefit of all citizens.

Another sore question is health care. Demographic problems are being faced by all the European countries, but these problems are rooted differently. German families have too little children. In Russia there is another headache since the infant mortality rate here five times higher than that in the Western Europe. Why? And how can we overcome this? How can we compensate the increasing health expenditures

if our population becomes older? Economics cannot withstand such a situation when one working man feeds two people advanced in age.

Who solves global problems? I fully agree with Mister Yakovenko. We do need a multipolar system for this. Only with joined efforts we can consider issues on the role of religion in human relations, different legal issues. We fruitfully cooperate with the Institute of State and Law of the Academy of Sciences, and other legal institutions. There are theses of the Davos Forum, and in July within the Saint-Petersburg dialogue we are going to have a conference in Ekaterinbourg. We hope to work out recommendations that can be practically realized at the political level.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Mister Bergman. I am asking Eleonora Valentinovna Mitrofanova to talk.*

E. V. MITROFANOVA¹: — First, I would like with all my heart to thank Alexander Sergeevich, Institute, and Governor of Saint-Petersburg for such a warm reception of our UNESCO ambassador delegation. It is a great honor for us to be here, especially in the run-up to the regional consultations planned by UNESCO in order to elaborate a medium-term strategy of development for the following six years. The dialogue of cultures and the world culture are key issues that pierce through all the fields of UNESCO competence.

I have carefully read the presentations which provide a wonderful ground for thoughts to whom the international range of problems is of great interest. Especially these are useful for UNESCO, as an organization that deals with law-making in different countries, helps them develop the potential in the field of education, science, culture, and communications. It is important for us to realize these theoretical and conceptual messages into feasible programs. And I am very happy that among key issues of the Conference there is one related to National states and world institutions interacted on the way of establishing global culture. I agree with the preceding speakers that the development of global culture is a provocative statement of question. Though, talking about culture we do not mean only arts. Culture includes the lifestyle, traditions, ethics, etc. That is a broad concept within which globalization is partially reasonable, and partially not possible. UNESCO applies every effort in order that respect to cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue we are strongly rely on take their confident position in the international political agenda. Based on these ideas the efforts of the organization are directed at the strengthening of the universal diversity as a process, and not a result which is impossible in principle through an authentic dialogue that requires constant support and development.

Dear colleagues, I have a message of greeting from the Director General of UNESCO, Irina Bokova, addressed to the participants of the Likhachov Conference. With your permission I would like to read a passage therefrom since you have the full text. *Citing.*

Dear participants of the X International Likhachov Scientific Conference!

Understanding of the others is now crucial. We live in the world with growing interrelationship in all the fields of

¹ Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO, Permanent Delegate of Russia to UNESCO, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Dr. Sc. (Economics). Author of a number of scholarly publications on the issues of economic cooperation.

human activity. As well new possibilities appear to strengthen the relations between people, cultures, and countries. The globalization process can also generate both fear and suspicion. The Intercultural dialogue strengthens the understanding of our differences. We all share the general fundamental targets faced by the international community. And we should find what further steps are necessary to undertake in order to diversify life in the world, and to promote mutual enrichment of the world population.

I think that these words correctly reflect the main conceptual approach of UNESCO to the dialogue of cultures. I would like once again to thank the organizers that they have provided us, ambassadors of UNESCO, many of whom are for the first time here with an opportunity to enjoy Saint-Petersburg, a city with an infinite cultural heritage inserted into the list of the UNESCO world heritage. It seems quite important for me that my colleagues can see it with their own eyes, and we have got such a possibility in full.

Thank you for your attention.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Eleonora Valentinovna. I would like to invite Mr. Murli Manohar Joshi to speak.*

M. M. JOSHI¹: — What is globalization like? There is an opinion that this is a positive resulting in formation of a universal culture. But this is an ideal conception. On closer examination we understand that now globalization means dominance of definite market structures, wild competition between world commercial forces. Market forces aggravate conflicts instead of harmonizing the world. In my lectures and speeches I assert that the world cannot be called global if globalization takes place only in the field of economics, science, and technology, but not in the field of culture. On the contrary, in the field of culture, religion, conflicts appear and become acute. Science, economics mean not everything, you should not forget about culture and ecology. If these vary not synchronously, but with different speed, conflicts are inevitable. Globalization has social-political and cultural impacts, and these are not always positive.

In the beginning of the 1990ies globalization was welcomed in many countries. It seemed that it can eliminate all conflicts and heal diseases. It was told that economics of all the states would grow, but to the regret of a major portion of people it turned out differently. The economists of the World Bank wrote a book on globalization and its consequences. It is harmful to ecological situation and stability of global economics, they say, but the most important it concerns the majority of the planet population. The President of the World Bank, Mr. Woolfenson in September, 2003, stated with regret that now the world is not in balance. And it is caused by market forces. The world is inhabited by 6 billion people, but only 1 billion uses all the benefits of civilization, and the other live in poverty. It is an unbalanced world while we are seeking for balance.

The so-called 'golden billion' belongs to the same culture, and shares the same values; for these countries globalism defined by market forces is good. But what is left to the rest 5 billions? It turns out that there is no global

culture, but two opposing cultures, the culture of the rich (a minority), and the culture of the poor (a majority).

Globalization leads to the growth of the misery among billions of people, and naturally it reduce their potential to contribute to the cultural development of the mankind. It entails many negative effects in all the spheres. The open market will certainly undermine democratic ideals. In many countries democracy is in jeopardy because of violent development of market forces. Instead of real democracy, e. g. power of people, all the power is concentrated in the hands of large companies. It significantly depletes cultures of many countries. These are trying to resist Americanization of their cultures, but opposite processes are very strong.

We have already discussed the issues of increasing migration. It is also a sphere of conflict since migration integrates very different cultures. There are times when firstly migrants are welcomed, but conflicts appear with subsequent generation. Moreover, cultural values are often used by politicians with a view of manipulation, in order to create a split in a country and attain own purposes.

These are the consequences of economics globalization that negatively influences the world culture. We should find a remedy to support cultures, harmonize social-economic and cultural life of nations. One should not forget about religion and philosophy. It is necessary to think how to use culture for improving the society and developing the civilization. These are very delicate issues to be addressed by thinkers, politicians, scientists, culture experts.

India is inhabited by people of different nations that speak different languages; we face many world religions. We suppose that all the religions can coexist in peace. We respect somebody else's beliefs and cultures, tend to the exchange of values in order that our cultures adopt best of each other. We should live in harmony and accord with nature and surrounding world. One has to respect that the surrounding people differ from us since the diversity if a law of development. If there is no diversity, life does not exist. Thus, we need to be tolerant to the fact that the others differ from us. And, respectively one of the main principles of the Indian society development consists in diversity.

The other principle is that the world is not a market, but a family. And the third is that we live in the same reality, but everybody understands it his own way. It is a basis of the possible dialogue between cultures. We should be tolerant, and it will give us an opportunity of the peaceful co-existence of all the nations on retention of their national identity which primarily formed on the basis of geographic, historical, and natural factors. But together nations can develop a common culture. Each culture is important and can add something positive to the development of the common culture. Let us keep the integration approach always in mind.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Mr. Joshi. I would like Juan Antonio Mark to come to the platform.*

J. A. MARK²: — I would like to say some words about certain initiatives concerning the partnership of civilizations. We can talk about the report of Jorge Sampaio, the Secretary of UNO because it was the working program which contemplated our joint actions for the coming three years. We are talking about alliance and cooperation, about

¹ A member of Parliament of the Republic of India. Former Minister of Human Resource Development, Science and Technology and Department of Ocean Development under the government of the Republic of India.

² Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation.

national plans, and how to unite them into the Alliance of civilizations, what can be done, for example, in the field of mass-media, migration, and education at the same time. Another eight national plans were developed and started to realize. We can have a look at the plans implemented at the regional level, for example, in the Mediterranean, Latin America, and south Europe. These regional plans are aimed at releasing barriers and breaking down wall, at free distribution and circulation of ideas. This is the relation of cultures, contact between people and simultaneous construction of common spaces for implementation of common projects. All this is steadily developing, and we can demonstrate how many astonishing initiatives have been the tools of promoting the idea of diversification of the world.

I can also talk about other projects. In the near future a series of forums with a significant value for the future are going to take place. For example, the forum in Brazil is opening in a few weeks, and we hope it impressively contributes to the development of the mankind. For 2011 a forum in Qatar is scheduled to discuss the dialogue between western Islamic countries. Then, in 2012 Vienna is going to accommodate a forum dedicated to the summation of the accumulated results. Thus, these are the key points of our movement: Spain, Turkey, Canada, Qatar, and Austria. We will sum up the results of our activity.

Of course, we cannot talk about skepticism which is shared by some people who has recently been watching the processes of consolidation. Nevertheless, these processes are evident, and this gives up hope. I expect that the year 2011 is going to be the year of Spain in Russia, and vice versa. Certain measures have already been taken with this view. In Saint-Petersburg, at the Hermitage a wonderful exhibition is taking place. The Hermitage is realizing a program of exchange with the Madrid Museum, Prado. And we hope that the same immense contribution is going to be done in the field of ideas, and we can create such a movement of initiatives that can enrich the dialogue we have been carrying on for ten years.

I also expect that in 2011 we watch much progress. Now it is quite evident that more valuable and promising initiatives appear to be common for different countries. These start to work, and future looks quite ambitious. We have watched certain events in Paris and Moscow, and questions are posed all the time like how you see the future of your country, future of other countries in subsequent ten years. And one of the philosophers awarded in Moscow said that we would see drastic changes mainly in the field of science, and these are going to be absolutely tremendous. Our computers have capacity a thousand times exceeding that of the computers we got ten years ago. Long ago we obtained the facilities that can reproduce and reinforce our physical abilities, and help us to communicate, for example, telephones, computers, planes, etc. And nowadays we are inventing machines that are able to understand our brain and reproduce its potential. These will be principal changes which we are going to watch and experience in near 10 years. It is evident while the attempts to cope with changes in consciousness are vague. And the basis of everything is diversity. We are not sure that we certainly need unity in this diversity. We should harden to the view that diversity is fundamental. Biodiversity, as we know, is the basis of the nature existence, and we understand that cultural diversity is the guarantee of human power and prosperity. The alliance

of civilizations I hope can help in universal distribution of this idea. The Italian artist of the Renaissance, Piero della Francesca said that the idea was good if it could make you move all day long and keep you awake at night. I think that these ideas can help us create a new urge to revive the civilization.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Mister Ambassador. Vladimir Yevgenievich Churov, please, it is your turn to speak.*

V. Ye. CHUROV¹: — As soon as it became known that in Moscow on May 9th, 2010, the Jubilee Military Parade was going to be participated by the armed forces of our allies, this decision was surrounded by a discreditable political squabble. Though it would have seemed that each of us who is more or less familiar with military and political history knows that the main strategy of any state is to search for, acquisition and retention of allies. We remember the examples of the King Carl XII and Napoleon who conceded having lost their allies. However, when I watched from the stands the walk of the Welsh guardsmen in fur-caps, Poles in their special caps called Rogatywka in Polish, waddling Americans with rifles slug on back, and others I was convinced of the fact that the dialogue of military cultures also takes place among others. The military culture is part of the common culture, aggregate of customs and traditions, legal rules and regulations for the armed forces personnel and divisions, e. g. formations, units, and subunits, and their relationships with the civil society. And if the reliable and wise decision of the chief executives of our country to invite the allies to the Parade has shown the presence of the military cultures' dialogue. That means that the dialogue of cultures is actually not a myth, but reality, and, talking in a wider extent of the word, our only hope for a better future that has already been told here several times in different languages.

The dialogue of cultures and civilizations is mostly impeded by international terrorism and crime in their various forms. Unfortunately, these displays are multiplying, and crime communities use the benefits of globalization in full. We feel this watching the elections in different countries. The buildup of tension in the multinational and multiconfessional communities is especially dangerous, and we get evidences of this in practice. In autumn elections are going to take place in several multinational communities not only within the territory of Russia. I was asked about the conditions required for the elections to pass normally in a complicated environment? I formulated four main conditions. First, it is an efficient political dialogue before voting, I point *before voting*. Here is a fresh example: one can assume that with the well developed and accurate sociological science of the Great Britain the results of the sociological questioning have completely agreed with the results of the voting. One can assume that the political dialogue between the participants of the elective campaign started well before

¹ Chairman of the Central Election Commission of the Russian Federation, Professor of SPbUHSS. Author of over 30 scientific publications and a series of journalistic papers, such as 'All Russia voting: on legal and organizational features of the coming elections', 'Elective legislation and elections in the modern world', 'Democracy and culture: issues of mutual effect of elective systems and national cultures'; scientific fiction, such as 'Mystery of four generals', 'Voyage with the Guards Major General of Artillery, Vladimir Iosifovich Brezhnev from Budapest to Vienna' and children novels, such as 'Tales of John Silver', 'Tales of an Old Yardman'.

the date of voting. And it helped to very quickly form a new government. Second, it is a stable judicial system; third, proper work of the law-enforcement agencies, and forth, good work of the election system. If these four conditions are met the elections represent part of the successful dialogue of cultures which is inevitable in an interconfessional and multinational country.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. Now I am asking Mikhail Viktorovich Shmakov to speak.*

M. V. SHMAKOV¹: — Dear colleagues, I would like to represent the issue of globalization and dialogue of cultures from the side of a trade union, the organization that composes the structure of a civil society all over the world. It is impossible to evaluate the role of globalization. The role of traditions in economic and social life is weakening, and the character of social relations varies. Globalization actively affect culture, morality, arts, attitudes, and political sets of millions of people, their manners of interaction in the economic activity. At the same time, globalization forms a system of international differentiation and cooperation of labor, world trade, infrastructure, monetary and financial system. It engages national labor markets into global social and economic relations, limits possibilities of realizing independent national economic policy, and generates new problems in the field of social and labor relations. A global labor market is formed that involves national human resources. Integration processes predetermine qualitative shifts within the national labor markets. It is evident that globalization affects the social and labor spheres of life in Russia, social and economic development of the country, establishment of market relations in the field of labor, and prosperity of people.

In every country there are both forces that promote and impede globalization. Under the conditions of global culture trade unions need to perceive this complicated situation, take up a weighed attitude towards globalization having strengthened it with target-oriented actions, solutions both at the international and national level. We clearly understand that globalization is an impersonal process. It goes without saying that global market economics demonstrates powerful production capabilities, but their cost means a universally increasing contradiction between labor and capital, as well as problems caused by the earlier unexpected scales of labor migration. At this stage of civilization stage it is almost impossible to overcome these contradictions, but one can surely reduce these having found reasonable compromises.

What are the challenges of globalization for us, for social and labor relations? These are above all migration processes and labor market globalization, something that I have already told about, because today the number of working migrants who come, say, to Russia, and the number of Russians who work abroad is quite big. The first factor is cer-

tainly more convincing than the second one, though this process is constant, and is growing in strength with the both factors.

As for the dialogue of cultures I would like to make a little remark. Culture is a multifaceted definition. And, probably, entering into controversy with the academician Nikandrov, and may be expanding his idea, I estimate the message he has announced. Nevertheless, there are different fields of culture. For example, engineering culture is almost global; we know financial, economic culture, and culture of new information technologies of which Internet is a striking example. It is a global structure that requires its own language. Of course, I am talking about a specific language, a language of Internet. Today, national domains are developing, particularly, domains in Cyrillic appeared. In general, Internet is an event global by definition. Whether globalization of culture occurs generally is a question of the long-term globalizing process. And I have already mentioned that today the term 'globalization' refers mainly to the economic and business spheres that pull all the other elements along. This is generally clear since any culture develops and takes shape as a national exception on the basis of the national economic development. We know that production of commodities, food, etc. in Africa differs from that of Europe, or, say, Indonesia since climate and natural conditions in different parts of the world strongly vary. However, globalization took place during the whole human history. And here in Russia there is a definite model that can be estimated this or that way, but one cannot say that we are starting from the very beginning. We used to have the Union of Soviet Social Republic that represented a definite model of a global system uniting over 100 nations and nationalities with own cultures and languages. There was an international communication language, Russian. Russia, unfortunately, faced a collapse in perception and development of international relationships, in practical application of the cultural dialogue, and in alignment of the internal policy so that these cultures become equivalent and mutually respectable. Russia is a polyconfessional country. We have a basis to rest upon, something to follow the example of in order to develop dialogue of culture.

In the overwhelming majority of European countries the old regulation model of labor relations with trade unions as a mass significant organization based on deep historical, national, and cultural traditions proved to be slightly compatible with modern competitive global economics and, thus, experiences a high degree of transformation. And now within the framework of the international trade union movement we have probably made a wide step in developing globalization with a human face having announced the following slogan: Let us compare globalization of economics and globalization of trade unions. In addition to the International Labor Confederation continental trade unions have already been established. Particularly, in Europe the All-European Regional Trade Union Council is founded that professes exactly the same principle that has today been discussed, the principle of unity in diversity. And this principle works well today. On the basis of global laws acknowledged by the world community or shaped as conventions of UNO, or conventions of the International Labor Organization global law legislation is created to allow move towards equal salaries received for the same work in any point of each country, and the whole planet. This is the globalization with

¹ Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, President of All-European Regional Council of Trade Unions of the International Confederation of Trade Unions, Honorary Professor of SPbUHSS. Author of a number of publications on the issues of Labor Union movement; author of papers for scientific volumes, among which are 'Improvement of Labor Union Activity under the Conditions of Globalization', etc. Coordinator of the Russian Trilateral Commission on Regulation of Social-and-Labor Relations between the All-Russian Unions of Employers and RF Government. Member of Administrative Council of the International Labor Organization.

a human face that provides new energy for globalization including in the field of culture. In my opinion it is necessary that globalization is accompanied with international social integration, e. g. adjustment of social status of the international working population through transition to higher standards, or more advanced norms. This mainly concerns policy of achievement and strengthening of international standards of wages, pensions, grants, medical service, and regulation of migration processes. And this will be the basis of removing international and inter-state contradictions.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Mikhail Viktorovich. I give the floor to Valery Leonidovich Makarov.*

V. L. MAKAROV¹: — Dear friends! Dear colleagues! I would like to comment upon two ideas which are as I see it correct and are directly related to our discussion. The first idea consists in tight relation, I point ‘tight’, between culture, its highest achievements and engineering progress, or technology. Culture and engineering progress strongly affect each other. In the Stone Age there was no engineering progress, people could only draw or write on rock with stone. But after people invented brushes, canvas, paints, and then as is known undying canvas were created. When the organ appeared Bach could compose his eminent works. With the invention of a piano the world learned of Beethoven. This is the progress. Culture and engineering progress constantly enrich each other.

At present, for example, when different information technologies are being actively developed brand one can observe mushrooming new 3D masterpieces. So rapidly we are progressing. Some connoisseurs suppose that Cameron with his Avatar has broken through, and his movie is an outstanding work. But not everyone thinks so. This is my first message.

The second idea consists in the fact that through the whole mankind history all cultural masterpieces we know have been created by genii, individua. And now, following the engineering progress, it seems like masterpieces can be created not only by genii, but any of us who I am going to name later on. Let it be some kind of intrigue. I should also note that the theory of mass consciousness develops not so violently. For example, a known social psychologist from France, Serge Moscovici describes crowd in his

book ‘The century of crowds’ as one resembling a hysterical woman. But he has one phrase not noticed by the others that the crowd possess a creative potential, but engineering progress is so constructed that this potential cannot be unlocked.

And nowadays we have approached the stage when this can be done. Wikipedia is an example. Many use it. Wikipedia has not buried, but replaces all the encyclopedias created by separate people, groups of people, etc. This is a brand new product that has appeared primarily due to Internet and other information technologies. Now we are facing technologies that allow the crowd (if someone does not like this word I can use the term ‘mass of people’, or ‘folk’) to create masterpieces. Presently, a new phenomenon appears that is called differently, for example, virtual worlds, synthetic worlds, artificial worlds. Mainly, there are online games which are played by real crowds of people, millions of people.

For example, the game Second Life or EverQuest is simultaneously played by millions of people who form this synthetic world. The American researcher Edward Kasronowa wrote quite a thick volume devoted to this issue where he investigated what conceptually new is created in these synthetic worlds, something that certain people, individua, genii cannot even imagine. You must admit that this is a new stage in the human evolution when culture, and cultural values gain an earlier unknown instrument. Now masterpieces can be created not only by such genii as Leonardo da Vinci, but also by crowd.

I have reported two ideas which I suppose are directly related to our discussion since new means like Internet associate with meta- or superculture. This is something that rises above culture, and we cannot escape it. The phenomenon of this above-culture is certainly as important as our diversity, uniqueness, etc. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Dear colleagues, we begin the second part of our Plenary Session. I give the floor to Andrey Gennadievich Lisitsyn-Svetlanov. Please.*

A. G. LISITSYN-SVETLANOV²: — Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen! It has been so much said today that I could enter a dialogue probably with each of the speakers, however the schedule seems to prevent this, and I would like to be concise and limit myself to three talking points which have just come to my mind. The case is that when we deal with the dialogue of cultures, and identity of each culture, global problems and preservation of this identity, we understand that these are tightly related to law. And in this connection, my first point will be devoted to the issue of the national law character, that is the issue of national identity. The second point concerns processes of globalization, and the matter is correspondingly about the international law. And the third point will touch upon combination of the

¹ Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor.

President of the Russian School of Economics, Head of the Economics Department of the State Academic University for the Humanities of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director-Organizer of the Higher School for the State Administration at Lomonosov Moscow State University.

Author of more than 300 scientific works, among which are the following: Mathematic Theory of Economic Dynamics and Balance (Matematicheskaya teoriya ekonomicheskoi dinamiki i ravnovesiya, with co-authors), Intangible Assets and the Intellectual Property Value Assessment (Otsenka stoimosti nematerial'nykh aktivov i intellektualnoy sobstvennosti, with co-authors), Russian Science and High Tech at the Turn of the Third Millennium (Nauka i vysokiye tekhnologiiy Rossiya na rubezhe tret'yego tysyacheletiya, with co-authors), Russia in the Globalizing World. Modernization of the Russian Economy (Rossiya v globalizuyuschem mire. Modernizatsiya Rossiyskoy ekonomiki, with co-authors).

Professor honoris causa of Lomonosov Moscow State University.

Editor-in-chief of ‘Economics and Mathematical Methods’ journal (Economika i matematicheskiye metody), member of the editorial boards and panels of the journals: Economics of Planning, Social Sciences, ‘Cybernetics and the System Analysis’ (Kibernetika i sistemnyi analiz), ‘Economy of Modern Russia’ (Economika sovremennoy Rossiya), ‘Science of Science’ (Naukovedeniye), ‘Optimization’ (Optimizatsiya) and others.

Laureate of the USSR Council of Ministers Award, Laureate of the L. V. Kantorovich Award and of the Demidov Award.

² Corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for State and Law (the Russian Academy of Sciences), LL.D., professor. Author of a number of scholarly publications, including: Mezhdunarodnaya peredacha tekhnologii: pravovoye regulirovaniye [International Transmission of Technologies: Legal Regulation], Pravovyye problemy sovershenstvovaniya khoziaystvennogo mekhanizma v SSSR [Legal Problems of Economic Mechanism Improvement in the USSR], Mezhdunarodnoye chastnoye pravo: sovremennyye problemy [International Private Law: Modern Problems], Mezhdunarodnoye chastnoye pravo: sovremennaya praktika [International Private Law: Modern Practice], Mezhdunarodnyy grazhdanskiy protsess: sovremennyye problemy [International Civil Procedure: Modern Problems], and others.

both, that means interaction between national legal systems in the context of the international law.

First of all it is necessary to mention that law itself is a phenomenon which is certainly part of culture and at the same time a mechanism that regulates culture formation. We have already heard here remarks concerning the way the legislation on culture forms, or the moment when law influences culture. At the same time law bears in itself a print of those centuries when it existed. And, certainly, it is impossible to overcome traditions which existed in culture of these or those people, in its legal system, even under the influence of very strong factors. If we speak about the force of law and consider not only disadvantages in the modern law-making, but even the facts of our country's history, we will see that not simply groups of Bolsheviks blew up Christ the Saviour Cathedral. It deals with a certain legal environment that provided a basis for this action or other actions.

When the construction of a temple is concerned, it also requires certain legal enactments that can provide the basis for land grants, construction activities, etc. By the example of this phenomenon we can see how culture of a country, its internal content alienates those negative moments which have also been generated by law, and then a certain stage of revival takes place. When we speak about international law it is necessary to address the issue on how possible the creation or development of the international law in the context of the dialogue of cultures is in principle. Let me mention such ancient sources of law as Oleg and Igor's agreements with the Greeks when the disappeared civilization that had a reference legal system, Byzantine Empire, entered into contractual relationships with the nation that was under formation, or with the state that was building up. Probably, this process was possible.

What is the present situation and what are the possible development trends in this direction? Modern international law is practically brand new having been generated at the end of the Second World War. But who formed this international law? It was formed by the bearers of various ideologies, but underlain by very close legal cultures. Sixty five years have passed and now the question arises on how the international law is going to further develop. Which elements will be introduced therein? I am deeply convinced that neither a human, nor a state can abandon the traditions. And if now we look at those main players who are capable of forming international law we will not see such uniformity that existed 65-67 years ago. There will be definitely more diversities.

Finally, a question related to the issue that is close to us and deals with the formation of the international law and development of the Russian law, or with development of Europe and Russia. Law (we conditionally call it Euronorth Atlantic) was developed on the basis of variety of European ideas and traditions which have not disappeared, but the objective process means that this variety, at least within the limits of the European Union, has certain tendencies to unification. How this Euronorth Atlantic community will influence further development of the international law and accordingly relations with culture? This is the problem which is presently facing its very initial stage of research.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thanks, Mr. Lisitsyn-Svetlanov. I would like to invite Efim Iosifovich Pivovarov*

the tribune, one of the most outstanding Russian historians. Please!

E. I. PIVOVAR: — Dear colleagues, the scope of my interests covers issues of social and cultural history, and that is why I am interested in the history of the Russian abroad, Russian emigrants. Thanks to Alexander Seregeevich, I have an opportunity to deliver my presentation to this audience. Having heard the other speakers who have already stood here, I would like to talk about other aspects which have not been mentioned today. Much has been said about the dialogue of civilizations, intercultural interaction, globalization from the viewpoint of science, humanitarian knowledge, and about interdisciplinarity in the context of analysis of these processes.

We are in the University building, and our conversation will be incomplete if we do not define to whom this all addresses. We are addressing to the future generations since education as part of culture is directed towards future and, of course, higher education. This University, as well as many other Russian high schools, is daily engaged in the development of higher education. In this connection I would like to deliver some thoughts that concern globalization from the viewpoint of education, high school. As a chancellor of a university I would like to ascertain (I think chancellors or those who deal with education hardly disagree with me) that globalization within education is already a reality. It is possible to discuss whether it is good or bad, but it is a reality. Therefore it is necessary for us to think and solve problems, on the one hand, related to minimization of those consequences which seem not absolutely positive, and on the other – to identification and definition of those steps which could be aimed at advancing in this process and achieving the best result.

Why is it a reality? Because under the conditions of an information society, the youth that is already the youth of the information epoch is involved in this process already from infancy. And these rates (Valery Leonidovich Makarov has spoken about it today and gave two examples that can be expanded) accelerate day by day. I think that we should be a bit self-critical. Educational administrative bodies, as well as chancellors do not always keep up with the youth. A variety of directions has appeared, but still has not been recorded in existing curricula and educational standards. It is high time to develop such standards, programs for teaching principles of Internet usage, including a humanitarian component of these technologies.

¹ Corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, President of the Russian State University for the Humanities, Head of Department of History of Former Soviet Republics and History Department, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor. Author of over 200 scientific works, including: *Sovetskiye rabochiye i NTR. Po materialam avtomobil'noy promyshlennosti SSSR* [Soviet Workers and Scientific and Technical Revolution. On the Material of Automobile Industry in the USSR], *Nashe Otechestvo. Opyt politicheskoy istoriyi* [Our Fatherland: An Attempt of Political History], *Materialy po istoriyi dissidentskogo i pravozaschitnogo dvizheniya* [Materials on History of Dissident and Human Rights Movement], *SSSR i holodnaya vojna* [The USSR and Cold War], *Rossiya v izgnaniyi. Sud'by rossiyskikh emigrantov za rubezhom* [Russia in Exile. Fates of Russian Emigrants Abroad], *Teoreticheskiye problemy istoricheskikh issledovaniy* (Vyp. 1–5) [Theoretical Issues of Historical Research. Issues 1–5], *Rossiyskoye zarubezhye: social'no-istoricheskiy fenomen, rol' i mesto v kul'turno-istoricheskom naslediyi* [The Russian Diaspora: Socio-Historical Phenomenon, Role and Place in the Cultural-Historical Heritage], *Postsovetnskoye prostranstvo: al'ternativy integratsiyi* [The Post-Soviet Area: Alternatives of Integration], and others. Member of editorial boards of the journals: *Vestnik arhivista* [Archivist's Reports], *Rodina* [Fatherland]. Mr. Pivovarov is a member of the board of the Russian Union of Rectors. Member of the Presidium of the Board of Rectors of state universities of Moscow and Moscow region.

There should be so called Internet managers who can be regarded not in the context of profession, but a direction. I would like to mention that already within the framework of our University we have submitted such projects for consideration, but so far without effect. At the same time the academic mobility, internationalisation of educational services, attraction of colleagues from abroad to the Russian universities, participation of Russian experts in the process of teaching in the world has already become real. This practice turned to be embedded into public only during last years, but the situation was absolutely different 20-30 years ago. It seems to me that there is no use to talk about threats of internationalisation from the viewpoint of education. It is necessary to discuss those trends of integration of our efforts which have not been realised yet. And I believe that this forum helps us promote discussion on this question. It seems to me, though all of us recognize and accept that this process takes place, its success and minimization of negative consequences depend on how active we are going to proceed from the viewpoint of proposing new educational programs and training trends which are unusual for the last epochs.

Recently there was a discussion about the correlation between the full-time and distant education. Some high schools have assumed a negative attitude towards the latter. But this is somewhat unwise. Modern education is already a kind of fusion of the both since it includes a significant element of self-education through up-to-date educational techniques which are available home and in most of training facilities. So this process can be considered from an absolutely different perspective. In this respect new forms of education which are offered by the modern information environment devaluate some of our concepts.

Distant, not distant, full-time, evening education, all these forms look completely different under the conditions of real reference to modern information technologies in the course of education. Professors actually work with their audience on a remote basis irrespectively of the faculty or group where a student belongs to. Finally, the academic mobility probably takes a new shape too since it does not matter where a certain student or teacher is found to be. We mean here the quality of the on-line communication which occurs between them. I think it is necessary to further study this issue since globalization and education provide absolutely new approaches, new decisions which seem to be significant for the future of the educational process in any environment, including the humanitarian one.

And finally, when promoting innovative trends of science and knowledge development the humanitarian component is extremely important. It is wonderful that that this forum gives an opportunity for scientists not only from Russia, but also from other countries to get together. And I believe that our only way is to systematically and step by step prove that any innovative project is doomed to failure without the humanitarian component. Thank you very much.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thanks, Efim Iosifovich. The word is given to Mr. Alfredo Perez Bravo.*

A. PEREZ BRAVO¹: — Dear Forum participants, Doctor Zapesotsky, I thank you for the invitation to

¹ Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the United States of Mexico to the Russian Federation; has been accredited as Ambassador of Mexico to 47 countries and before one international organization (CARICOM). General Director of International Scientific and Technical

participate in this seminar. As a diplomat I have a rare possibility to live and work on five continents. As an ambassador to Mexico, I worked in many countries where during my diplomatic service I have noticed and understood some simple truths. The most important resource of any country is its people. Each person is a huge value. In different countries I noticed that every day citizens strive to improve their life conditions, try to achieve their dreams. How can we give people more opportunities for realizing their dreams? Social policy should favor it being in turn created and applied by people.

The rate of social changes in any society depends on innovations and their availability, on science and new technologies. This is indisputable. The rate of social development increases. That means that higher standards of life become more accessible. It is impossible to deny advantages of progress, but it is also impossible to forget that possibilities are not identical at all, even in the same society, in the same building, never mind different countries. I think it is the biggest world problem. Everyone should have equal opportunities for development.

The inequality between people, social groups, and nationalities always existed, but social groups, societies and nations have never been more closely related than now. There have never been better opportunities for the creation of a fairer world. The relations between people, nations are based on their own interests. We should not deny it. Every nation has own interests, own projects just as every individual has its own life. Everybody struggle for the best life for the family, nation, nevertheless it is always necessary to understand that our interests should coincide with the interests of our neighbors, and it is should be kept in mind.

We should change our attitude, be tolerant and to try to eliminate economic differences which can lead to conflicts. This strategy should include distribution of new knowledge, new forms of access to education. It is necessary to create new models of cooperation between organizations of different countries. It is necessary to follow the common idea. The public policy of each country and social programs should be concentrated on satisfying the needs of the population. We should strive for well-being of all social classes, all nations of the world despite their origin and level of development. We should erase borders between people and nations to avoid conflicts which can threaten the existence of our civilization. The human society should be more constructive, and all of us should treat each other in a more civilized way.

I would also like to tell a few words about Mexico, a country which has a centuries-old history. Mexico is a big country with a rich history. The country is inhabited by 110 million people, and 35 million people live in the United States. This year is very important for us because we celebrate the 200th anniversary of our independence, the 100th anniversary of the Mexican revolution, and also

Cooperation, in that capacity he was the chairman of more than 60 Bilateral Commissions. Adviser of the Minister of Foreign Affairs and to the Secretary General, Head of Cabinet of the Deputy Minister in charge of Europe, Asia and Africa; Deputy General Director of International Treaties. He was Head of the Political Division in the Mexican Embassy in Washington D. C. He has been Professor in three Mexican universities. He was the Ambassador of México in Malaysia and Dean of the Diplomatic Corp. The non-resident Ambassador to the Republics of Armenia and Belarus; the author of "Mexico Today"; has a number of published scientific works in 30 field journals.

the 120th anniversary of diplomatic relations between Mexico and Russia. All these issues are very important for the Mexicans. Now it is high time to learn the lessons of the past. We should strive for our words to correspond to our actions and be clear to the society. We should work on providing the best life for future generations. I thank you for your attention.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. I give the floor to Mr. Rene Guerra.*

R. GUERRA¹: — Dear Alexander Sergeyevich, dear participants of Likhachov Scientific Conference! I will be brief. Having arrived from France I learnt that my presentation is published together with the others in the Conference proceedings which I have received. So I began to look through the weighty volume to find food for my today's reflection. And I have read (not accidentally, you will soon understand why) the paper by Alexander Sergeyevich Zapesotsky on the issues of the dialogue of cultures in the scientific and moral heritage of the academician Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov. I have been amazed by a sharp urgency and wisdom of views and approaches of the Russian intellectual to the issue of the dialogue of national cultures based on the consideration of each culture as a value, a source of mutual cultural enrichment.

Naturally, I will not list all provisions of his Declaration of the rights of culture dated as of 1995 which has already been touched upon today. I will be limited only to a reminder on the three first and basic provisions. I consider these are worth it. First, culture is the main source of the mankind humanization; second, culture of any nation that defines its spiritual uniqueness, expresses its creative power and abilities, is simultaneously the heritage of the mankind; and, finally, third, the dialogue of cultures provides mutual understanding between people, reveals spiritual uniqueness of each of them. I remind today much has been told about globalization, global culture when Victor Hugo and the World Exhibition in Paris that took place in XIX century were also mentioned. And I would like just to remind of these simple, but wise words of the unforgettable Russian intellectual Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you very much. I ask Mr. Walter Giger to speak now.*

W. GIGER²: — Dear Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen! I think that the topic of our session is very

¹ Head of Russian Language and Literature Chair at the University of Nice (France), Dr. Sc. (Philology). Specialist in Slavic literature, publisher, art collector and researcher, President of the Association for the Preservation of the Russian Cultural Heritage in France. Laureate of Tsarskoye Selo Artistic Award (St. Petersburg, 2009); Laureate of Delvig Literary Award (Moscow, 2010).

Author of more than 200 academic and journalistic works on the culture of post-October Russian émigré community, among which are the following: *The Younger Generation of Russian Émigré Writers* (Mladsheye pokoleniye pisateley russkogo zarubezhya); *They Carried Russia With Them...: Russian émigré writers in France in the 1920s — 1970s* (Russkiye emigranty-pisateli i khudozhniki vo Frantsii: 1920–1970); *Pity for the Russian People* (Zhal' Russkiy narod); *Bio-bibliography of B. K. Zaitsev* (Biobibliografiya B. K. Zaitseva) and others.

² Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Switzerland to the Russian Federation. Dr. Giger has been in the Foreign Service since 1974. He served as an Ambassador of Switzerland to a number of African countries and countries of South-Asian region such as Turkey and Azerbaijan.

important for the promotion of the dialogue of cultures. In Switzerland there is a tradition that the country is divided into cantons, and inhabitants speak its own language. Therefore we really communicate in different languages. The concept of my presentation lies in globalisation that became real. And we should accept it as a fact and solve global problems. Without having created a global system of values, we cannot construct a system of behaviour which can help us solving globalisation problems. If we do not promote development of this basis, then the strongest one will get all the power. We have already had such examples in our history, for instance, Pax Romana (or the Roman peace). But the basis now has cultural, national specificity, it is not global, and that is why the conflict has been already predetermined.

People are often afraid that they should adopt this or that way of life which is alien to them. I would like to demonstrate it by the example of Switzerland. As you know, the overwhelming majority of citizens have voted against building of new minarets in the country. Certainly, this constitutional instruction does not contradict confession of Islam and visits to mosques in Switzerland. It only concerns construction of new minarets. But it has occurred in the country which is known for the transparency and tolerance. The government has urged people to refuse this initiative, but meanwhile the fact remains.

In Switzerland there are 20% of foreigners, and therefore the native population is seized by fear that it is necessary to treat other forms of behaviour with tolerance, and sometimes even adopt them. This threatens cultural identity of Switzerland. In this case minarets have acted only as a symbol of this threat. It was simple display of uncertainty, fear of an alien culture. How to find a way out of this scenario; how to get rid of fear? As an ambassador I would recommend a dual strategy of action. At the international level it is necessary to introduce a policy of dialogue, but it would be possible only (and I would like to underline it) when at the national level we see that the citizens and people have faith in own culture. It is impossible to conduct a constructive dialogue without self-confidence, faith in cultural value, national heritage, in globalisation that does not threaten national identity.

The policy of neutrality has been an integral part of the Swiss foreign policy. We have followed this scenario for decades, accumulated huge experience and are ready to share it with other countries. Last year it seemed to me that many Russian citizens did not understand what it meant and that there was no political dialogue in Russia. I often hear that one-sided political decisions are made in Moscow.

I would like to make several examples how our country is trying to put peace policy into practice. When two countries cannot agree among themselves, there is a difficult situation as it was in the case of severance of diplomatic relations between Russia and Georgia. Switzerland is proud that Russia gave us a vote of confidence and asked to represent interests of Russia in the embassy of Tbilisi. But here I represent not only interests of Switzerland, but also of Georgia. The second example of our peace policy is an attempt to make positive changes in relations between Turkey and Armenia. I can give a lot of examples where Switzerland as a negotiator represents itself as 'a soft power' and promotes development of the international dialogue.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. I give the floor to the outstanding Scandinavian historian Rolf Torstendahl.*

R. TORSTENDAHL¹: — Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you for the invitation. I would like to say a few words about world and transnational culture. I think that it is a fundamental question of our conference. Under what circumstances can we talk about culture globalisation? Is it real, is this goal can be achieved and how can we achieve it? These questions were already mentioned by the previous speakers. I think we can look at it at another angle of view. I will try to make it. One kind of culture globalization is really foreseeable. It is the existing world culture in economics. Not everywhere it is favourable, but nevertheless it exists and is based on the international organisations as, for example, the WTO or the International Currency Fund which are trying to introduce certain rules into the state concept, and also to affect players in economics.

Thus, in economic system there is a chain of obligations, this system is can be regulated, and this results in creation of some global culture in this area. Nevertheless it is very difficult to allocate any other area where the international consensus would be reached. For example, there is an ecology question which is closer to us. Recently there was an UNO conference devoted to the issues of ecology in Copenhagen. During the conference various opinions were presented. However participants managed to reach general consensus. It is quite obvious that it is difficult to establish a subordination system to existing rules in this area though ecology is close to economics. If other aspects of culture are considered, we will find out that they are further from the world consent, than, for example, ecology. I mean public health services, politics, mass media, musical culture, culture in the field of education etc.

National identity strongly limits globalization. I will not decipher this term, but I would like to underline its value. National orientation and religious orientation are very important in this classification of the person, but there are other identification moments. If we consider a history course we will see that these or those ideas which have arisen in the different countries, become the world ideas, or they are perceived by the entire world. For example, as the ancient Romans who extended their culture almost through the whole populated universe. The Chinese also investigated the world, and they started to consider China as a celestial and unique culture which everyone had to reckon with. The same situation was in India; there was *espekha*; there was a period of great Mongols. All these phenomena were always supported by the religious principles, belief.

¹ Foreign member of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, member of Academia Europaea, member of Swedish and Norwegian Academies, professor of Uppsala University, historian, Doctor *honoris causa* of the Russian State University for the Humanities.

Author of the following books: *Origins of a Democratic Culture: Russia in the Early 20th Century* (with co-authors); *Ironworks and the Peasantry: Problems of Social Organization of Industry in Russia and Sweden in the Early Industrial Period* (Metallurgicheskie zavody i krest'yanstvo: problemy sostial'noi organizatsii promyshlennosti Rossiyi i Shwestii v ranneindustrial'nyi period, ed.); author of some books in English and Swedish: *Bureaucratization in North-Western Europe; Assessment of Twentieth-Century Historiography. Professionalism, Methodologies, Writings* (ed.), some of his articles were translated into Russian, such as 'Individual and Society in History', "'Correct' and 'Fruitful' as Criteria of Historical Science', 'Social History in Sweden and Western Europe', 'Dialogue with Academician I. D. Koval'chenko about the Nature of History Competence', 'Professional Competence and Usage of History in Politics', 'Return of Historicism? Neo-institutionalism and "a Historic Turn" in Social Sciences' and others.

European founders of empires considered their culture the best one and it continued till the First World War. Then there was a Soviet dream of the communistic world and the American dream of Americanization of the Universe after the Second World War. All these aspects are the same. These are all aspiration for one culture to become global. When we consider globalization, we should remind ourselves about such historical examples. It seemed to people that they had keys to global culture, but they were wrong. What was the essence of the idea of global culture? There are two possible answers. The global culture is unachievable. If we analyse historical development of the last three centuries, we will see that there is no way for the convergence of civilizations. But there is also other answer to the same question. The cooperation has amplified, and there was a convenient transition in many areas, but it is possible to tell that they are still a little limited. Cultural contacts have been strengthened for at least two centuries.

Let me recollect the trade unions which became significant enough and, certainly, international organisations which protect the rights of very many levels of population. For example, possibility to plan a family has promoted the way of life that women could conduct and which is pleasant to them. Besides, the legislation that protects the rights of minority and nature, has improved a society life in many respects. All these things have proceeded for at least two centuries. Not everything goes the way as it should be, but there is an effect in the sphere of nature protection for the sake of well-being of the future generations.

On the basis of the above-said I can conclude that all these examples prove the possibility of transnational culture, and it already exists in many areas which I have just mentioned. Also there is transnational development, and it is very important. And we can achieve prosperity, and have already achieved something for the last two centuries. Transnational development and history are very important, and international decisions though still limited, promote joint prosperity very much. We should together make efforts in this area and strive for the global cooperation though the general global cultural space is not reached yet. We should continue dialogue in this area. I thank you for your attention!

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you, dear colleagues, I invite Anastasiya Alexandrovna Yemelyanova, a student of the Novlenskaya secondary school of the Vologda region to speak. As I have mentioned before, we have the International Likhachov Forum of senior pupils, attended, basically, by schoolchildren from Russia. But senior pupils from other countries come to the Forum as well. First they submit their compositions. These are hundreds and thousands of compositions devoted to Dmitry Likhachov's ideas and the present. The authoritative board headed by Nikolay Dmitrievich Nikandrov and Daniil Alexandrovich Granin together with the academicians, philologists from the academic institutes is carried out the jury functions; they look through them and choose the best works.

And Anastasiya Alexandrovna has sent the best composition this year and it is entitled as 'Local history brings up love to the native land and gives that knowledge without which preservation of cultural monuments in-situ is impossible'. The title is a little bit long, but it is absolutely

correct. I would like to hand over flowers and the diploma to our remarkable participant. The 1st Grade Diploma means a considerable state prize in the form of monetary compensation because this competition is included in the state list of school competitions and the competitions for especially talented children. Besides, Anastasiya Aleksandrovna Yemelyanova is granted with a chance to study at our University free of charge at any faculty. If you want, you can tell a few words, please.

A. A. YEMELYANOVA: — I would like to thank the Organizing Committee for the opportunity to take part in the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, as well as the jury of the competition and, of course, my parents.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thanks. Brevity is the soul of wit.*

I would like to invite madam Margot Klestil-Löffler to speak for the participants of the International Likhachov Conference.

M. KLESTIL-LÖFFLER¹: — Dear participants! If I am invited to speak about culture dialogue and civilizations today, St. Petersburg is especially suitable place for this purpose since this city as any other city of the world has grown up out of such dialogue. Taking into consideration changeable and often heavy common history, Russia and Austria are united with an ancient tradition of dialogue of different cultures in it. For a long time both states have absorbed cultural influences of the East and the West and were able to again and again find peaceful and mutually enriching compromise of the suggested opposite cultural influences.

As if we talk about dialogue, first it is necessary to find out what this concept designates in the specific thematic context. It is impossible to understand dialogue in the context of an intercultural exchange as doctrinaire proselytism. The essence is that the equal and mutually respecting interlocutors try to define where they differ and where the onset of the common basis is that can provide the basement for the fruitful cultural mutual understanding. Austria has long experience in how to overcome cultural borders by means of cultural cooperation. Diplomats, including Austrian ones, are invariably in demand. The successful foreign policy is now more than ever engaged in dialogue of cultures, serious discussion of cultural distinctions and unanimity, issues of the cohabitation of people of a different cultural, ethnic and religious origin.

The challenge of variety especially at home should be met clearly and fairly. We see that the coexistence of people of a different cultural origin involves fear and big uncertainty. For example, in Vienna there are as much people who were born abroad and for whom German language is not native as it was 100 years ago. Today we are very much proud of a creative atmosphere of the Vienna of 1900.

I would like to pay a special attention to culture globalization in the youth environment, in the area of literature, cinema, dance, science. It is necessary to name, in particular, cooperation of historians of both countries. Certainly it is not enough if the dialogue of cultures is limited to the cooperation between institutes

¹ Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Austria to the Russian Federation, Dr. Sc. (Philology).

and their representatives. The idea of culture dialogue and knowledge thereof should be introduced into the society. In this connection it is necessary to tell about the value of mass media that are presently part of key founders and intermediaries in the cultural dialogue. In the dialogue of cultures and civilizations mass-media takes a key position and should realise its own responsibility. The history of Austria and Russia as a traditional point of intersection of numerous cultural influences during many centuries formed originality of this country. Besides, modern processes that take place in Europe give us belief that the cultural dialogue is a correct way towards peaceful coexistence. Thank you very much for your attention!

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Mrs. Klestil-Löffler. I ask the outstanding Russian economist Oleg Timofeevich Bogomolov to speak now.*

O. T. BOGOMOLOV²: — Thank you. Dear participants of the Jubilee and quite impressive Likhachov Conference. I am going to touch upon the issue that may seem insignificant in the context of the dialogue of civilizations, but still has not been mentioned here if I am not mistaken. It is a question about public or social science role and political thought in our life. Today many of us start to ponder over how the global economic crisis is going to affect the cultural and spiritual heritage of the earth civilization. Whether the mankind becomes wiser having made conclusions from the shocks which have captured the world? And are theorists, scientific and political leaders ready to learn from experience of this economic crisis deepest from the post-war period? The public thought in the leading countries including Russia is expected to give the answer to the question about the reasons for these shocks. The dominating ideological doctrines in the leading countries of the world and, naturally, in that part of the world which is represented by Russia, East and Central Europe will define much in overcoming the crisis and excluding its recurrence in future.

It is pleasant to notice that there have already been signs of critical reconsideration of the dominating economic ideology, a so-called mainstream of economic thought. Even among the convinced liberals and ultraliberals who remain quite powerful attempts are undertaken to understand the situation including the issue of how much economic science and theory is guilty in occurrence of the today's crisis problems. I had to encounter some papers with a title like "Scientists-economists are guilty in the global economic crisis". In this respect those papers are

² Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Adviser to the Russian Academy of Sciences, Honorary Director of the Institute for International Economic and Political Research (the Russian Academy of Sciences), Head of Chair of World Economy at the State University of Management, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor.

Author of over 700 publications including the books *Reforms from American and Russian Scholars' Viewpoint* (Reformy glazami amerikanskikh i rossiyskikh uchonykh); *Reforms in the Mirror of International Comparisons* (Reformy v zerkale mezhdunarodnykh sravneniy); *My Chronicle of the Transition Period* (Moya letopis' perekhodnogo vremeni); *Thoughts Over the Erstwhile and Essential* (Razdum'ya o bylom i nasushnom); *World Economy in the Globalization Period* (Mirovaya ekonomika v vek globalizatsiyi).

O. T. Bogomolov is Honorary President of the International Association for Economics; he was elected the member of the UNESCO's International Council on Social Sciences Executive Committee; Deputy of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR and the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of Russia. At present, he manages the Interrelations of Economics and Society Research Project. Supervisor and editor of *Non-Economical Facets of Economics*, vol. 2, summing up the results of team studies.

symptomatic that were published in the authoritative British magazine *Economist* which was completely not notable for the progressive political orientation, and, on the contrary, rather ascribed to the camp of ultraliberals.

One of the *Economist* magazines of previous years had a cover photo of a weighty volume of modern economic theory. And below there was a note in large print saying "Which mistakes does it have and how crisis changes it?" In the publications of this issue it was affirmed that two central sections of the economic science, macroeconomic and economy of finance, are now subject to the legitimate and serious revision. To read such a conclusion on the pages of this magazine means a real sensation which was difficult to imagine even some time ago. But appeals to reconsideration of the theory described in all American and some Russian textbooks are also heard from certain authoritative scientists, including such Nobel prize winners as Joseph Stiglitz, Paul Krugman and Paul Samuelson.

So, Paul Krugman notices that for the last 30 years macroeconomics has been impressively useless at best, or is simply harmful at worst. In his last book Joseph Stiglitz perceives sources of global crisis in that passion of deregulation which warmed up the Wall Street market fundamentalism. He ascertains inconsistency of economic science and fundamental defects in the American model of capitalism. But we, Russians, in our economic reforms were guided by the America-fashioned macroeconomics which was promoted by Chubays, Gaydar, and other reformers. That is why taking lessons from the global crisis, including the Russian one, it would be relevant to listen to the appeals of the Nobel winners and reconsider some dogmas and fixed notions of the economic theory.

In my opinion, revaluation of ultraliberal recipes is one of the most important conclusions which will help to overcome difficulties of the crisis period. It is necessary to say that the same issue is present in the official documents of the United Nations Organization. Market fundamentalism, *Laissez-faire*, of the last 20 years has failed the exams dramatically, — ascertains the UNCTD report on 'Global economic crisis: system failures and multilateral means of treatment'. The *Economist* magazine continued discussion of the issue I am talking about and in one of this year's issues expanded the thought in this respect as 'The world observes rise of a new economic hybrid which could be named as the state capitalism'. It means here that the strengths of the European economic systems especially in the northern countries, and also of the planned economics in the USSR and the countries of the Soviet block in the past, present China could be considered in some new patterns especially as the crisis forces to strengthen the role of a state in the regulation of the market relations.

It seems that the world community has already started to learn the mistakes. And the search of a new paradigm of the postindustrial development has been launched in different countries, including China. It is possible to assume that the United States finally prefer to be limited by some updatings of the existing system whereas the Europeans continue to look for the optimal model of postindustrial development.

I also paid attention to the fact that there is a strategic approach in the measures undertaken by America and Europe towards "the fire extinguishing" related to the crisis and those holes which formed in economics; today there

is an intention to be prepared for the challenges which are expected in the XXI century. In this connection I would like to quote two statements. The president of the United States of America Barack Obama when he spoke for the National Academy of Sciences underlined that 'today the science more than ever earlier is necessary for our well-being, safety, health, for the preservation of our environment and quality of life'. And the president of France Nicolas Sarkozy declared the state intention to loan from the private business and to allocate 35 billions euro to education and science. He motivated this with the need to bring France, its young generation to a higher world level of knowledge and competitiveness. Unfortunately, we have not put similar tasks yet, we are only discussing them. Actually we have cut our budget for education, development of science and especially development of the academic, fundamental knowledge.

We monitor the success and failures in the economic development usually judging by the indicator of a gross domestic product. As it seems, the fixed notion about gross national product as a barometer of an economic environment does not demand reconsideration. However it is not like this. This indicator does not always reflect a real status of affairs in the economics. That is why the President of France Sarkozy has called two Nobel prize winners, Joseph Stiglitz whom I mentioned, and Amartya Sen to head the commission for evaluation of the representability of the gross domestic product. Stiglitz says that the things we evaluate influence the things we do. If we have an incorrect evaluation, we are going to have incorrect results ... It is necessary to stop idolizing gross domestic product and to understand its limitation ... It does not reflect many aspects of life including life expectancy, both quality of life, and public health services condition, and many other things. As for the president of France he has expressed himself more rectilinearly, saying that the citizens think when we cite the data about gross domestic product that we lie and we result wrong indicators. And they have the basis to think so. And actually the commission which I have mentioned headed by Nobel prize winners, has come to a conclusion that it is impossible to rely on gross domestic product indicator, it should be strengthened with another important criteria. When we estimate the economic situation today and discuss our plans for future, it is necessary to take into consideration the indicators characterising demography, nation health, distribution of the created income between various levels of population and economic branches, rate of inflation and its reflection on the life standard of rich and poor people. That is to say, we should concentrate on many other prominent aspects of life of the population and each separate person. Unfortunately, we still have not grown enough to have such a view of statistics. We are offered to make conclusions about real incomes of the population of the country on the average index similar to average temperature in a hospital, without taking into consideration that some people show growth of these indicators, while the majority of people demonstrate minimum or even decreased dynamics.

In the end I would like to notice that the weakness of the modern social and political thought can be especially visible and transparent in the global economic crisis. And we should overcome this weakness. It is the responsibility of many scientists and theorists. Here the dialogue of

civilizations can be very fruitful and useful. Thank you for your attention.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Oleg Timofeevich. I would like to invite Michael Gennadevich Delyagin to the microphone. Please.*

M. G. DELYAGIN¹: — Thank you very much. Dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, comrades, it is a great honor for me to perform not only under D.S. Likhachov's portrait, but also at the stage of this University because it is one of few Russian high schools where, I know it for sure, there are no bribes. It means a lot of things now. I am admired by the courage of the organizers of our today's event who were not afraid to declare the topic of our conference. This is the sharpest, painful and explosive one of the all existing in public consciousness. I should correct the dear chancellor because the title of a research professor of MGIMO is given for a year, so at the moment I am just an economist.

I would like to address a number of ideas which have been announced here. All of us know that globalization in spite of the fact that the word is quite fashionable, makes sense. It also means the limiting simplification of communications and, accordingly, limiting toughening of competition. The fact that it is not simple competition toughening slips away from our perception. Because during the cold war the competition was conducted in a bipolar opposition force field which kept it within the limits of one civilized paradigm. Now this field does not exist anymore, and the competition is conducted between civilizations, or, say, large-scale cultures, and the competition of cultures is a very specific thing.

First, there are different systems of values; second, there are different images of action and when you strive for reaching different purposes in different ways, there are fields not only for cooperation, but also for conflicts which have no solutions. And the competition of cultures is probably a unique sphere where mutual understanding growth often does not raise, and, on the contrary, lowers compromise possibility because it stripes basic incompatibility of the purposes. Certainly, dialogue of civilizations, cultures is a remarkable thing, but it is versatile. Here it was told about the dialogue of military cultures. All of us know that this dialogue is much more often conducted in the fields of battles, and not in common parades, whether it goes about the Red Square or Brest in 1939.

Sometimes feature of culture looks like the way which excludes a possibility of dialogue from the side of the other culture representatives. The Saint-Petersburg journalists like the example with a cathedral mosque. 20 years ago anyone could come in there, even a woman because it is a fantastically beautiful place. And when about four years ago I was guided there, it was found out that it was impossible to come into this mosque. However, later I was told that it was impossible even for some Muslims to come into because

part of the Muslims community which supervises it does not enter into dialogue even with their coreligionists.

Another example of culture that is hard to be involved into dialogue is the culture of some today's Russian bureaucracy which sincerely considers the state not as a tool for achievement of the public blessing but as a tool of personal enrichment, considers the population as a certain biomass which is subject to rocessing in personal well-being. We are facing many reforms of which last dealt with changes in budgetary sphere that as a matter of fact means its destruction. And what about the dialogue? Dialogue of cultures is very simple — you are not heard, and even they start listening to you, you are perceived as a hysterics. In the worst case you are treated in accordance with Article 282. Thus, dialogue of cultures is not always possible. As a result their interaction can be destructive because of their own features.

In this connection I have to notice that political correctness and tolerance which moved ahead in public consciousness initially as the factors that raise efficiency of a human society, today in some cases simply are not compatible with a long life. They demand refusal of the full account of cultural differences in a practical life and, moreover, force to brand this account as fascism, nazism or at best as a hysterics. I try to imagine myself that I am a Jew in Germany before the Nuremberg process. Should I treat fascism culture which provides my physical destruction tolerantly and politically correct?

It is difficult for me to imagine this but I felt similar in 1993 when someone who used to be my friend began to explain me why lamb was the tastiest meat. He said the following (I apologise for being not so politically correct): 'You understand, a sheep is like a Russian, it is being cut, but does not understand this'. I ask you to pay attention to what the deepest penetration into our Russian culture is. Unfortunately, the dialogue within the limits of interaction with such culture has a unilateral character.

Moving to global problems, I should say that there are two main problems in the global development today which the cultural factor makes very serious impact on. The most important problem is the archaization. We are all talking about progress — social, technological and so on. The archaization trends are very strong in the whole world during last 10 years. I do not mean here our country since we are always one step ahead. The most important thing is that globalisation, and not simplification of communications, is related to the application of technologies of consciousness formation by masses that is more intensive than ever before. And now there is a change in the character of the personal activity.

If earlier a human was able to change the surrounding nature, now the scenario is completely different. In the course of development the mankind starts to modify its own consciousness. It is harmless but when we change the tool of the world cognition and we concentrate the influence on own consciousness, the world becomes objectively less available for us to learn. It is a real tragedy for science, education and many other spheres.

The other direction lies in the fact that computer is going to make people equal in their access to the formal logic, in the same way as the Internet has already made us equal in access to the unchecked information. If we are equal in access to the formal logic, human activity will be superseded

¹ Director of the Institute for the Globalization Problems, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Full Class 2 Counsellor of State.

Author of more than 800 publications and 12 books, among which are the following: *Economy of Defaults* (Ekonomika neplatezhei), *Ideology of the Renaissance* (Ideologiya vozrozhdeniya), *The World Financial Crisis: A General Theory of Globalization* (Mirovoy finansovy krizis. Obschaya teoriya globalizatsiyi), *Russia after Putin* (Rossiya posle Putina), *The Drive of the Humankind* (Draiv chelovechestva). Full member of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences.

into the sphere of creative thinking. But those who are not trained to use the creative abilities, and unfortunately, such people form the majority, the activity will be superseded in the sphere of extralogic thinking, in other form of extralogic thinking — not into creative thinking, but into mystical. We also see this, and it is archaization again.

Finally we have an economic crisis. Removing all the details, I will tell that rotting of global monopolies is treated by technological progress which destroys monopolism, but global monopolies resist to it and, naturally, constrain technological progress. We do not need to create new devices, promote new commercial projects of the technological principles opened at the time of the cold war, but we should generate qualitatively new technological principles. Unfortunately, technological progress has slowed down for the last 20 years though accelerated in the field of life.

The second problem where the influence of the human factor is very strong is a problem of the middle class recycling. May be it sounds sad. The matter is that the modern society, modern social relations are adopted to previous industrial technologies, and the today's crisis, occurring changes in mankind are related to their adaptation to new postindustrial technologies, at first information, then, maybe, anything else, biotechnologies, for example. We do not know, where we are moving to, but one of the consequences of this transition is that industrial technologies are ineffective where each person was an absolute value because he earned profit it was necessary to catch, train, put him/her to the machine and made him/her feel happy. And it resulted in a well-being society, or middle class.

These technologies are replaced with much more productive information technologies. It is also found out that in order to make former volume of the blessings, to saturate the market, a small part of elite in any society and a small part of social bottoms are enough, and the middle class appears superfluous. It is superfluous, as well as the population of Russia under the conditions of a "pipe economics". And if we keep the former paradigm of development focused on achievement of profit as the main motive of activity of the person we anyhow face the necessity to solve "a cannibal" problem. If we want to be apart from it, we are compelled to leave the market and aspiration for profit as a main motive of movement towards self-improvement, and, in general, it is not so clear what motives are to be met in this case. Our country, Soviet Union, went its own way, but experience was unsuccessful.

And last thing. In order to carry on dialogue of cultures in any form, peaceful or not, we should first learn ourselves, our culture to be able to use our strengths and correct, or at least not make our weaknesses prominent, where we are really bad at. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thanks, Michael Gennadevich. Our visitor from New York Mark Scheuer is invited to come to the tribune.*

M. SCHEUER¹: — It is a great honour for me to make a speech in front of you. It is very interesting to meet colleagues from every corner of the globe, Russian teachers, students and public figures. Besides, I would like to mention that we are staying in a brilliant city for the whole people

¹ Director of the Secretariat of Alliance of Civilizations of the United Nations Organization.

community. I will try to comment on some ideas which have sounded today. There was a very interesting thought concerning necessity of compassion in the world — if we want to resolve world problems, it is impossible to act without compassion. I will try to remember this thought and deliver it everywhere where I should speak after.

Then a variety which was much told about, through deglobalization and development of new communication facilities we should strive for the world variety. Hundred millions of citizens carry out actually a variety support. These innovations stimulate diversification development in the world. We are witnesses of occurrence of global culture, and this is a very interesting process and the moment of world history which does not mean merge of existing cultures, but slow emergence of certain elements of global superstructure from the point of culture. The speaker from India has paid attention to the globalisation that is painful in economic sense for the majority of a mankind. So that it is possible to support positive things and to try to get rid of negative things in the course of globalisation.

The basic problem is that the society kept in a state of peace and seek for a balance. The balance is hard to maintain, it is necessary to respect national features and simultaneously not to forget about creation good global cultural superstructures. This balance is necessary to be kept, scooped from everywhere. I want to thank the ambassador to Spain in Russia for the fact that he has mentioned a question on the development of alliance. And I also would like to explain what I think about it. It is not the new international organisations, but just processes, force which connects innovations and new ideas arriving from citizens of the various countries, and relates it with the national politicians of the countries and world politics.

Social work is a very wide concept. There are non-governmental organisations, the governmental structures, religious figures, art workers, and all of them with their initiatives should support at all possible levels — national and over-national — all good, positive offers arriving from various parts of company through mass media and through education. How can it be achieved? Certainly, there is a tense atmosphere in the world now, but it is necessary to listen to a voice and opinion of the public. It is impossible to underestimate a role of mass media. They should help mankind to hear themselves, even if they are quite far, supporting the positive initiatives especially proceeding from youth.

Nowadays we are observing that the youth from many countries of the world co-operates, crossing all political and geographical borders, and takes the lead in many positive undertakings. We should notice it and support young generation since it is necessary to find out, repeat, copy and introduce all the interesting and useful innovations.

It is necessary to concentrate on how to organise life in cities correctly. There are often conflicts between rural and urban population. It is necessary to erase a difference between a city and village. But also, it is necessary to monitor life of religious communities, support the positive initiatives aspiring to peace existence, try to level religious conflicts and to avoid radicalism. In order to operate in this direction, we should provide the activity and secure with support of the international organisations, first of all, of course, UNESCO which is the leader of dialogues and intercultural undertakings.

We should work with the organisation of the Islamic countries, develop relations with them, direct bridges between various groups of the countries, be attentive to cultures of all countries. A big help is provided by the international conferences similar to that takes place in Rio de Janeiro where there are representatives of different cities, religions, and states. At such symposiums problems and ways of their decision are scheduled, conclusions are summed up. These meetings are always very useful to all mankind. Many thanks.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. Let me invite Vladimir Konstantinovich Mamontov to the microphone.*

V. K. MAMONTOV¹: — Dear Alexander Sergeevich, ladies and gentlemen! First of all thank you for the invitation to participate in this exciting forum. Of course, I always accept such invitations with pleasure. I got friends here, and first of all people with which it is possible to exchange important ideas that come to my mind, and learn without ceremony and false modesty if these are really important or not, or whether you simply exaggerate your own complexes and deliver them as something more serious and general. And when we meet here and exchange impressions, something turns out to be really important.

You know, I have arrived here from Vladimir where the audience is different — my colleagues-journalists, not academic people, academicians and professors, and people who are not engaged in any intellectual search. But a surprising thing is that I spent there two hours and all day here today, and how many surprising coincidence connected with our direct work, journalistic life, media sphere I can see. The thought of Mr. Makarov that a certain collective creativity is quite possible, and we only approach this history; the same was told yesterday in Vladimir. If the newspaper, leaving the paper version, passes into the virtual version, it can really turn to be a collective product.

Readers of virtual newspapers become co-authors, and mass media involve readers-co-authors in creative process, exchanging with them the information. Thus, by means of Internet we receive absolutely new product difficultly censored, much freer, sometimes silly, ridiculous, strange and sometimes ingenious. It is worth struggling for those gleams of genius which arise in the course of absolutely new technological thing. Earlier we read the paper version, and now all of us “live” in the Internet, maybe, not everyone but a major part of us, including youth as a more advanced generation.

My colleagues from Vladimir have asked me very interesting question on my opinion about the equal content of the old-fashion, modern newspapers, magazines, and Internet? Or the content for Internet should be different? My answer, of course, was that the content of virtual newspapers is different because they think differently. And their answer that the content should be the same with the only difference in data carriers. We do not agree I suppose.

Today a very good thought has been announced that as soon as piano has been invented, Beethoven became possible. And what possibilities are discovered by the Internet? Actually we do not know yet. The people working on the Internet, using these absolutely unusual, new, great technological possibilities, sometimes seem to us monsters

¹ President of Izvestiya Newspaper Office, OJSC.

and silly people who splash out their complexes as at a communal kitchen. (Many people call the Internet the big dustbin.) Actually, it seems to me that sooner or later it will split up, on the one hand, the Internet will be a collective, new, absolutely creative tool, a grand piano for the future Beethovens, and on the other — it remains anonymous and senseless marketplace for our own complexes.

Who should operate it? There are “Internet gurus” who already operate these processes very dexterously, but frankly speaking I don’t like it. Objectively they are all new, surprising and fresh, and but actually it is the same attempt to seize power over the audience, but in another way. The Internet seems to provide equality, but we will see what “gurus” write and what comments then follow, they are all visible — who is the chief and who is not present. It turns out that the scheme is the same. It does not suit me.

But at the same time it is possible to now see on the Internet the merging of intellectual streams and cultivation of absolutely new products. Against this background it becomes clearer we, newsdealers, do and how we should evolve. It is clear that there are questions about what version of the newspaper is more important, paper or Internet; what will die and what remains? They are comparable to those fears that sometime book will die, but it is alive and will live. Therefore we will see, time will show.

Certainly, an absolutely new world is opened for us by means of Internet, including in mass media. Now we are talking a lot of about globalization that also concerns the World wide web. There is a very interesting question. What about language barriers? When we speak about association, globalisation, does it mean that everybody has to study English? Or we should believe that all of them will learn Russian? A very strange question. Actually whether it is a barrier for globalisation or, on the contrary, great happiness, but in any case different civilized islands will arise to be united. And then superculture will appear in accordance with the idea of Abdusalam Abdulkerimovich Guseynov. Time will show.

To sum up everything I would like to tell you that thanks to the University and Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov we have an opportunity to talk and think about similar things, and this is a great happiness. And thanks you very much for granting us such opportunity.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. I give the floor to George Borisovich Kleiner.*

G. B. KLEINER²: — Thank you very much, Alexander Sergeevich, dear colleagues. I should tell that it is the

² A corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Deputy Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Economy), Professor. Director of the Institute for New Economic Information of the New Russian University, Head of Chair of Economics of the State Academic University for the Humanities, Head of Chair of Institutional Economics of the State University for Management, Head of Chair of System Analysis in Economy of the Financial Academy under the Government of the Russian Federation, professor of the Department of Economics of Lomonosov Moscow State University, of Moscow School of Economics under Lomonosov Moscow State University, member of other universities.

Author of more than 500 scientific publications, among which are: *Strategy of a Company* (Strategiya predpriyatiya); *Microeconomics of Knowledge* (Mikroekonomika znaniy); *The Theory of a Firm and the Practice of Russian Enterprises: Status, Problems, Prospects* (Teoriya firmy i praktika rossiyskikh predpriyatij: sostoyaniye; problemy; perspektivy); *Evolution of the Institutional Systems* (Evolutsiya institucional'nykh sistem); *Production Functions: Theory, Methods, Planning* (Proizvodstvennye funktsii: teoriya, metody, planirovaniye); *Forward Production Plan-*

first Likhachov Conference where I am taking part, but I am happy that it takes place annually. I think that there is a special intellectual and communicative atmosphere. It gives us the chance to join to what we call the dialogue of cultures, dialogue of civilizations, dialogue of people, dialogue of directions, that is to what makes, as a matter of fact, the core of the modern Likhachov Conference. I am very grateful to the organizers and everyone who came here. Today we have heard many very interesting, more or less not trivial, more or less correct opinions and proposition which are in any case worth of attention and discussions.

I would like to draw your attention to one hypothesis which is closely connected with our basic problematics — dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations. It is a question of the Russia's role in this dialogue, and in a more comprehensive sense — about mission which Russia could perform in the world community, and also about communication of this mission with intercultural dialogue and intercivilized partnership. It seems to me that this communication is not casual, but natural. One face of the Russian mission consists in realisation of such dialogue and such partnership. I would like to tell some words about it. From my point of view perception or, it is better to say, comprehension of this mission is the primary goal of scientific and cultural intelligency of Russia. Mission is not created, not developed, not selected. It is comprehended, inspired with. It seems to me that this comprehension should be one of the basic leitmotivs of the Likhachov Conference.

I would also like to tell some words about mission of Russia as a state. What preconditions exist towards the conversation about the mission and what is it necessary to proceed in the course of studying of this question from? Obviously, each state has the things which can be called invariants and there are things which are variants, that are variables. Invariants cannot be changed without changing the subject's essence. In our case it is a state. Variants are subject to a selection or an establishment and are objects of management. While we do not learn and we will not find the consent that is invariants of Russia, and what – variable characteristics, we cannot define, where and how we should move.

It is clear that the invariants of each country are its territory, nature geographical conditions, and historical way. For Russia they are that our country still remains biggest and most extended in the world. And these geographical open spaces noted not only by the geographers, economists, but also representatives of Russian culture, writers, such as Gogol, Pushkin, L. Tolstoy, Goncharov, Leskov, Dostoevsky, etc., have created special, civilization type.

Among other countries, even quite large, Russia is allocated as a typically environmental country, certain huge and non-uniform enough environment in which special human relations, between the person and nature, between the past and future are formed. The distance here passes in

time, and time flows into distance. Such, as a matter of fact, the boundless environment forms special type of mentality of the people. The same authors whom I named mark in the Russian mentality special lines which are peculiar to our country. It is certain changeability, binarity, polarity of estimations, historically instant transition from 'very bad' to 'very good', and vice versa. The special binary style of perception of the validity and a special historical way corresponds, such back and forth motion, i.e. 'a step forward, two back'. As an example it is possible to recollect a well-known expression of the early 1990ies that one should take the sovereignty as much as he can carry with him', reflecting centrifugal tendencies, and other expression reflecting modern centripetal movement like 'Return the sovereignty, as much as you can'. Due to the changeability of moods, the Russian population is very sensitive to external (including overseas) influences and absorbs another's ideas with special force. As a rule, then these slip out of the elite, but remain in consciousness of the people in the remote corners of Russia. At the different historical stages we were guided by the most different, inconsistent ideological installations. Due to the considerable territory and lowest population density the Russian society is non-uniform and variable. This creates favorable conditions for preservation in territory of Russia and own historical "rudiments", and ideological enclaves borrowed of other civilized countries and sprouts of the future development.

What is possible to tell about mission of the huge country with a difficult, zigzag historical way when each idea, whatever it was, after a while finds the counteridea again to return to 'its circles' after a while in the world community? What is the role of such a environmental country like Russia that, perhaps, is unique in the world? After all it distinguishes Russia from many other countries where a natural basis is not an environment, but may be projects which are perfectly carried out also and which are perfectly operated with (America); or from the countries at the heart of which life latent processes lie, undercurrents as, for example, it is shown in performance of our Chinese colleague speaking about achievement of internal harmony...

Owing to features of the spatial position and a historical way Russia contains also archaic elements, apparently, left in the past, and supermodern, and modern components which already are in the world or which start to win it. The world repeatedly became the witness of how an idea arose first in Russia and then lately it becomes the world idea.

And so, the mission of Russia as it seems to me, consists in preservation of this unity in time and space of the world civilized achievements. That is why in Russia there will be a mixed type of economics. Our country never becomes "pure" in economic sense — neither purely capitalist, nor purely communistic or socialistic. And when politicians who would like to make the country "pure" and homogeneous come to power, it is unimportant — capitalist or communistic, it turns to be a tragedy for Russia. Russia is a keeper and saver of the world social, economic and cultural variety. Mixed, mosaic, fragmentary, huge, susceptible and multidirectional country that provides its existence and activity to the dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations of all countries of the world is the image of Russia for which we can aspire.

ning in Company: An Attempt of Modelling (Perspektivnoye planirovanie proizvodstva v ob'edineniy (opyt modelirovaniya)), and others.

Editor-in-chief of 'The Economic Science in Modern Russia' journal (Ekonomicheskaya nauka v sovremennoy Rossii), Deputy editor-in-chief of the 'Russian Journal of Management'. Member of the Academic Expert Council on Anti-Crisis Policy of the Analytical Administration of the Executive Office of the State Duma.

Laureate of the V. S. Nemchinov Award of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2002.

In the end I would like sum up that in order to realise the historical mission which contours have been outlined above in a best way, Russia should make many steps towards harmonisation of own development, development of there population tolerance, choice of an intermediate way between global missionary work, imposing of and the ideas to the world and global money grabbing, or absorption of the world values and the blessings inside. Russia should choose «a third way» aimed at realizing mission of development of dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations.

Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you very much. Mr. Armand Kless, I ask you.*

A. CLESSE¹: — Thanks. I would like to talk about mixture of cultures, not about collision, but about mixture that means fusion of mentality. But this mixture and collision of cultures conducts to cultural decadence, to its end, death. Now collision of civilizations and the cultures is not that important, the most important danger is fading and decomposition of cultures. Collision conducts to the culture fading of civilizations. The culture and civilization in some languages are synonyms. In German language it is different terms, there are distinctions between them. The big threat for the world is loss of a cultural diversification that can lead to occurrence of a new civilization without culture, without conscience which is its important component, to thinking degeneration.

The escalating pragmatism can literally lead to the vulgar society, hedonistic, economical and eudaimonical when all noble will be mocked and subjected contempt. This is the time of thoughtless nihilism of vulgar masses. The modern society is very selfish, and the Western world characterises it as a society with the disappeared religion. And many movements which we observe, maybe, are noble in itself as, for example, preservation of the environment and so on, but all the same are materialistic enough, they concern only some details. They are focused only on one aspect, say, on preservation of the environment, either as mankind, or on nuclear disarmament, or on protection of animals. Certainly, everything is very important, but these are pseudo-progressive movements. For example, movement towards liberalization of abortions. It turns out that it gives to women freedom of choice, but the rights of just arising life are thus violated.

Now some words about other things. We observed occurrence of so-called democratic culture, culture for everything, the elite culture thus is cut, it becomes not courageous. I consider that culture feminization is a negative process. Sometimes it can be positive, but, nevertheless, it is impossible to 'castrate' culture. All the same creativity can frequently be male especially in art. Thus, the society moves to shameless mediocrity, and very frequent journalists or people with money define what things are valuable in the culture. And, unfortunately,

¹ Director of Luxemburg Institute for European and International Studies, Ph. D. Author and editor of a number of scholarly papers on issues of European and international politics, including: *Russia-EU Relations: New Challenges and Opportunities*, *The Vitality of Russia*, *The Vitality of China and the Chinese*, *Beyond East-West Confrontation: Searching for a New Security Structure in Europe*, *The Vitality of Japan: Sources of National Strength and Weakness*, *The Euro as a Stabilizer in the International Economic System*, *Europa auf dem Weg zur Weltordnung?*

only things which answer the nasty taste of the rich define the rules of cultural market. Quality becomes smaller, and culture — sexless if it is still possible so to name the degenerate American and Postamerican culture extending for the whole world.

In many countries which, unfortunately, follow this incorrect way, I mean the countries of Asia, the South America and China, the culture becomes populist, infantile. And, unfortunately, vulgar taste of rich men becomes the standard, defines values in the cultural market. Shagal works are not sold any more for the same money as modern advertising products. And this epidemic of the culture softening extends unfortunately and comes even into the countries of Africa.

What is the great art, great culture? Debates are being continuously conducted. High art and culture always are a fruit of the highest pressure of emotions, and it is not so simple to create such culture. I wish to inform you a thought that great works of art of the last centuries which all of us still can study, exist, but the present, unfortunately, does not give us similar masterpieces. What is the role of religion in there? If we look at great products of different art forms we will see that there are repentance elements. Repentance and humility are very important things without which existence of great art is impossible. And modern socialism and capitalism do not promote a birth of great works of art. These forces cannot support strong feelings without which the strong works of art giving sensation of cleanliness and height are impossible.

I understand that it is a very wide theme, but the extremely important especially in Russia because I hope your country is probably one of the last strongholds of the high culture who will help us to be kept from Americanization of culture of the whole world. When I wrote the manifesto of certain bankruptcy of mankind thought that once Dostoevsky here created, wrote, expressed the feelings and sufferings in the books, in the creativity. Who can do that now?

And last small remark. I am happy that many talented and beautiful students study here. And this beauty is very important not from the academic point of view. As we know the beauty saves the world, and you should be proud of it.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Many thanks. I ask Alexander Evgenevich Kibrik to talk now.*

A. E. KIBRIK²: — Our plenary session approaches the end. And it seems to me that, speaking about dialogue of cultures and civilizations would be correct to recollect the instrument this dialogue, namely about natural human language which each of us owns, is possible. It is well-known that for the dialog with the antique civilization had a great importance for the spiritual culture of Renaissance. The remained texts in the Greek and Latin languages were

² Corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of Chair of Theoretic and Applied Linguistics of the Philology Department of Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Philology), Professor. Head of Department of Linguistic and Cultural Ecology of the Institute for the World Culture under Lomonosov Moscow State University.

Author of 270 scientific publications, including: *Methods of Field Research* (Metodika polevykh issledovaniy); *Structural Description of the Archi Language* (Opyt strukturnogo opisaniya archinskogo yazyka); *Modelling Language Activities in Intellectual Systems* (Modelirovaniye yazykovoy deyatel'nosti v intellektual'nykh sistemakh); *Constants and Variables of Language* (Postoyannye i peremennye yazyka), and others.

Honoured Higher School Educator of Russia. Chairman of Moscow Typology Society. Deputy editor-in-chief of 'Issues of Linguistics' (Voprosy yazykoznaniya) journal.

the major source of knowledge of this half-forgotten culture in the Middle Ages.

I remember, 50 years ago when I studied at a university, I read the Socrat's Apologia in the classroom together with remarkable teacher Justine Severinovna Pokrovskaya in the Greek language. When there was a tragical final episode when our teacher, an elderly woman cried. And I recollect D. A. Granin's words concerning crying of peasants who heard stories about Peter. It is possible because those texts have been saved. If they did not exist, the subsequent generations could judge this great antique civilization only in the wake of material culture. Unfortunately, the overwhelming majority of ancient civilisations disappeared from the face of the earth, without having left us language signs and thus we know nothing about them.

Except for the participation in transfer of culture in the form of written texts it is necessary to note even more universal function of language. Any language is the basic carrier of spiritual culture of ethnos speaking, the developed picture of the world of this ethnos is embodied and stored in its structure. It concerns, first of all, how the individual identifies surrounding validity, allocates separate subjects, events, abstract concepts. So, any person who speaks Russian easily distinguishes dark blue and blue colours, thus that in the English language there is only one name for this, and it is blue. And, for example, for words to "wash" and "erase" in the English language there is only one word — wash. Languages are infinitely various in how they "pack" knowledge of the validity in the structure. And there are a great variety of examples.

The contribution of human languages is remarkable into the person's making process, sorry for the tautology. Language is a speciation characteristic of the person. But only possessing of the language man became man. In general the spiritual culture uses natural human language as a base. And as ethnic cultural objects a large quantity is possible to learn through language certificates. Meanwhile in XX, and now in the XXI century there is a tragical process of mass disappearance of languages of the small people. It is enough to tell that now there are 6 thousand languages, and approximately 90 % of them are languages of ethnoses, ethnic groups which are spoken by less than 10 thousand people. Everything is even aggravated that it is not prestigious languages which are, generally speaking, out of the scope of the scientific attention. Therefore now there is a very important problem, or drawing up of the high-grade scientific documentation about these languages, collecting of a maximum quantity of texts; it is an advanced procedure in linguistics.

For 40 years I am engaged in so-called field work with the students; seven large grammars have been published, describing such disappearing languages. But now, 30–40 years later, it is visible that documentation possibilities have been technologically extended. And now in my declining years I personally with the young colleagues adjust this knowledge to the modern technological standard so that everything was stored not only in books, but also on electronic carriers. And consequently, finishing the performance, I wish to tell that importance of the documentation of languages which are threatened by disappearance is difficult to overestimate today, it is one of the way of maintenance of dialogue of cultures and civilizations. Thank you for your attention.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Alexander Evgenevich. I give the floor to Mr. Ildir Peçi.*

I. PEÇI¹: — Dear Chairman, dear colleagues, thank you for the opportunity to share some of my thoughts with you. I represent not only the Netherlands University, but also young generation of teachers which today have a possibility to freely move across Europe without any borders and to investigate cultural background of different countries. I have Greek and Albanian roots; I studied in Holland where I continued my career. I say it because if we talk about dialogue of civilizations, we cannot ignore what occurs in the European Union last five years. We have various purposes which do not recognise borders; we need a society without borders. And now we are talking more and more about culture, law in the field of culture.

We mean here certain elements which, on the one hand, draw attention of our citizens, and on the other are chosen by our citizens. There are new organisations which establish or develop a new legislative order. And if we speak about harmonisation process, we understand that it is a process which shows necessity of this partnership, cultures of dialogue of civilizations. Especially it is important when we speak about harmonisation of criminal law as here there is very interesting dialogue of cultures. We see, how it is hard for participating countries to accept any amendments or new approaches from the European Union and to bring them into own settled systems that concern criminal law.

And many countries search for mechanisms which could advance dialogue between the nations, help protecting human rights, would allow continuing that cooperation and to strengthen those bases of cooperation which we talk about is a creation of the European court and a role of the European court in the field of human rights. It would be possible to give further examples. If we speak about the European community such aspect as a common market when people can freely move and exchange services, goods etc. is important here. We often hear about the role of this market which is difficult to overestimate as it is a symbol of the cultural exchange. It is a huge chance for everything to get larger and better advantages.

Nevertheless it is necessary to mention another prominent aspect that concerns the European Union in connection with the mentioned common market under the conditions when there are no more internal borders. One of the consequences of such development about which I am going to talk, is a criminal aspect. Criminals feel freer in Europe where there are no borders, and members of our Union understand that cooperation and collaboration at a level of police authorities and bodies are necessary, and it comes true. There is the Amsterdam Agreement as of 1980 which was developed for strengthening the cooperation of the police bodies. It is one more step towards the harmonisation of criminal legal codes that contain rules to prevent and struggle against underworld across all Europe.

The purpose of this step is to provide higher level of safety under the conditions of freedom which should be directed on strengthening of our possibilities in struggle against the organised crime, spread of drugs, corruption etc. Nevertheless the states are now very cautious towards initiatives of the Central European Union participants which deal with legal systems of individual countries because

¹ Doctor of Law at Utrecht University (the Netherlands).

during many centuries they developed their own codes. And frequently such criminal codes are those corner stones which provide a basis for many governmental things such as values, norms, nations, traditions etc. Therefore such unwillingness of member states to accept new initiatives immediately is quite clear.

We are searching for balance between the European Union member states, on the one hand, creating space of justice, safety and freedom, on the other – protecting interests of the countries, the traditions developed by centuries, including those in the field of law, and also settled principles, approaches to a life, behaviour etc. I would like to present examples of compromises which have been found in this area. First of all it is a principle a mutual acknowledgment. We mean not only harmonisation, and mutual acceptance. Members of the European Union should recognise those decisions in the field of the criminal law which are accepted in other countries because they should trust each other. That is where a concept of mutual trust should be. We live together, we trust each other, we study the each other's cultures, we protect human rights, and we recognise legislative systems of each other. It means harmonisation, but also participation of the European Union in the process of criminal law-making.

We can speak about such things as the European rules, i.e. the interdictions developed in Bruxelles for certain types of behaviour. These rules are extended now not at the national level, but directly at the level of the European Union. It is interesting to tell about the public prosecutor of the European Union. It is the legal initiative which will serve for the further elaboration of a new system of protection of human rights and public prosecutor's system at the European Union level. We are talking about legal and legitimate law order at the level of the Union directed also to national legislation systems. Thank you very much for your attention!

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: — Dear colleagues, at the end of the plenary session I would like to note that the speeches made today were rather monologues than dialogues by genre. Of course, I would never think that I am the only person here who has read each of the 234 published papers. But I would also like to express a hope that the next Conference will be dialogue- rather than monologue-like. We have already witnessed some examples of how to do that.

Since I know all the digests of the Conference since 1993, I would like to make some suggestions that could be taken into account in further discussions.

Dialogue of cultures is the main topic of the Conference. However, before speaking on what a dialogue of cultures means, we need to define what culture is. There are a number of approaches to this notion. First of all, culture is defined as human activity and its results. There is also a semantic approach, according to which culture is a system of signs. There is a value approach, within which culture comprises everything valuable for a human. Research works are based on these approaches. However, as far as dialogue of cultures is concerned, I would say that the most fruitful is the culturological approach, which understands culture as everything created by the mind and the hands of a human being.

There is an extremely interesting question in this context: if cultures are able at all to be engaged in a

dialogue? Abdusalam Abdulkirimovich Guseynov at the last but one Conference, if I am not mistaken, made an absolutely valid notice that only a man can be a subject of dialogue. Cultures themselves are not involved in dialogue. Dialogue is performed by people on specific problems.

It is true that works of art and items of culture do not have a dialogue themselves, but there are processes of objectification and disobjectification. The man is the creator of works of art, literature and culture etc. through which he has an indirect dialogue with other people. How should we take this dialogue? I mean, should we take the items of material culture and the results of the human activity as connecting elements in the dialogue, as the elements that take part in that dialogue? This is what needs to be perceived. We know from philosophy that dialogue is characteristic of human communication. However, we also need to consider the culture's part in the dialogue. Which way? – Indeed, Vyacheslav Semyonovich Styopin takes culture as a source of human's activity programmes. This is what we need to consider when we structure theoretical schemes of dialogue of cultures.

Some authors in their recent works perceive culture as a second nature, meaning a 'living' substance. Culture is taken as a living substance, because all the items of material culture incorporate human activity, warmth and soul. I think we should move further and upgrade the theory of cross-cultural dialogue.

As you know, University of the Humanities and Social Sciences is the place where we, together with Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov, created 'Declaration of Rights of Culture'. We were immediately told by the lawyers it was impossible to adopt it. Even when the work on the declaration was still in progress, it was clear that the legal community would not accept it because culture is not a subject of law. However, we have some intuitive feeling that this kind of approach may be worked out in detail and improved. Indeed, culture is not a subject of law, officially. But it is an objectified human activity. We inherit it. The rights of culture are our rights, our children's and grandchildren's rights.

Now I would like to speak about two political approaches to dialogue of cultures. The first approach is fairly well studied by a lot of western scientists, including Samuel Huntington. The core of this approach is: cultures are different, and after the USSR collapsed the conflicts in the world will no longer be based on the clash of two different socio-economic systems – communism and capitalism. They will be based on cultural differences. The West is supposedly the medium of ultimate culture and has to think of how to gain a victory over the barbarians. Thus, since 1996 we have been taking Huntington as a herald of inevitable conflicts precipitated by culture.

There is also another approach, established by Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov. This approach is being elaborated in the world (Mr. Joshi, Mr. Yakovenko and other participants of the Likhachov Conference dwelt upon that) – each culture is self-sufficient; diversity of cultures is especially valuable and has to be taken as a treasure. That means that we should love our own culture, but at the same time we should see other cultures as a source for personal improvement and cultural enrichment. Based on that, the right of all cultures to exist is confirmed. It becomes clear when we speak about ancient traditional cultures, like India's or China's cultures

etc. However, the cultures of indigenous people have the same rights as well.

The first viewpoint is: the West possesses some sort of exclusive right for the truth, some sort of ultimate knowledge, so the rest of the world has to admit that and restructure itself according to the western cultural pattern. Another point of view on what takes place in the cross-cultural dialogues is: each culture has the right to exist and it has to be perceived as a treasure. I think this is an important issue to consider. These two approaches are totally different. Perhaps, we should add one more element to the modern understanding of human rights – the right for culture. Then Likhachov's viewpoint, full of freedom and parity, will prove to be more 'western', in the classical understanding of the basics of law, than Huntington's ideas.

We had an extremely interesting conversation on global culture today: if it can be established or not. My personal opinion is that it has been established already. Abdusalam Abdulkerimovich Guseynov has written a lot of interesting things about that. Vyacheslav Semyonovich Styopin's works contain a lot of informative thing about that too. The world of science, natural science for the first place, is global culture already. We can witness the global culture operating at airports, international organizations etc. The spheres of our life where global culture is displayed are many. And it is clear today that it is a 'superstructure' of national cultures.

Expressing his doubts about global culture, Nikolay Dmitrieevich Nikandrov turns to the language problem. It seems reasonable if global culture is equivalent to national culture. But why should global culture be taken as equivalent to national culture? Why shouldn't it possess a different structure and a different frame of subsystems? Why should it be based on a common language? Why don't we consider a different approach?

But everything remains somewhat ambiguous even if the language constituent is taken into account. Consider, for example, expatriate Russians on Briton Beach or expatriate Chinese in San-Francisco. The seniors there can speak only their native language, but their children speak English as well. However, this fact does not impede the family culture. We see the family where children speak three languages – the languages of their mum, dad and the country of residence. It turns out that we are able to live in a multilingual world.

Three years ago Mikhail Borisovich Piotrovsky said at the Conference that all of us should learn to live in diverse cultures. It seems an obvious and topical approach to me.

On the other hand, there are considerable contradictions between global culture and national cultures. Each nation will dream of its language spoken all around the world. But how will global culture be structured? Which way will national cultures contribute to the establishment of global culture? How will the rights of national cultures' quota in global culture be guaranteed? It seems to me that these are the questions that haven't been well examined by social sciences and the humanities. I think it would be reasonable to discuss these questions at the workshops tomorrow, as well as at the next International Likhachov Conference.

There is one more interesting issue that I would like to share with you. Organizing this Conference I had some difficulties talking to some lawyers, economists and historians. You may know that Karl Marx's formula still prevails in Russia (the way we used to interpret Marx) - 'the social being of men determines their consciousness': economy is supposedly the foundation while culture is supposedly the superstructure. Culture includes libraries, theatres, museums and cinema houses, institutions that are 'secondary' to economy, while economy is supposedly the main key element. I would like to make another emphasis: culturological approach in one of its aspects understands 'culture' as everything created by the mind and the hand of man throughout the human history. Economy, in the frame of such interpretation, is only one of subsystems, but not the key element. And economy has a lot of sophisticated interconnectors with culture. So, after 70 years of a limited and oversimplified interpretation of Marx we have to reconsider some things and to get to a different interpretation of interconnections between material and spiritual spheres of social life.

The same thing is true for law. A. G. Lisitsyn-Svetlanov made a very interesting speech today. Indeed, law is tightly linked to national cultures. And prominent and outstanding lawyers are, by all means, aware of numerous complexities of such links. However, I know by experience that lawyers, at the law faculty at our University and other places, when talking on culture and law, only say that people must be cultured and must observe the law. Lawyers are not always aware of the fact that law, legal system and law enforcement are predetermined by culture. By all means, law is an independent subsystem, but only within a culture, while culture incorporates economy and philosophy and ideology. We should study the interconnections of philosophy, ideology, economy and law through culturology.

I wish you every success at the workshops tomorrow. And you are most welcome to the Conference next year!

Workshop 1

NATIONAL STATES AND WORLDS INSTITUTES: TOWARDS THE MAKING OF A GLOBAL CULTURE

Conference Hall of Radisson SAS Hotel, May 14, 2010

Heads of the Workshop:

- E. V. MITROFANOVA** Chairman of the Executive Board of UNESCO, Permanent Representative of Russia to UNESCO, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador, Dr. Sc. (Economics)
- A. V. YAKOVENKO** Deputy of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador

Participants:

- G. ANASTASSOPOULOS** Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of the Republic of Greece to UNESCO
- F. A. ASADULLIN** Head of the Department for Science and Relations with Public Services of the Russian Federation of the Moscow Islamic High Council, sheikh, Candidate of Philological Sciences
- V. M. DAVYDOV** Director of the Latin America Institute of RAS, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor
- P. DUTKIEWICZ** Director of the Institute of European, Russian, and Eurasian Research in Carlton University (Canada), Professor
- M. EL ZAHABY** Permanent Delegate of Egypt to UNESCO
- J. DE GLINIASTI** Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the French Republic to the Russian Federation
- M. M. JOSHI** Member of Parliament of the Republic of India, Ph.D
- M. KATAGUM** Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Nigeria to UNESCO
- V. B. KUVALDIN** Head of the Chair of Social and Humanitarian Disciplines of the Moscow School of Economics of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Professor of the Moscow State Institute for International Relations (University) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, Doctor of Historical Sciences
- M. R. MAJIDI** Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran to UNESCO, Doctor, Bachelor in the field of electronics, Master in the field of management
- K. MUSHAKOJI** Director for the Centre of Asia-Pacific partnership of the University of Economics and Law (Japan), Vice-Chancellor of the UNO University of Regional and International Research, Professor
- V. V. NAUMKIN** Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies of RAS, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor
- F. PETITO** Professor of the University of Sussex (Great Britain), Doctor
- V. V. POPOV** 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 Historical Sciences, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador
- J. RADVANYI** Director of the Centre for French-Russian Research (Moscow), Professor of the National Institute of Eastern Languages and Civilizations (Paris, France), Doctor of Geography
- M. RAVA** Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Estonia to UNESCO
- P. ROELL** President of the Institute for Strategic, Political, Security, and Economical Consultancy (Berlin), Ph.D
- M. SANAI** Director of the Centre of Study Russia and Eastern Europe in Teheran University (Iran), Member of the Kazakh Academy of Social Sciences, Professor, D. S. (Political Science).
- K. V. SHUVALOV** Ambassador-at-large of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Special Representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation in cooperation with Alliance of Civilization, Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador
- O. SUEBSITH** Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Thailand to UNESCO
- M. TLILI** Founder and Director of the New York University Centre for Dialogues, Diplomat
- T. YAMAMOTO** Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Japan to UNESCO
- K. YAO YAO** Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Cote d'Ivoire to UNESCO
- T. A. ZHDANOK** Deputy of the European Parliament (Latvia), Doctor of Mathematics

A. V. YAKOVENKO: — Dear Ladies and Gentlemen, the subject of our discussion is “National states and World Institutes: interaction in the process of formation of the global culture”. Before we start working I would like to introduce those who are present today.

Eleonora Mitrofanova, a representative of Russia in UNESCO, the Chairman for the Executive Committee of UNESCO, is going to be in charge of the meeting. Further, I would like to introduce myself. My name is Alexander Yakovenko, I am the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation. I would like to greet every ambassador who represents UNESCO at this conference. This is for the first time that we have such a representative delegation from UNESCO at the Likhachev readings. I hope the tradition will be kept in the future. The Likhachov readings are a really great event. We feel proud to welcome you all here. And we are very grateful you have found the time to come to St. Petersburg.

All the speeches made at the plenary meeting seemed very interesting to me. Some reports were more of theoretical nature, some were of practical nature, but still each one was very interesting. Since the Ambassadors for the UNESCO participate in the work of our section, there is a suggestion to concentrate our attention on some practical issues. So we make a special emphasis on practical aspects like what has to be done at the level of international institutes to put into effect the idea of a dialogue between civilizations and cultures; what has to be done practically in international organisations to secure peace and safety through intercultural dialogue. Considering these issues I suggest we structure our discussion.

Please, do not read your reports. Every speaker is given 5–7 min. in order to let everybody take to the floor. Hope every one who wants to participate will have an opportunity to speak and answer the questions following the speech.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — First of all I would like to greet everybody who is present at the remarkable Likhachov readings. I am present at this event for the first time and I was impressed like lots of my colleagues had been, by the number of original opinions expressed at the plenary meeting. To my mind Mr. Yakovenko was very precise outlining the directions we have to have our discussion. For UNESCO it is very important to touch upon the practical side of the issue as the word combinations like the “dialogue of cultures”, “dialogue of civilizations” have become common. By the way we are trying to gradually do without the word “civilization” since most of the men of theory and men of practice we are co-working in UNESCO believe that the words “dialogue of civilizations”, “conflict of civilizations” and in general the word “civilization” help to part people more than to unite people and bring to common points of view and common issues.

What is a “global culture”? What segment do we mean in respect of civilization? What do we mean in general, speaking about culture? As we have got the economical culture, the technological culture. What do we speak about? It is important for if the global culture is possible in techniques and in economics we probably have to consider the human rights as the basis for the global culture? We have to have a clear notion of the terms and listen to the opinions of our colleagues.

The other important aspect to my mind is that within the international organisations the issues of the dialogue of cultures are being discussed very often. These issues are discussed in the international level already. But it is obvious that our efforts to find common points at the level of international organisations and governments are often strange to those people who these efforts are targeted at. Is this the issue for the elites only? What do we have to make the end consumer understand? What are the means to achieve this? What is going to be the media to convey those noble ideas in the dialogue of...lets do without the word “civilization”, lets say “cultures”. This is what we would like to listen to the opinions about. I realise everybody has a different topic to speak about, still if we make an effort to touch upon these issues, it is going to be very useful from every point of view. So, let me introduce the first speaker. It is Mr. G. Anastassopoulos, the Ambassador of Greece in UNESCO, the Chairman of the UNESCO’s General Conference in years 2008–2009.

G. ANASTASSOPOULOS¹: — Thank you Mrs. Mitrofanova. Ladies and Gentlemen, the debate of the global culture, its origin can not be overvalued. It is very important at present. In order to address the matter I believe it is important that we begin clarifying our vocabulary. This will enable us to take a closer look at the concept of global culture, which for all intended purposes can be split into 2 components: globalisation and culture. Above and beyond the theoretical debates that are very important, globalisation describes a process resulting in increasing the cross border flow of goods, information and culture. As such globalisation is the process that generates an increase in the cross border flow of several elements, among which culture is also included. In The Declaration on Cultural Policies, which was adopted in 1982, one can find 2 or 3 basic points: culture is the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterise the society or the social world. It includes not only the written letters but also the different modes of life, the fundamental right of the human being, value, traditions and beliefs. And this Declaration emphasises that every culture represents a unique and irreplaceable body of values. Since each people’s traditions and forms of expression are its most effective means of demonstrating its presence in the world. Building on these definitions the concept of global culture being far from uniform, is a set of values shared by the entire world. That is a world wide interconnected network of different cultures existing within nations.

The understanding of global culture concurs with the vision of the UNESCO Universal Declaration of Cultural Diversity. Some phenomena become simpler due to the rapid development of information communication technologies. It also makes the dialogue between separate cultures simpler. Globalisation does not necessarily imply the homogenisation of cultures. It can also facilitate the dialogue between cultures and cultural diversity. There are

¹ Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of the Republic of Greece to UNESCO. The author of books: “The 1992 challenge”, “Horizontal production”, “Double threat for Community Law”, “Common Principles for a European Electoral System”, “Constantinos Karamanlis: Myth and Truth”, “Introduction to European studies”, “The conflict on the system of electing the members of the European Parliament”, “The debate on the system of electing the members of the European parliament” and others.

two fundamental questions coming to our mind. How the states and international organisations have to react to the emergence of the global culture of diversity? And what is their role in this emergence and development? These questions are very important, and the member states forming the international community have to think of this.

This item was discussed at UNESCO in 1993, and in 1998 at the UN. And this is quite natural that nations are making efforts to protect their identity. There are also international conflicts that should be avoided. A number of other, not very big international organisations are also giving these items proper consideration, and the number of these organisations is constantly growing, the number is equal to thousands at present. These parallels and parallel trends can be stream flowed in well matching structures, and these structures can institutionally promote a good cultural status.

The issue of multinational states that sometimes fall apart into several new states based on the nationhood should be given special attention. We should not undervalue the role of international organisations in this respect. We should not let the influence of these organisations be diminished in the world. National states can not play the part the international organisations are playing in the world. The problems of international management are very important. We should give proper consideration to the tendency when national states are trying to get away from the influence of international organisations. Only the international organisations implying the interests of several countries are capable of sorting out international problems.

And I am finding another important point in globalization and would like to say a couple of words of the global cities such as New York, London, Tokyo, Singapore whose role transfers the nation's states in which they happen to be located. These states are unique state cities combining at the same time functions of several states at the same time. These are multinational cities. Multinational organisations have to pay special attention to these cities and assist in organising the life and the culture there. These cities are experiencing pressure to hand over power upwards to international organisations, for instance, on the other hand, they are also under a crisis pressure to hand power downwards to regional institutions.

I would like to give a few examples in order to shed more light on this question. The Mexico City Declaration of Cultural Policies contains the set of principles that should govern the cultural policies and sets the ground for a paradigm shift. The UNESCO declaration on Cultural Diversity a little later in 2001 further elaborates on this vision by aiming both to preserve cultural diversity and to prevent segregation and fundamentalism. It defines cultural diversity as the common heritage of humanity and should direct to be preserved for the benefit of present and future generations.

UNESCO signed Memorandum of the alliance and actively participated in two international forums organised in Madrid and Istanbul. The third Forum of the alliance of civilizations is due to take place on 27–29 May this year in Rio de Janeiro under the title “Bridging cultures—bridging peace”. The year 2010 is declared the International Year for the Cultures, and given this we are going to actively participate in building peace. UNESCO is designated to

play a leading role in the celebration of the year and we shall participate in all the events of this year.

I would like also to give some more examples. I do not believe in the existence of a unified world culture. A diversity of cultures co-exists. The main thing is to understand the cultures well. Precisely the lack of understanding generates problems. On this ground I should also have to question the ongoing sense of the term “civilization” that artificially unites around a single entity a multiple of values, beliefs, belief systems, ways of being and traditions.

I would like to refer to a very characteristic paradigm. To give you an idea of how things are, how we think things similar, I am referring to paradigm of Hellenistic period. In that time people tended to give everything a profound consideration. It may be called an expedition of civilizations. There was a very good congress in UNESCO and we have seen that after the last findings of the ecological missions in the whole area, and after the appraisal of texts, people found out that between the Greeks and the colonies they were setting up, between nations living in the Mediterranean was in fact a characteristic symbiosis within the 2 parts of the Mediterranean and a cultural exchange. So it was a symbiosis of cultures that managed to enhance the whole mankind.

And I came to my conclusion. And I would like to ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, knowing how we all struggle at the international level to measure and manage the culture diversity within our borders. I ask myself, is there a necessity to develop a plan to hit the targets using the right terms? We have to realise the difficulties arising on the way, for example we understand how difficult it is to organise and hold the year of Cultures. I sincerely ask myself and I am asking all of you what we can specifically do to bring cultures to dialogue. Is it appropriately fast to intervene in certain spiritual arenas that are beyond our sphere of influence? I realise that it may sound provocative, but I honestly feel compelled to ask, can we do more than just organise cultural events that just propose artistic traditions and demonstrate a good way to value each others artistic talents? How can this cultural conversation in cultures, lead to more miniscule transformations that force the lasting peace and the new ethnos of dialogue?

I don't have the full answers to these questions. But I think that I have very solid grounds to put them. I simply believe that we have set a tall order for ourselves that may require that we consider refocusing our political attention on some basic considerations such as: what are the values that bring us together? What does this really mean to dialogue at international and national levels? What do we expect from this exchange? High level panels can help us list the principles that all of us cherish, but they can not build the consensus that is needed to solve the problem. And these are the main points.

Long-term stability requires us to consider without further ado the critical role culture plays in our personal and collective well-being and development. This in my opinion implies defending the global culture of diversity as well as universally shared values that guarantee our humanity. By serving that all cultures are intertwined and feeding each other, the international year should hopefully help us straighten our resolve to fight for human rights engage new forms of racism and discrimination that build hatred and distrust in the minds of men and women.

Thank you very much for your attention.
I was a bit long but I had to outline some issues.

A. V. YAKOVENKO: — *Thank you for your speech. You exercised your right of the first one taking the floor in respect of the time of your speech. I would like to ask other speakers to keep to the time limits to enable everybody to have the opportunity to make their speech. Now I would like to introduce Mr. Naumkin, the Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Science. We will thank you, if in your talk you will also respond to the items addressed in preceding speeches, which will make our discussion interactive.*

V. V. NAUMKIN¹: — I am going to respond briefly to what has been mentioned here already. My understanding is that we are not dealing with the global culture, nowadays; we have to deal with the global lack of culture. As for the culture, and here we can use any terms like “civilization” or “culture” is still something that belongs to the nation, hence it is something attributed to national peculiarities, ethnic origin, religion and other identifications and markers making up the basis for the culture. We may discuss the item of the global culture endlessly, but to my mind it has not yet been set up. Further, external powerful globalising processes taking place in the world (keeping in mind that globalisation started long ago, it is already hundreds of years old), some of them currently are extremely sensitive, these processes do not deal with the essence of life, but the real culture, its real essence strives to keep to the identification and national traits, to root the identification in the life of people, to maintain the cultural identity. A certain national ethnic, confessional integration for groups of solidarity is going on and they resist in some aspects the said powerful influence of globalisation.

That’s why, let’s say, a notion of a terrorist who is using not only a mobile phone, but a satellite phone and a PC for anti-globalising and in general for an anti-human act, this is something that people have got used to already. There are still more peaceful examples. Experts in cultural interactions often mention the following example. A traditional Japanese elderly woman dressed in a kimono comes to a cash dispenser and bows down to the machine as it has been a custom there. This is an example of a cultural peaceful discordance. Still there are tougher cultural discordances. To mention wearing a yashmak or paranja in Europe nowadays which gets people worried? What should be the approach to this issue, what should be the solution? The answer should be looked for not only in the field of culture but in the field of politics as well.

Talking of the cultural interaction one should mention three main paradigms in understanding the process. The first is the paradigm of differentialism, or it is the result of globalisation when cultures drift apart more and more and concentrate within themselves only. This is what

¹ Director of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor. Author for more than 500 articles including books: “The histories of the East”, “Articles on Ethnic linguistics of Sokotra”, “Sokotrians”, “Islam and the Muslims: culture and politics”, “Abu Hamid al Hazali”, “The right scales” and others. Chairman for the Editorial Board for “Oriens” magazine, the Editorial Board for “The Eastern archive” magazine, participates in editorial boards and editorial councils of the following magazines: “Central Asia and the Caucasus” (Sweden), “The Russian nation leaflet”, “MGU Leaflet”, series “Oriental Studies”, “Modern Islam”. Most books are translated into foreign languages.

I spoke about above. The other paradigm is the paradigm of convergence. It is expressed in assimilation or an idea of a more developed culture, let’s say, imposing on less developed cultures, and suppressing them, as has happened very often in the history of mankind. This is what causes fighting back. And the third paradigm is the paradigm of hybridisation, when cultures mix with each other and we have hybrids of cultural indications. It seems to me that, precisely this is the way to cultural interaction, in respect to cultural diversity, which is the heart of mankind.

Talking about a practical side of the matter (which is what the Chairman called everybody for) we are facing a question: should we be opposed to something, should we resist something (like, for example, xenophobia or segregation) or should we protect something and move forward (for example, maintain cultural identity for these or those groups)? How to combine the above said with those processes arising mixed feelings and very difficult to be interpreted only one way that was spoken about by the representative from Germany? Why migration does bring about a scourge nowadays and a manifestation of mixing cultures? If the globalisation is more like creating hybrids, it is acceptable, but if it means collisions in terms of one culture suppressing another, this causes awful cultural discordance or political clashes. The example of which is, the collision between the Western and the Islamic worlds.

I would like to sum up my message the following way: the modern approach to the culture, the modern interpretation of culture tends to simplify everything nowadays. The culture is understood a very simplified way. The close ties of the culture to the politics are being underestimated. And rooted within the very culture identification values that are resisting to globalisation are underestimated either. That is why getting cultures together by promoting cultural hybrids, promoting the values that help to unite people. That is what we should strive for.

Thank you.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you very much. And now I would like to let Mr. Murlī Manohar Joshi to take the floor.*

M. M. JOSHI: — A lot of what is written in our reports has been already discussed in the plenary meetings of the Likhachov Conference. I would like to emphasise some points.

The global communities must accept that diversity is the life of nature, it is created by nature, it is not only the meaning, but the basic fact is that nature itself has created diversity. The diversity reflects some sort of unity behind it. These natural diversities are not opposed to each other; they are not enemies to each other. But they are the system which creates a sort of a family, a glue which can be hard, which can make two things to come together. That is the most essential thing. Unless we accept that diversity is love nature, it is life. And we must not only accept diversity, not only tolerate it, but also be guided by the fact that diversity is the basis of the life. I think it is important not only for the nature, but for mankind as well. It is important also to understand that there may be different approaches to the forward movement, to the progress. I want to emphasise

that the principle of diversity shall be accepted as the basis of our life. It should be kept in mind.

Secondly as we know there are no objections to it, that culture defends some total experience of the community, of the millennia. We have to look into the way, how do we think of the others, what is our relationship with the environment? And we may be guided by this approach when talking about the culture as the movement to harmonisation. Here comes the role of globalisation.

What destroys the concept of family is a market. If we want to harmonise the cultures, we have to overcome the conflict existing at present. To me the harmonisation is not in the opposition to the idea of harmonising the cultures. Harmonising the cultures is more important. There are different cultures in the world: they are the cultures of customs, cultures of behaviour, cultures of developing and developed countries. But in every community regardless of the country there are highly educated people. There are developing nations that very often share common values though people may belong to different cultures. The issue we are discussing today is related to very serious problems. There is violence between the communities because of the difference in the economic status. A small section of the world community, which is about 16 %, controls almost 80 % of the global domestic product.

So these are very serious points which have to be discussed. How to create an economic situation, a level of consumption in the economy which is available to entire mankind or to the majority of mankind? And unless it is done I don't think that it is possible to talk about a world culture or a globalised world. What can be done in this respect? For instance, how and what way we could rely on techniques? And again we speak of certain systems control and of those who control those systems. In the present day world the information is passed to a bigger number of the population. What is going to be this information, how it is going to be passed in the globalised world, if it is going to reach every community, or some communities will be excluded? What is the ration man information? Is the process of consolidation going to become stronger? How in this respect globalisation is going to influence the communities?

History has proved that migration had always existed. People were migrating from one place to another. People were migrating from China to Europe and from India to Europe and from India to other countries and from Europe to other countries. So this was happening. So the migration was always there. The transformation of cultures was taking place. But it was not dominated by the economic forces, at least not to the amount we have got now; probably it was quite a different way. But still by migration, people brought in different values from different cultures.

One is aware of values shared by the Christians, the Muslims, the Hindus, and the Buddhists. And it is not by the way of globalisation but by way of a dialogue, traditional tolerance. I believe that "amalgamation" or merging of values and cultural elements is quite a tradition for mankind. It had been and it is now. And everything taken together will help (provided we want this) to turn the communities into a big family. But still we don't have to lose our diversity, the world diversity. I mean the spirit of every nation. When we are talking of globalisation we

discuss the materialistic side only, we forget of the spirit. I don't think "globalisation" is the best word to be used in the future of the mankind. We have to speak not only of globalisation, but of setting up a dialogue as well. Nothing can be sorted out using one means only. We have to implement a dialogue, possibilities that the science offers to us, we have to implement the spirit and the education in order to move towards the future.

Thank you.

A. V. YAKOVENKO: — Thank you very much for your interesting speech. You are right we have no other way but to start a dialogue. I listened to colleague from Germany at the plenary meeting attentively. He used numbers to show how the world is going to change, including the demography. Speaking about the politics, especially considering the financial and economic crisis we witnessed the "Great 20" setting up. This is an example of the co-operation proving that only joining our efforts we can cope with some global issues.

In the XX century, especially in the second half of it in respect of globalisation and global culture the Western countries dominated, the so called "western civilization". The dominance was obvious in information, for instance in the Internet as a part of the global information network, in high tech, in industry. The reason for this is obvious: the Western countries used to produce the major part of the gross domestic product. The situation is being changed at present. China, India, Brazil and some other countries are taking over. The world is changing. We have already felt it when the places in the International Monetary Fund were allocated. Quotes in the World Bank are being changed; the influence of "new" states is growing and will be growing. Naturally the cultural influence effected by these states represented by 1,5 mln people will also strongly influence the global culture. The influence of these countries can only grow. Some 10–20 years will pass and we will witness this process. And the Western culture will have to make up with this. My opinion is that without the dialogue of cultures we will face only arguments and conflicts. This issue seems very interesting and I suggest that the speakers make their attitude towards this problem sound.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *The next one to take the floor is a delegate of Japan to UNESCO Mr. Tadamishi Yamamoto.*

T. YAMAMOTO¹: — Thank you Mrs. Chairman. I would like to touch up on globalisation a little bit differently. Globalisation literally touches upon the basic desires of human beings, we have to look at how these basic desires are affected by the globalisation. There are several ways the globalisation already increased the communication and exchanges among nations across the globe.

One affects the cost level or the convenience level of people. For instance, the proliferation of the fashion, "McDonalds", or proliferation of something which is very comfortable to the human being is something which can proliferate across the border. And it is common that sometimes these ideas are monopolised and it is a fashion

¹ Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Japan to UNESCO.

that is effective. But this is something very basic. It is a sort of sentiment which is common to all human beings for desire to have something nice and comfortable, nice and lovely and this is all right. This aspect we can sort of leave alone.

The second aspect is that the globalisation enhances the information exchange, and this can actually produce problems. One calls for the rise of pride of nationality, of identity, because people begin to realise that within a more common, more globalised world you have to set yourself, you have to know who you are. And the urge for identity is thought about more, actually acutely as compared to when you have nation states defining their identity. Then they loose this sort of identity of nationality as something defining and giving the passport to go everywhere with certainty you have to have your own identity. UNESCO actually plays a very important role in this respect. The whole idea of world heritage, the whole idea of intangible heritage is designed to bring about the awareness of nationality, of the historic pride, of the people, so in fact in some remote places like Japan or Asia, or Africa, Europe you name it, these groups shall be given the identity that they need.

Another aspect which is more difficult is actually the conflict. Because people thinking differently contact with each other and they have conflicts. And this is the place where I think the most attention is now being paid. In terms of conflict of interest, conflict of civilization and so on and so forth. And this is the area which many people are addressing.

I don't have to speak much about this because I think that all the arguments have been made. Here obviously you have to try to fix the issue by trying to bridge the gap. How to bridge the gap, that is of course as people already said, dialogue is one way. But I think people have to look for some kind of key-word. What is it? That is to make it possible for dialogue to be possible. That is the creation of the environment where actually people can understand each other. The problem arises particularly amongst the sort of religious dialogue because of the particularly monostheistic culture, because of the doctrine that you shall not accept any other doctrine other than yours. And this means that there is of course very little room for dialogue and understanding.

So here if we go back in the European history of the 17th century, for instance, the Huguenots and Catholics in France made efforts to grasp the basis for the Heretics existence. It was a very painful process but they could achieve the results, by exhibiting patience and tolerance. Let's have a look at that situation in modern day Asia, including Japan. Asian countries developed by accepting different cultures from outside. This is Japan accepting the culture from China, Korea, and the Eastern world. They often were opposed to each other in terms of existence. They were not exclusive. We were ready to accept them. This made to do with religious thinking which actually started the animism, we accepted 8. 000. 000 gods which we had no monolithic authority of their own. Similarly with Buddhism and Confucianism. It was a sort of philosophical thinking which we allowed for the acceptors diverse and different. Therefore the cure here is acceptance and harmony, tolerance, which should create dialogue.

We have to respect the authenticity and differences of all this historic pride. We have to differentiate notions speaking of globalisation. Thank you.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you very much. Let's give the floor to Tatyana Zhdanok, a Deputy of the European Parliament of Latvia.*

T. A. ZHDANOK¹: — I want to tell you some words as an acting politician, dealing with problems of international relations, national minority rights, since in the European parliament in Latvia I am representing the problems of the Russian speaking minority. Being a man of practice I will speak on the situation in Europe since I am working in the Committee in civil rights, freedom and home affairs of the European parliament which is substructure of the European Union. I am participating in the group of so called "regionalists" who are representing the interests of the majority.

Here if we have a look at the given tasks is a certain contradiction. Mr. Naumkin suggested an alternative: On one hand we have to develop the legislation, let's say some international agreements prohibiting discrimination, any forms of racism, anti-Semitism, xenophobia, Islamophobia (in the European parliament I keep suggesting to include Russiaphobia into this list, as we are facing this phenomena very often especially in the European politics); on the other hand, on the contrary we have to think and act positively and develop the right for cultural uniqueness for every nation and other groups of people. I am more and more coming to the conclusion that one should go parallel to the other, since here we come across contradictions all the time.

It is considered that people being of a multiple identity have to speak their mother language, the language their neighbours speak, be familiar with the culture of their neighbours and besides to speak the "global language". For example the English language is gradually becoming "lingua franca". The problem is the hostility and rejection often is registered in respect of the language of the neighbour and the culture of the neighbour. Here we have to use the means that oppose the discrimination in respect of some languages.

Mr. Anastassopoulos mentioned the Basks movement and the aspiration of some people to create their own states. This could be achieved for instance by setting up autonomies. But I am sorry to say striving to create all possible conditions for their own culture some people start to discriminate the culture of their neighbours. In autonomous community Catalonia, for instance, they are discontinuing to use the Spanish language in the education given the conditions that so many Spaniards are living there. In Latvia where I'm living the Russian language is being retiring from the education everywhere. Or a conflict being faced in Belgium, manifested by their government dissolved and elections planned for the sake of creating a new government on the grounds that the Flemings are trying to stop using the French language in Brussels. Sometimes

¹ Deputy of the European Parliament of Latvia, Doctor of Mathematics, Co-Chairman of the Board of party "For the rights of the man in united Latvia". The author of a number of books, including "Test tasks in higher mathematics: Sets. Functions. Limits. Derivatives", "Tasks for written entrance exams in mathematics in 1983 and 1984 (including answers)" and others. One of the founders of the European Russian alliance.

the demands are absurd, like welfare will be provided only in case people speak Flemish. But the second language for the emigrants in Brussels is French. Hence there are arguments.

That is why we need international means, institutes that make it possible to protect the rights of minorities. These minorities got new qualities in new formations. I still do not know how to settle the problem of forced assimilation of the traditional minorities living in the given area. This problem is obvious everywhere in Europe. One more example is a notoriously famous law of the language in force in Slovakia that infringes the rights of Hungarians living there.

Mrs. Mitrofanova asked a question, how to sort out this issue at the level of international organisations. Being a representative of the Committee of Latvia on human rights had the chance to participate in international forums and came to the conclusion that once it comes to the problems related to the rights of minorities there is a kind of a “football” game. For example the Baltic countries accuse Russia of violating the human rights. Russia in its turn blames the Baltic countries in violating the rights of the Russian speaking minority. The same “football” game or blaming each other in terms is between Greece and Turkey when speaking about Cyprus. Nobody is looking for the solution at the end of the day. So the suggestion is for the governmental bodies to consider the issues not in the course of a dialogue but every issue separately. For instance a Committee on the Russian speaking population in the Baltic countries is set up, and it deals only with this problem on every level, and should not be tied to the problem of the human rights violation in Chechnya, that is what happens very often.

I would say there should be a dialogue on every one separate problem. And every conflict (there are a lot of them, I am sorry to say) should be sorted out implementing international means, institutes that ban discrimination, without reference to other cases in order to avoid going in circles. Thank you for your attention.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you very much. And the next one to speak will be Mr. Mushakoji, the Director for the Centre of Asia-Pacific partnership, University of Economics and law (Japan), UN University Vice Rector in the regional and international research.*

K. MUSHAKOJI¹: — I am not going talking about my people though this may be of a definite interest to you. I will talk about my own paper which is very close to the discussion presented by professor of China Xing Guancheng yesterday about the fact that if you want to have a good dialogue you should not only have Aristotelian Western logic but also have the wisdom of the Book of Change, China. But I would like to address the question which has just been addressed about human rights and culture.

Personally I am involved in the international movement called “The International Movement Against All Forms of

Discrimination and Racism” and I am working in the UN Human Rights Council. There I found that a very important resolution presented by the Russian Federation Republic was accepted but was accepted in the absence of the Western industrialised countries. And this is for me a very sad situation. The notion presented by Russia was about the human rights and human values and the human rights. Specialists of the North, the West did not like the idea that traditional values can be comparable to universal human rights. And I am for universal human rights, but I am not for imposing human rights from outside, and UNESCO and the University have been developing the concept of indigenous development, indigenous intellectual creativity, and this is where the problem is. Human rights can be implemented only if you have indigenous internally generated cultural process. And the story of Chekhov, and the peasant woman. Who cried, listening to the story of St. Peter. I see that there is something which is not in the enlightenment, but which is very important for the countries that are not the leading countries. These are very special characteristics which should be remembered and which should be kept. In Japan I have an uncle-writer who started a village for artists, for community life which was based on the Tolstoy (he admired Tolstoy). And in Japan we have a long tradition of learning from the Russians. And it is because, probably, in Russia you had an experience of meeting modality, meeting universal values imposed on you from the West. And we are all sharing that.

We realise that it is important to possess something that is not a part of a global thing. Universal values are extremely important. But imposing universal values is quite a different process. Sometimes it is just silly starting to impose universal values. What is important is to develop a rich understanding of the lack of human rights in different parts of the world but within each country’s control and historical tradition and this is fair, for example, in China. Precisely in China one can witness this inheritance, this continuation of the culture.

At the same time there is a process of sharing and teaching. Jawaharlal Nehru used to emphasise mutual benefits the colonial countries obtain in the process of mutual education. China, and probably Japan, used to be egocentric countries. They are getting closer at present. In China they have Hu Shi, the writer who wrote about what the effect of modernisation on the common people is. And so we in Japan would be very disturbed by growing China in the American style, a liberal China. But we know that in China they have a very deep and versatile culture, they have their philosophers, historians, etc., who are looking at things not from the top, but from the bottom, from the people themselves.

And so I would like to ask you to discuss the problem of meritocracy which comes top-down global and then local. I am against localism and I am for globalism. We should start from the local and from human insecurity. And the Japanese Government has strengthened the idea of human security, because human insecurity is not just universal but something that is felt by the individuals. We should start from there, and then from the local goal to the global. This is why I would like to ask you to think of dialogue in that sense. Not of dialogue from the global level down, but a cultural dialogue, which start with a peasant woman and,

¹ Director for the Centre of Asia-Pacific partnership, University of Economics and law (Japan), UN University Vice Rector in the regional and international research, Professor. Author of works “An Introduction to Peace Research”, Political and Cultural motifs of Conflicts and the Global Management”, “Japanese Foreign Policy in a Multipolar World”, Behavioural Sciences and International Politics”, etc.

for example in Japan we have a dialogue with Philippines who have being travelling, and they are much wiser than we are. So this is the kind of cultural dialogue which I hope UNESCO will promote. Thank you.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you. Let me introduce Veniamin Popov, who is the Director for the Centre of Partnership of Civilizations of the Institute of International Research of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia.*

V. V. POPOV¹: — I would like to make some remarks in order to speed up the discussion and make it a little livelier. A lot was said about the two tendencies for universalism. There is no way to stop the globalisation. It is an objective process. Still we have to keep in mind that soon probably there will be no one mono-heinous state in the world, with only one nation represented. And we have to live with this and create new ways of life. Changes in our life take place so quick that we have no time to fix them, nothing to say of studying them. The science is not very quick, I am sorry to say. Mr. Yakovenko was right saying that the speed of changes and alterations does not let you think over what is going on and to think of the future.

I dare say that the coming several years are going to be the years of opposition between the Western and the Islamic worlds. I see it as the four crises will get to the burning state at the same time. They are the Middle East crisis (which is a dead end to my mind, and there is no way for now to settle the problem); Iran crisis (meaning the situation set up about Iran); Iraq drama (Americans must leave Iraq), and the last one is the Afghanistan and Pakistan area (which is very dangerous; I am not going to go into details but the fact that in 2009 the Taliban were attacking the General Staff of the Pakistan army tells us a lot).

Nevertheless we have to live in the world where each nation (especially a small nation) has to defend its rights. I fully support the speaker from Latvia. It is a must for otherwise smaller nations, which will just dissolve in bigger nations. And in this respect we have to emphasise useful and positive things. It is a task for every international organisation and for every human being. What positive experience means in this respect? In fact there is mutual enrichment between civilizations and cultures, they interact, but we have to fix the borders for this interaction. Borders like Academician Guseynov used to say are, no violence. Everything can be discussed, spoken about, but do not start to be violent.

There are many examples of how the civilizations enrich each other. A representative from Japan was speaking here. To my mind the experience they have got in Japan should be distributed to other states and should be strongly promoted by UNESCO. There on some dates they go to Buddhist temples, on certain dates to Shintoist temples, girls prefer to get married in Catholic cathedrals.

¹ Director for the Centre of Partnership of Civilizations of the Institute of International Research of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia. Candidate of Historical Sciences, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. Author of a number of scientific articles and books: "Persian Gulf in the plans and in the politics of the West", "Tunisia is close" and others. Member of the Boarder and the Director in the International Relations of the Fund of the Islamic Culture, Science and Education Support.

It is a nice example of tolerance. And these examples are multiple.

My point is: "the life suggests more opportunities than any plot", this was first mentioned by Goethe, and the life proves this point. The fruitful way different cultures and the civilization intertwined with each other, is manifested even by state figures acting in the politics nowadays. What do we see in the USA? The president is a man of different cultures (not only "black" and "white" cultures, if I am allowed to say so). This is a man who spent several years at school in Indonesia, and got familiar with several cultures. What is going on in France? We are witnessing there a similar process. N. Sarkozy is a classical example (if he has some French blood, the percentage is still very small). The present day British leader for the Liberal-Democrat Party has obvious Russian roots. This is the law of the present day life. One can give an endless number of examples like that. This process can't be stopped. By the way there a lot of people like that present at the meeting. This is our future; we have to pay attention to this, which way and we have to make films about this, promote this on the Internet, and write books about this.

We are at present writing a book on why the religions went apart, why different civilizations emerged. It should be translated in many languages and be read by the young people. In this hall there is present an outstanding Russian scientist, Professor Yu. V. Yakovec, the author of the theory of civilization, who wrote a lot of books on it. He is thinking of an Internet University now. To my mind it is a very important thing. I would say this idea should be supported by UNESCO and other organisations. Basically because the young people in Russia do not watch TV, they are submerged in the Internet. That's why people on line should be guided the right way, I mean correct videos and stories should be shown, etc. I was happy to make friends to Chigiz Aitmatov a great writer and a wise person. He used to emphasise all the time that he was a man of different cultures. Thank you.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you very much. I would like Mr. Jean Radvanyi, Director of the Centre for French-Russian Research, Professor of the National Institute of Eastern Languages and Civilizations (Paris), Doctor of Geography.*

J. RADVANYI²: — Since I have become the Director of the Centre for French- Russian Studies in Moscow I have to deal with the issues of globalisation, cultural exchange, etc. I have got the impression that global cultures do exist, global tendencies do exist, but at the same time there is quite a different tendency, it is a tendency to simplify things. We are living in the time of stereotypes. It is peculiar for every country to have their own points of view to other cultures, neighbours, other states. I do not think it is a good tendency,

² Director of the Centre for French-Russian Research, Professor of the National Institute of Eastern Languages and Civilizations (Paris), Doctor of Geography. Graduated from INALCO specialising in the Russian Language. Was at head of the group studying ex Soviet states, managed the center for Russia and Euro-Asian research. Author of the books: "Les Etats post-Sovietiques", "La nouvelle Russie", "Atlas du Monde diplomatique", "La Russie entre deux mondes", "Atlas geopolitique du Caucase" and others. Member of the Scientific Council Leibnitz Institut fur landerkunde in Leipzig (Germany) and the Editorial Board of magazine "Slovo" (INALCO).

and it depends on and is caused by the instruments of the global civilization: Internet, international TV, etc.

For example, for many Frenchmen, as well as for a lot of people in the West, Russia due to its historic, cultural, religious specific traits seems to be a country where democratic ideas, ideas of modernisation will never be customised. It is a cliché which is multiplied by the TV, newspapers, etc. in the West. At the same time here in Russia people think that due to a great number of immigrants coming into France takes the risk of losing its culture and its language. These clichés are basically a problem. And I consider my task is to find out how we can get rid of them as they are very harmful, they are too widely spread, it is obvious. I guess these clichés are related to many phenomena: historical, social, economical, geopolitical. They depend on what a certain state is doing in certain circumstances. At the same time these clichés are tightly connected to the history of the state.

I would define the last two years as the years of commemoration (collective memory). It is related to the Second World War. Practically in every state, including Russia and France, some politicians and sometimes the Government made use of the events in order to not only celebrate the victory, but also to influence the public opinion changing it to their mind. The targets may be different in this case: exclusively electoral, political or what is more important, they try to change the attitude to main events and main figures like Stalin for example.

Our Centre arranged a seminar called "History, historians and the power" where Russian, French and German historians exchanged their views. What was the general conclusion? They drew attention to the fact that in the last few years, getting access to the archives is not easier but more difficult. Not long ago I read the interview of D. Medvedev given to "Izvestia" newspaper. I hope this will help to change the situation for the better. It is also difficult for the young scientists to participate in the dialogue, in co-operation, in joint work between our countries; I mean France and Russia.

At the said conference there was expressed an idea that only practical and specific solutions should be proposed. I am not a diplomat, I am the Director of the Scientific Centre, and to my mind what should be done is some steps should be taken to change the visa legislation between Russia and the European Union and the students' exchange. In the Western Europe we have a program "Erasmus" for the students. And it ensures a possibility for those who want to study for 6 months in another country of the European Union. It is important as the students are merged into a different culture and study a different language. I would suggest that Russia should be accepted into this system, so that students from France could study in Russian Universities and vice versa, the students from Russia have to have the right to study in French Universities. I want the access to the archives to be open and also to different funds. These are practical steps that can be made. Thank you for your attention.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you. And now Mr. Piotr Dutkiewicz, the Director of the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Research in Carlton University, Canada, is going to make his report.*

P. DUTKIEWICZ¹: — Ladies and Gentlemen! I am not a diplomat. I am teaching children and from time to time I come to the Canadian Government to ask them not to make too many mistakes.

There are 2 questions that I believe are the centre of our debates for the last few days. The first question is why to a certain extent we are going in circles in the debate of dialogue of culture. And it seems that we are in the same place after so many years. And the second question is why is there a growing gap between the high debate of the dialogue of culture and the low debate? Why there is a growing gap between the international diplomatic efforts and the people down below? The high level is becoming less and less relevant to this debate. And that is my great concern. Because to bring both low and high level effort together is the ultimate goal of our debate.

The dialogue about the culture, the dialogue about the civilization, does not matter, the terminology is ontologically the same, it is about equals. What makes us equal? What make dialogue among culture equal? It's because we are facing the same existential concerns, because we are facing the same existential threat. What are the differences and what are the existential concerns for the people down and below the social ladder? It's a problem of nature; it's a problem of bio-economy, bio-diversity, so on and so forth. It's a problem of justice. It's a problem of governance, how we can manage the diversity? How can we manage the difference? And it's a problem of space. Which include migration, urbanisation, etc. So these 4 areas, nature, justice, governance and space are of the great concern to those people which we are working for. My point at today's discussion is that we should not address probably in reconcilable cultural differences, presenting in purely value terms or religious terms, but rather we should attempt to conceptualise the relatively universal talking points. That will be of the relevance to people like me.

Thank you very much.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you. The floor is taken by the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the French Republic in the Russian Federation Mr. Jean de Gliniasti.*

J. DE GLINIASTI²: — The theme put for the discussion today — institutional structures of the local and global level is extremely relevant today. It took the world less than 50 years to swap from bi-polar structure to the uni-polar structure. There was the time when the USA, it goes without saying, dominated in everything. Now we are having a multi-polar structure, based on which the global culture is going to be created.

There are different aspects to this problem. But I will touch up on a few. There was in the history of mankind a remarkable time when we started to believe in the end of the history, the end of national cultures due to a model

¹ Director of the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Research in Carlton University, Canada, Professor. Author of books: "Problems of local development in Poland" (1989), "NATO looks East" (1998), articles "Challenges of the democratisation: perspectives of the political transformation in the Eastern Europe" (et all), "New role of Canada in relationship with Russia" (et all).

² Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary Ambassador of the French Republic in the Russian Federation.

prevailing that was called a “soft power”, into the globalised culture represented by a mixture of Hollywood, coca-cola, Mirelle Matieu (as some elements of this culture belong not only to the American culture). That’s why the end of the bi-polar world and setting up the multi-polar world were to conform with a cultural model considered at that time to be unique, “enriched” with some folk elements of Slavic, African, Latin cultures. This was what we consider to be the global culture. This cultural model is based on structure powers that belong to the uni-polar structure.

At this very time a swap to the multi-polar phase took place. To the opposite of our expectations, there was no end of the world, but wars and crises went on. The main event that changed the geopolitical and cultural presentation of the world was emerging of new powers. Having China, India, Brazil and Russia back in the international scene we are facing the world that is not yet stable, but already striving for cultural diversity. Hence after the uni-polar stage is over the governments try to promote their cultural models, their way of thinking, and their own conceptions. New states and more significant centres of cultural development.

This world is being created currently. It is clear it is surviving its diversification stage at present. I mean not the stage of falling apart but diversification. For instance, Chinese films are made, Chinese literature created. A lot of things prompt the idea that the world is becoming multi-polar and at the same time a very versatile culture wise world, which may seem at the moment to be making no sense. We are in the intermediate stage at present. How can we arrange this stage, the way more preferable for us, I mean a more united, more tight, more harmonised world institution and culture wise.

I would like to say a couple of words of the world institutions and international organisations. The international organisations like the UN, until today followed the set up rhythm- bipolar and uni-polar. The question is how to manage the multi-polar world and how to transfer it into a logic system intended to control world wide issues? Speaking about the Security Council in the UN, I have to say that the item of procedures is very difficult. Still it is clear that we have to enlarge this organisation, though the process will take us longer than we expected. The Security Council in the UN without China and India is a nonsense, we have to accept these countries if we are willing to secure strategic safety in the world.

The economic development went similar way. We started with “Great Five”, then we proceeded to “Great Eight”, and now we have “Great Twenty”. It is unavoidable. Currently “Great Eight” is involved into looking for solutions for some items only. China, being a member of the “Great Twenty”, became a powerful player. There they have concentrated not only half of the population of the world but also significant monetary funds.

The same applies to the environment issues. It is a well known fact that these problems are connected to the problems of culture, cultural changes in respect of the nature and the world as a whole. We are at the stage now when conventions are adopted; conferences held, that very often result in failure and are more of a sign of a necessity to manage the cultural inheritance and the world together. It is clear not all the problems may be settled by the Copenhagen Conference or Rio de Janeiro Conference.

We have to have an organisation that would undertake to get involved with every element above mentioned and would secure international legitimisation of the environmental culture.

I would like to sum up saying that this relationship between the Institutes and the culture is now at the stage of globalisation, which basically is manifested by new structures of the world management and control setting up and put into effect by different international organisations. This is difficult. An interesting fact is that this international structure is in compliance with the new type of culture. This is very important for the Frenchmen. Cultural diversity is based on the set of values that are worked out step by step by the international organisations as well. Thank you.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you very much. Now I would like Mrs. Yao Yao to take the floor.*

KAN YAO YAO¹: — I am grateful to Mrs. Chairman for the invitation to participate in this important conference. I heard here a lot of terms like “global culture”, “getting cultures together”, and “cultural diversity”. But I do not see many representatives from Africa, whereas in Africa there are a lot of experts in this field. How to get people familiar with us? I am representing the whole Africa here. My country, Cote d’Ivoire, made a great investment into the cultures of such countries like Nigeria, Benin, Burkina-Faso, Ghana and other African countries. Is the global culture possible? From what I can see Africa is absorbed, flooded by other cultures and by the Western culture in particular. I speak French, others speak English, but in fact I can not express what I would like to when I am not speaking my native language. Because the French language, has a totally different mentality, in viewing the world. I would very much like to say something of utterly our own, my own. That’s a pity I speak only French. It is a problem of my country and my culture, but not only my culture. We have existed in the global culture for a long time. Though such great artists, such as Picasso and others, they got a lot of ideas from Africa. This is our investment into the global culture.

I do not think people know much about us, though we need to be known about. Here at this table there are not specialists in culture but ambassadors who want to share their ideas. How to get cultures together? Yes, we want them to get together. When we come to Europe it is rather easy to communicate to the Europeans, but in Russia it is difficult because of the lack of knowledge of the language. But we have problems going to France because of their visa requirements. It is necessary to make for the people getting closer to each other easier. At the same time we want to go back to our own culture, to our own values, we do not want the African culture to be substituted by the European culture. We appeal to the humanists — scientists, to the politicians: there are remarkable people of culture and science in Africa who could assist getting the cultures together.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Mr. Muhammad el Zahaby from Egypt is welcome to speak. Next.*

¹ Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Cote d’Ivoire to UNESCO.

M. EL ZAHABY¹: — Thank you. First of all I would like to greet the organisers of this conference for the choice of these topics. I was just thinking to suggest if we would continue the debate of the subjects at next sessions of UNESCO.

I want to focus on some issues. The first questions asked by Mr. Yakovenko: what should we do. I think that we should do a lot, and we have to do a lot. In our time including the last century we all agree that the target of widening the market has been present since antiquity. And these increasing independencies and the conventions activities amount to the loss of the cultural identity. And this may be the problem as the culture and the globalisation seem to be incompatible. This is one point.

The second point, that since the Second World War, the acceleration of globalisation is more or less exponential. But this process is not really leaning in the past. If we look at the periods post the World War and the Great Depressions of the 1930s, this gave bias to a state of fragmentation of the market and return back to nationalisation.

The third point is that world globalisation makes bigger the gap between those who can take the opportunities offered by globalisation and those who can not. Globalisation is an impact not only for people; it is an impact for countries and nations. Sometimes it causes differences, creates obstacles getting health services, to the sources of energy and other advantages necessary to everybody.

One more point. The pace that changes take place in our life makes us forget of humanitarian values. We should not let it happen. We should stop also any religious quarrels and discrepancies that are getting more and more painful. Speaking about the role allocated for the culture, I would say it should make the society more human. It is the main target for the culture. I see two ways to achieve this. First of all to create a general culture based on the English language, so that the English language is the international language. Secondly is the diversification of cultures. No standardisation is allowed as it will insult the minorities. Still we have to keep in mind the necessity for people to understand each other.

The culture is the sole of the nation. That's why there should be no lack of financing in respect of the culture. The culture should also be democratic and national at the same time. Co-existence of cultures is a difficult task but it should be sorted out. This should be achieved in spite of the differences in cultures.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you very much; the next one to report is Mr. Petito.*

F. PETITO²: — I'd like to make some points really in dialogue with some other things that the UNESCO representative had said at the beginning. We have so many "actors" here, who this way or that way represent different sides of the international dialogue.

I am involved in writing and scientific activity, so I'm dealing this way or that way, with the issues we are taking about now.

There is one point I want to make very clear. I think it's a mistake not to use the word "civilizations". The United Nations and UNESCO has this tendency now to move towards intercultural dialogue. This is a development we can not avoid. And I will try to tell you that it is not only philosophical but it has many important implications.

Some people say that it's as disgraceful and irresponsible to use the word "civilization" in the framework of the clash of civilization as well as, I think, in the framework of dialogue. Why, because civilization creates borders and oppositions. But this is the point which then allows what our Chinese friend says a tool. In the UN resolutions, for example, we see the movement to establish a productive link between human rights, culture and traditional values. In the UN as we know there is an advisory body dealing with different religions, social problems, etc. There are representative bodies for different countries. Though we have to avoid, any such kind of discourse, related to the dialogue and intercultural co-operation. When everything is interpreted in the terms of the Western European understanding. Speaking of civilizations one has to remember that we are talking of real people and their lives. The story, told by Chekhov in his novel, can be transferred from the Christian culture and imply to the Islamic, Hinduism and any other religion.

But what we are facing today is the lack of knowledge of each other. If we try to achieve a real intercultural dialogue we have to pay attention and see if there is a real authentic voice of average people. If we simply remain in the real not intercultural academic discussion, without letting the authentic voice of civilizations speak, we don't achieve anything. So I want to make a case that we need to use civilizations as a category in this discussion. I am very pleased that the representative of the alliance of civilizations here made important and true points. As there is a real danger, to limit the discussion, to the arguments of theorists and politicians. Still there are a few issues. I think it's very important that we voice deeply through these institutional attempts to the great world-wide religious and cultural and traditions of civilization. How to create the conditions for these civilizations to speak by themselves, to participate in the international movements, contribute into the development of different societies? Will it be sensible to rewrite the World Declaration of Human Rights and other such documents? And working on such papers to implement the traditions of every nation? The French Ambassador was right saying that the world is changing, a new configuration of government and power is being introduced, and the world now is multi-polar and multicultural. We have to adjust international legislation to this world. For instance the Bill of the Human Rights can also be a foundation stone in the future. The same can be the role played by politics. We have to reassess a lot. Why do not we think of such phenomenon as sympathy (which was raised yesterday)? Why can't sympathy be involved in the legislation? In this respect a great part can be played by traditions. They could provide the strength, energise and activate different sides of political and legislative life. We know the word "conflict". Scientific books say that the conflict irrespective of its reasons whether cultural or religious, takes place when there is a lack of

¹ Permanent Delegate of Egypt to UNESCO.

² Sussex University, professor (GB), Doctor. Area of scientific interests is problem of interaction of civilization, culture and religion factors in the international relations. Author of more than 100 works, including "Civilization Dialogue and the World Order: the Other Politics of Cultures, Religions and Civilizations in the International Relations", "Europe, the United States and the Islamic World: conceptualizing a Triangular Relationship", "The International Political Thought of Carl Schmitt: Terror, Liberal war and the Crisis of global order" and others.

identity, when people are not aware of their own culture. And in this case energetic politicians may use this for their own purposes, in their own favour. That's why we have to look deep into the matter and protect the identity. The identity should manifest itself in the intercultural dialogue, and should not be afraid of it. Religious fundamentalists are perusing their own goals and ignore such aspects. If talking of fundamentalists in general, Christian or Islamic, they usually ignore their own traditions, which is ignorance. They do not assist the dialogue of civilizations for they do not speak the true language of their culture and their traditions.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you. Mr. Sanai is going to speak now.*

M. SANAI¹: — It would be useful to discuss in conferences like this one if the dialogue of civilizations is successful or not. It has already been for 10 years since we are stating the necessity to have such a dialogue, but what is the result? There are positive signs but there are still negative signs. In any case the dialogue of civilizations influences the political and economic processes going on in the world. But there are things that tell us that still we have lots of problems in this field. For instance precisely the year 2001 was declared according to a proposal made by the President of Islamic Republic of Iran the year of the "Dialogue of civilizations", and precisely in that year we witnessed those sorrowful events like the 11th of September in the USA. That's why my opinion is we have to make up a list what positive and what negative things are obtained via the dialogue of civilizations during the last 10 years.

The dialogue of civilizations is a strange notion. Let's say yesterday Mr. Guseynov made a very interesting comment as for the global culture. And I have got a question in respect to this: what in general is the dialogue of cultures? If the culture means identity it also means borders. We are aware at the same time that in many countries the state nations have been formed already long time ago, in some countries the formation of the state nations is going on currently. In the former Soviet Republics, I mean, in the ex-Soviet territory precisely the last 20 years are spent to create what is called the identity. But it is possible only in case there are borders made. We have to specify, how to arrange and improve the dialogue of civilizations — via the dialogue of different cultures or via the global culture? If it should be done via the dialogue, then how the people having different cultures may come to a dialogue, if via the global culture, then what nature is this global culture? It seems very strange to me. The global culture is very difficult to be defined since the representatives of different cultures understand it their own ways. Let's take different religions. Almost every religion votes for the global culture. But every religion still explains the global culture its own way. So I come to the

¹ Director of the Centre of Study Russia and Eastern Europe in Teheran University (Iran), Professor of the Law Institute of the Teheran University, D. S. (Political Science). Author of books: "Along the Great Silk Road... Meetings in the Land of Kazakhs", "Relations of Iran with CIS Countries of Central Asia: social, political and economical aspects", "Muslim Law and Politics" (teaching aid), "Relationships between Iran and Russia", and a number of scientific articles. Honorary Member of the Union of Writers of Russia, Member of the Kazakh Academy of Social Sciences, Advisor on "The Encyclopedia of the Islamic World" in respect of Russia, Central Asia and Caucasus.

conclusion that it is essential in the dialogue of cultures to specify those representatives of cultures and civilizations who have to have a dialogue or to negotiate directly with each other.

I would repeat myself: we have to find out and decide on what we want, whether we want the global culture or the dialogue between the cultures. Since these are quite different notions. If we are for the global culture then 2 ways are possible. Professor Guseynov was right yesterday saying that there is a natural process of modernisation, which is the foundation base for the general culture, and at the same time there is general characteristic of different cultures at the time of modernisation. Still we have such different notions like globalism and globalisation. Last years we are facing the results of creating the one-polar world. Given this situation I am sure we have to pay attention to some aspects. And the first one is the man and the bringing up of the man. In respect to this I will refer again to what Professor Guseynov said. He quoted Victor Hugo stated that the 20th century would be the century of the mankind, not the people or nations. But what we had was quite the opposite. We had 2 world wars. Can it be that the man is not yet properly brought up, and that's why the generally alike programs for bringing up people in different countries is very important. In my report I would state that the Islamic experience in this respect may be very useful. Islam people pay great attention to bringing up people in tolerance and they teach to communicate with people of different cultures. It is even reflected in the verses of the Islamic poets.

The next problem we have to sort out is the lack of fair in the world politics and in the activities of the international organisations. It is very important as it may help a lot in the dialogue of cultures and the dialogue of civilizations. I would say that nowadays the international organisations whatever structure they are not in confirm with the real life requirements. They do not face at least the problems of Africa, Asia and the Muslim world. Besides this such important subjects of the dialogue of civilizations as the religion leader have to start their dialogue as well. I would say that in spite of the dialogue of religions being held at present the religious leaders do not participate much in the dialogue.

I believe that the Likhachev readings is a very important event. I am participating for the second time and hope that the reports being printed out will be read by people in different countries and in different languages and I believe it shall influence the dialogue of civilizations.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *And now I would like Mr. Tlili to make his report.*

M. TLILI²: — I think yesterday's discussion was a little bit general. It gave me the impression at the end of the day that you could come up with a grid, with 2 entries to the grid — culture, globalisation and then with various or variables that you could develop or the proposition to that grid. I was very much impressed with the fact that a few words were said by the Russian writer because he spoke

² Founder, and Director of the Dialogue Centre of the New York University, Diplomat. Author of the books: "Le Bruit Dort", "For Nelson Mandela", "La Montagne du Lion: Roman", "Lion Mountain", "La Rage aux Tripes: Roman", "Un apes-Midi dans le Desert: Roman" and others.

somewhat directly from the heart. Otherwise I think we remained a little bit frustrated after all these considerations, general considerations about what we call globalisation, culture and so on. There are so many books that can fill the libraries of the last 10 years, and I don't think that we could make so many advances. Therefore I am happy that on the one hand the Russian Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs asked us really to focus really on what to do, and I was also happy to see that our discussion was brought to more focus, to ask ourselves, what is the meaning of what we are going through today. So retain from what was said by the French Ambassador that we live in the time of transition.

Now the 19th century went through the same anguish I would say, through the transition that was taking place, which was the industrialisation, the expansion of Europe and so on. And that time of anguish gave rise to major thinkers including Marx and then later Lenin who asked what to do. Well the answer was probably not the most fortunate. As we see it today. But at least they asked themselves that question. And today we live in the same transition. And I will focus on one particular element of that transition. And that is the emergence of the Muslim world.

The history of the Western relationship with the Muslim world is a very complicated and an ancient story, that started with one side up and the other side down for a number of centuries, and then again the side that was down is now struggling to come up. And what we see is suspicion on both sides. That suspicion is clearly felt and in the political field, we know it, we spoke already of the tension with Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan. And this is a general feeling in the Muslim world that the Muslim world is under siege, that the West is there somehow to contain the Islamic world and its power. And this, of course, probably, should be taken into account when we tackle issues such as terrorism, because some colleagues in the social science field conducted enquiries on the basis of the profiles and the biographies of known terrorists or acts of terrorism. What you find quite often is this element of mistrust, of suspicion and the need to re-assert certain dignity. And this explains the popularity, it is sad to say, in the general public when an act of terrorism happens at the gut root level you have applause. We should not forget it. There is a number of statistics and some of them conducted by Gallop, if today Osama bin Laden was to be a candidate for the presidency of the high Office of any Muslim country; he would be elected with an absolutely great majority. This is the fact and the reason for this is simply this sense of suspicion and of fear that you have throughout the Muslim world.

Now the issue of what to do, I think with relationship to the institution of intergovernmental or between civil society institutions, what we have, what we call dialogues, conversations, dealings on the state level there has to be recognition. One of these is transition, of this shift. There has to be a number of guiding principles, operating principles if you wish. And there too, and I am thankful to our colleagues from Japan, with the emphasis on these principles, mutual respect in order to have a dialogue, a conversation, whatever the nature of that conversation. You have to respect the other party. That is basic way to make some progress, because otherwise you are going to remain in the conflict mode. If you institute natural respect

as a framing principle of conversation, then you are going to at least start listening to the other.

Secondly, mutual understanding. Without mutual understanding we are not going to go any further. We have seen it in the case of Iran. Of the last 10 years Iran has been put under siege mentally: you do it our way or in various modes and various nuances of the Declaration and statements either we are going to "obliterate you" Mrs. Clinton said. That is exactly what she said during the campaign. "If you do not behave we are going to obliterate you through nuclear attack". In other words the mode that we have adopted now in the West with regard to Iran is "either you submit or we are going to do something about it". Whatever the variation of that meaning is.

Second if you take the example of Iraq. What the new Conservatives and the Bush administration did was simply to impose the sense of what democracy should be, what Iraq be and so on and so on. We are facing a number of the challenges in this relationship. And I am thankful that Ambassador Popov put the emphasis on this. If in the coming years we are not aware of this need of recognising the ways the major shift is taking place in the relationship between the Muslim world and the West, and that this shift implies mainly the rise of the Muslim world claiming its dignity, claiming its heritage, claiming simply its voice in international affairs and in its relationship with the West, then we are going to be in serious trouble.

Before I conclude I will say a few things about the presence of the Muslim world in the West, and in particularly the presence of the Muslim community in Europe.

About 15 to 20 mln European Muslims live today in Europe, and they are asked to integrate with the Europeans. I have not seen until now any integration, whether in social science definitions or in government proclamations or any other statement that we can refer to, and the little share there is, any precise definition of what we call integration that the social scientists would refer to and take for something you can work with. What do you mean by integration? What is the definition? And therefore it is mainly a political ploy that is used from time to time for purely political reasons. And these are facts of life.

If we want these communities to be part of the national fabric throughout Europe we have to find other ways of putting them into the national fabric so through other means. That methodology should be based only on one concept, and that is citizenship. Because unified citizenship with obligations and rights. If you depart from this framework then you are not going to go anywhere.

And therefore these are the two points that I would like to make. One is institute mutual respect, mutual understanding in any dealing with the Muslim world, and second, as far as to the presence of the Muslim world within Europe, base the relationship with the Muslim communities on the concept of citizenship and not on any vague solution of integration.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *The next one to take the floor is Mrs. Katagum, Nigeria.*

M. KATAGUM¹: — Thank you very much. I must say thank you for inviting me to share my views. Mine

¹ Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Nigeria to UNESCO.

basically is an African view, the Nigerian view. Looking at the topic and listening to the debates from yesterday and this morning one has reason to believe that the organisers of this conference or the readings have a lot of foresight and good intention. But good intentions are not everything. You remember yesterday the conversation was about the dialogue of civilizations. And nobody mentioned Africa in this respect. One of the speakers mentioned that Africa has growing populations, a lot of young people. And I thought that's a very important thing, they should not be ignored.

Most African nation states, being members of the United Nations, try to fulfil the obligations placed upon them by membership, by virtual membership of those UN agencies. But invariably a lot of things, a lot of initiatives are taken without carrying a long African in the discourse. We are very often ignored, so in many African countries getting adapted to the international institutions requirements takes years. We open our borders, let the Europeans to get in food products without difficulties, but the main profit is cropped by the trans-national companies, who get their products into our continent, whereas small manufacturers in Africa suffer losses. My point of view is that there should be a dialogue of civilizations on this very important issue as well as there should be a dialogue of civilization on other issues of the global culture. It is very important for the African people since one of the most important issues for the people in Africa is satisfying their essential needs.

Sometimes some of world institutions need to look at the balance of power within some countries. We have about 6 countries, I believe in the IMF, which controls more than 42 % of the votes. But they set conditions which affect a lot the developing countries, especially Africa. And as a result of those conditions a lot of African countries get into social, economic and political problems which invariably manifest in the social upheaval, violent conflicts, and then we have this cycle of arms and ammunitions, wars and so on and so forth. So some of these world institutions especially those of the UN, need to be looked at. They have to consult the representatives of the African countries, and should always consider the geographical and political nature of the continent. There is a necessity to get involved countries more into the process of sorting out their own problems. I am of the opinion that the African representatives should be wider represented at conferences like that. Somebody suggested that there should be more women participating in this conference. And I fully support this idea. For us the issue of global culture we think that we can control certain things that are outside of our control. Just one minute. If you take the case of Nigeria we have a phenomenon- the Nollywood, Nollywood phenomenon. We are producing films at a tremendous rate. And these films have gone into the national televisions set in countries having dedicated channels showing these films. These are things that we can not control but there are things that invariably have an impact on whatever emerging global culture there is. So these are things that can not to be ignored. We have to look at that, we have to look at the effect of the Internet. And then of course the lazy young people, unemployed young people that are idle. We may not be able to control. I am not saying that anybody talking about the global culture should surrender his own diversity. We must recognise and respect diversity but I am one of those who believe there is a global culture emerging in various forms.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *The next one to make the report is Mr. Kuvaldin.*

V. B. KUVALDIN¹: — Thank you Mrs. Mitrofanova.

One of the last leaders of the Soviet Union Yuri Andropov once said: "We do not know the society we are living in". I am afraid nowadays one can say: "we do not know the world we are living in". The situation causes discomfort and potentially is very dangerous.

I am focusing my interests and efforts the last 15 years on the issues of globalisation. If you familiarise yourself with what I am doing you will see that I am touching upon different sides of globalisation but the globalisation in the field of culture. Why? I have to frankly admit that the scale of the issue puts my mind into difficulty. The issue is very complicated and I mean this. Nevertheless I think that the science currently and also the social development process have reached the point when we can not but start discussing this item. Since those who organised this discussion called us for working out practical steps and advice, I have got my first and the only recommendation for the UNESCO to become a so called practical laboratory for intercultural interaction, and one of the leading centres for analysing and thinking over the whole complex of issues caused by the process of maturing the culture of the global world. I also think that the global culture is still making its first steps. Unlike those sceptics I believe there is a big future for the global culture. I believe that the XX century is the century when the culture of the global world will develop at a high speed, I believe it has a future since if the global culture does not have a future, the whole mankind does not have a future either.

What can be mentioned today? To my mind we are right in respect of the processes of globalisation, we are right in stating that the centre of the global development is shifting from the European continent to Asia and basically to eastern Asia. At the same time we have to be very careful in our assessment, when we evaluate the speed of processes and especially when we extrapolate our assessments made in one field to other fields. It goes without saying that eastern Asia is going up at present. But there in eastern Asia there are lots of debatable and complicated processes. That means we should think a lot before evaluating any of the processes going on there.

European hegemony is a relatively new phenomenon, registered only in the century of the industrial capitalism. Less than 2 centuries ago, in 1829, 26 % of the population used to live in the industrially developed countries. And they produced 37 % of the world product. By the year 1913 the situation in the world economy changed dramatically. The population of the developed countries grew up to 37 % and their specific part in the gross domestic product almost doubled and reached 70 %. By this time the Euro-Atlantic civilization dominated the world economy and in politics and culture. All the rest of the world, called "developing

¹ Head of sub-department of social and humanitarian subjects in Moscow School of Economics of the Moscow State University named after Lomonosov, professor of the Moscow State Institute for International Relations (University) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, Dr. Sc. (History). Author of more than 50 scientific articles, including: "Intelligent people in the after war Italy", "American Capitalism and Intelligent People: Essay on history and sociology", "The Global World: Economics, Politics, International Relations", and others. Member of the Gorbachev Fund.

countries” was in many ways discarded when it came to important issues in the process of globalisation.

A lot is spoken today of the growing role and meaning of the developing countries in the world economics and politics. Of course, this tendency has been registered since the middle of the XX century, though we should not overvalue this fact. Let’s discuss the economics. Calculating in terms of buying power, the developing countries occupy less than a half of the world produced product. If we calculate in terms of the exchange rate we will get even less, only one fourth of the world produced product. And on top of this the leading subjects of the scientific and technical progress are not in Asia. It is still the USA and to some extent Europe. Still the conditions are changing, though not so quickly and not as good as it is discussed in the mass media addressed to the public.

Does it mean that the situation in the culture shall have and will change at the same time? Not obligatory. The fact is that the culture is a specific field, trends and rules are applicable to economics and politics cannot be applied to the culture.

Cultural globalisation is a process that we registered lately and some scientists insist there are a lot of issues related to globalisation and cultural globalisation which are debatable. Nevertheless we are facing the cultural globalisation and we have to deal with it. As I have already said one should not extrapolate evaluation applicable in the economics and politics to the culture. Even when a civilization dies or yields to another civilization, it does not mean it ceases to exist. The best times of the Ancient Greeks are in the past, but the influence of the Greek civilization is very powerful even at present. The same can be said about the European civilization. A lot is said about the weak points of the European civilization meaning not only the economics but also the population getting older and having no wish or power to protect their values and ideals. But at the end of the day more than 1 bln people is a lot. European civilization has witnessed its ups and downs, it has a significant history, and one should not forget on top of this that it is backed up by the USA, the country having rather good population growth indices.

The global culture is getting matured on 2 levels. The first is the elite level, and in this respect the discussion of the dialogue of civilizations is extremely important. And the other level is provided by average people. In particular if you have a look at Academician Guseynov report, you will find very interesting facts about the behaviour of people in international airports. In relation to this one has to stress that at present the global culture exists in functional and practical forms. I mean relatively simple interaction, that had been reproduced dozens of times and do not demand any special creative efforts.

I would like to go back to a fundamental question asked at the beginning of the day by Mrs. Mitrofanova and which was not paid due attention in our discussion. To my mind it was a very fair remark made of the value of the global culture. If we speak of the global society (and this is the essence of the process of globalisation), we mean not only the development of the economic co-operation, which is only a part of the process, and not the most important part of it. The essence is in creating the global community of people. I do not think we are living in the global community at present. We are living in the global world organised

basically considering national and state principles. But still we are slowly moving towards the global society. If we are going earlier or later to live in the global community, we have to have the global culture, otherwise no global community is possible. Global culture in this case has to be based on something, and I do not mean practical and functional but also metaphysical. To my mind it was very fair to mention at the very beginning that the basis in the practical and political sense the basis should be the human rights. Here we come up to the second question which is even more important. The culture helps or is meant to reproduce the senses. Precisely the culture should find the answers to the questions, who we are, where did we come from, what do we live for here on the earth? I mean the culture should answer the fundamental question; it should speak of the human being not in relation to the man, but in relation to the Space, the Nature, the Universe. That’s why the global culture in the true meaning of the word demands to be enlightened, inspired, and demands intellectual and mental efforts, new fundamental basis for the human being that can be created or started in the XXI century.

Making conclusions I would like to repeat myself. The most important and the most complicated problem that the humanity is facing nowadays is the formation of the global culture, a general system of symbols and senses ensuring the further development of the global community since this is the key direction for the optimisation in modern conditions.

It does not mean rejecting national cultures. National cultures have being and always will be the essence, the centre of the development. But besides the centre we have peripheries and semi peripheries. I believe that precisely there on the level of peripheries the global culture will develop successfully.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you very much. I would like to welcome Madam Suebsith.*

O. SUEBSITH¹: — Thank you very much Madam Chair. I think it is an honour and a privilege for me to have been invited to participate in this very important conference, which is open in St. Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences.

I would like to summarise that our world is very complex and it is rich in cultures that our ancestors have established long ago. So it is our duty to conserve this rich culture, promote and transmit it to our future generations. Otherwise the values and integrity of our culture would disappear, and we’ll become an endangered culture.

I do not argue the theme dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations in the context of globalisation related with human rights, human dignity. But in the meantime there are threats in the world. We continue to encounter difficulties which potentially stem from mistrust, misunderstanding and refusal of differences. So we need to find ways to solve emerging problems, as would prevent us from mutual understanding and potential development, ways such as establishment of peace, non violence, and solidarity and dialogue among cultures would allow us to further discuss, consult, exchange and could be able to strengthen ties and relations in the future. And we also have to create opportunities to learn from each other.

¹ Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Thailand to UNESCO.

I fully agree with our guest speaker from New York who stressed importance of mutual respect with including with Japan and also mutual understanding. And also we have to create mutual trust, mutual respect, mutual understanding. We have to find opportunities to learn from each other. Learn from cultural diversity and to respect probably soon that we must increase human dignity.

This area, along with the promotion of knowledge of diverse culture, so I would like to stress that in this year of globalisation promotion of cultural diversity is with us all. Governments, educational institutions, local authorities, civil societies, organisations and international communities have to play a role in cultural diversity. In order to make this effective all communities have to be covered. And to complete this task I think we need sufficient number of promoters of cultural diversity and we need to create a systematic mechanism to complete the task in order to promote the pluralisms. Representatives of cultures should participate in this system. We also have to have target groups and get our programmes oriented to these groups of people.

Since I am from Thailand, I think I would like to provide you some aspect of Thailand in this context. The government believes in the power of culture. And we have been promoting the power of culture at all levels, promoting cultural exchanges and understanding, the cultural policy. We also did our best to introduce co-operation between the government and private and civil society. The basics of morals and the culture are the subjects taught in school and integrated into the school curriculum. It is expected that the power of culture would be strengthened and become a major driving force for development and the people will live in a peaceful environment. And the public understand the values of cultural diversity and live peacefully together. How Thai culture has been promoted? We have the Ministry of Culture which is responsible for the national cultural policy. It encourages cultural studies and research not only Thai culture but also international culture. And also we recognised various types of activities and workshops at national and international levels. And to enhance our cultural exchanges we have the network at the regional provincial and district levels.

I like to move a little bit to the religion. I think that religion and education can go together, because the majority of Thai people, or 85% are Buddhists. Such religious organisations as temples help to promote this philosophy and teach moral education at schools. A lot of Sunday schools are located in various temples. The principle of the culture of peace has been promoted in school.

If we touch upon the mutual trust, respect to the people's dignity I have to mention a number of projects and programmes, we made a lot of new steps. We also organise special events for outstanding dates. This process is also included into our education curriculum. We do not concentrate our attention on the Thai culture only. We are studying and pay attention to the world culture. And we do our best to promote it and get the Thai people familiar with it.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you very much. It is Mohammad Reza Majidi who is going to speak now.*

M. R. MAJIDI¹: — Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for your invitation. With your permission I will begin my speech with some verses of Sadie, one of the greatest Iranian poets:

Human beings are members of the whole,
In creation of one essential tool,
If one member is afflicted with pain other members uneasy will remain,
If you have no sympathy of human pain the name of human you can not retain.

It is difficult to talk about global culture but we can talk of culture in the globalised world. In this regard different paradigms like dialogue of civilization, alliance of civilization, getting cultures together could help us to have a more clear vision. This process, I mean these paradigms and through this process like the process of getting the cultures together we can reach the yet hidden capacities. Each culture should be recognised, examined and studied. In this regard no one can speak more about the capacities hidden in each culture and civilization than thinkers, scientists, philosophers, intellectuals and the religious elites. The role of religion, it is my Iranian and Islamic view that I present here, the role of religion in this regard should be highlighted. As, for example, Islam is in favour of the harmonisation of cultures. Our dear guest from India talked about the love of the nature, diversity of culture, he said, is the love of the nature. I mention that in the Koran this love nature is mentioned as a divine rule and love. You know in many verses of the Holy Koran they regard to the diversity of cultures and its significance for mankind. Verse 13 says:

Oh the mankind, we created you from a single pair of a male and female.
And made you into nations and tribes that you may know each other,
Not that you may despise each other.
Really the most honoured of you in the sight of Allah
He who is the most righteous of you,
And Allah has sure knowledge and is acquainted with all things.

This holy verse shows that the origin of all mankind is the same. Allah all Mighty has made the mankind into nations and tribes so that they would be able to know each other and this fact emphasises the importance of unity, of the essence of nature and human beings, and at the same time refers to the significance of cultural diversity and its key role in the life of mankind. In fact it refers indirectly to religious cultural dialogue that should be predominant in the interaction between people.

If such dialogue existed among main actors in the international arena no conflict would take place at all and every problem would be solved through dialogue and conversation. In fact monetarism, which is the split of all divine religions, we have to worship the God who is the absolute beauty and wellness in religious interpretations,

¹ Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran to UNESCO, Doctor, Bachelor of Electronics, Master of Management. Author of the number of articles about politics, development of science, shipbuilding, development of techniques in oil and gas industries and other strategic industries, nano- and biotechniques, development of co-operation between Universities and branches of industries.

we have to reject the human beings dominance over another human and emphasis on freedom and the human beings respect of the God, all issues that can not only become the subject for our dialogue but also help us more towards building a better world.

What we need is placing more emphasis on common things, highlighting cultural diversity and different ways of life, avoiding the politization of cultural issues and taking proper steps toward the culturalisation of political differences. We need to begin any effort on the basis of the respect, of the respect of priority and common matters, to pay due attention to intellectual and cultural heritage as political ground for dialogue and interaction, to use media as a tool for culture and cultural dialogue, and instead of the conflict to highlight the role of elites in the field of academic dialogue. And last but not least we have to use intellectual power and wisdom instead of violence as the Persian poet Mula Jallaladin Umi says:

Oh my Brother,
You are the same as you start,
Nothing more,
As for the rest you are only bone and sinew. ”
We are all made of flesh and blood; everybody is the same human being.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Now I would like to ask Mr. Davydov to take the floor.*

V. M. DAVYDOV¹: — Our discussion in general proved that we are always get into the trap asking the questring “either- either”. My point of view is we have to ask the question “yes or no”. I fully agree with those people who are of the opinion that there is no global culture. There are only some elements of the global culture and there is also the whole future in front. This future is hundreds of years, not dozens that will be spent struggling and co-existing. Demography as a science is against of the global culture or against of the globalisation of culture. I think that the USA phenomena can teach us a lot. A critical mass is being accumulated, and this mass is against of assimilation, this is an ethnic thing that is a basis for a simple and even extended reproduction of the civilization. Speaking of the national civilization in the USA itself.

Speaking of the practical side of the matter, we need the dialogue of cultures; we need the partnership of civilizations. But we still have to answer the questions, who are the participants of this dialogue? Either it is we, who are present here today, or the international organisations. It is a very serious initiative. And I vote for the alliance of civilizations as a project. This project is aimed at ways of influencing the world community, so that there

¹ Director of the Institute of the Latin America Studies of the RAS, Doctor of Economic Sciences, Professor. Member of the Bureau of the Social Sciences of the RAS. Author of more than 180 articles, including books: “Spain, modernization at the end of the XX century”, “Phenomenon of the Financial Globalization. Universal processes and the reaction of the Latin American Countries”, “Modern financial and Economical crisis. Reaction of the Emerging markets and the Centres of the World Economy”, “Cuba of the 90-s: the model of the economics in Transit and Co-operation with Russia”, and others. Member of the editorial Board for the “Small Russian Encyclopaedia”, scientific Magazine of the Cambridge University, magazine “Latin America” and “Iberoamerica”, member of the panel of the national Committee on Assistance in Economic Co-operation with countries of the Latin America, Academician, member of the Academy of Culture of Portugal.

are no differences, but points of contact. There are a few instruments like this available at present. There probably was not made any sociologic research as for who is for the dialogue of cultures and who is against of it. I think that in politics and social movements there can be more people against the dialogue of cultures than for the dialogue. I mean different nationalistic, chauvinistic movements, conservative formations and organisations. How can we oppose to them?

My last remark is, if there is a possibility to influence the dialogue of cultures positively, to promote it, I would say one of the practical means is in the education. And in this respect a great role can be played by UNESCO. I suppose this organisation is authorised to influence the development of curriculum, methods of teaching, teaching aids, and the points of view of students. If it is done meaning the partnership and co-operation of civilizations then it is going to be a practical deposit.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you very much. Mr. Margus Rava is welcome to report.*

M. RAVA²: — Thank you. I am a civil servant. I am not an academician. So I will give a couple of short remarks on this perspective about the interaction of international states and international institutions. Estonia is a fairly small country, values greatly the framework of international institutions for that sort of dialogue, and I think that the question of Mr. Dutkiewicz “What makes the dialogue of cultures equal”, I think it is the organisations like UNESCO.

From our point of view the work in UNESCO has for example involved us within the work of committee of intangible cultural heritage. This work has 2 facades. Firstly we have to work on the safeguard of the traditions and heritage. But secondly it has also introduced us to several notions of different cultures which have been made also known to Estonian public through the work and aid of the national commission.

And my last remark would be least important and I would like to argue with those colleagues who have said that there is no global culture and role perhaps is not as big as the global culture. If one considers sport as part of culture and I think that there has been already for some time some expression of that global culture. In one months’ time we will all be watching football, millions, perhaps billions. There are 11 men during 90 minutes and very clear and simple rules and the only problem with this seems to be that the football of men is more important than of woman. So there is agenda, an equality problem that should be solved soon too.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you very much. Now I would like Mr. Asadullin to speak. Please, Mr. Asadullin.*

F. ASADULLIN³: — I would also like to join those present here who state that the energy of the words should

² Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Estonia to UNESCO.

³ Head of the Department of Science and Connections with the State Offices of the Russian Federation of the Moscow Mufti Office, sheikh, Candidat of Philological Sciences. Author of more than 100 scientific works on the problems of development the Arab culture, history of Islam, Muslim religion and inter-religious relations, among the others are: “Islam in Moscow”, “Essays on the History of Libyan Literature” of the XIX–XX Centuries”. Member of the House of Public of the Russian Federation, head of the Scientific and Public Committee of the Mufti Council in Russia.

be transferred into the energy of actions, useful, targeted and done by people united for the purpose. Conferences like the present Likhachev Readings are being organised in the world on a regular basis, basically every month. For example in Russia we also have the World Public Forum "Dialogue of civilizations". There are a lot of possibilities for the alliance of civilizations, which as far as I know is going to be held in Brazil soon. In the Arab and Muslim world a lot of if not all of the conferences of the latest period try to address the problems of them inter-civilization dialogue. It is very important (and Mrs. Mitrofanova called for this) to find out how to evaluate the usefulness of these conferences, their practicability. I think we should not waste our time to persuade each other here. I believe we represent the elites of our people here, we speak basically the same language, and at least a lot that has been said here is understandable and can be shared by me. It is in line with my attitude to the life, it is also in line with my understanding of what the representatives of the national elites and national cultures should do. But as soon as it comes to taking political decisions we have faults, as it is very difficult finding a compromise between different approaches especially when there are interests of competing states behind them. At the same time we have to give a proper consideration to the matter where in this competitive world each civilization will find the best place? Is it going to be still fighting of civilizations or some kind of hybrid of civilizations? I think there are 2 alternatives. It is wither reverse movement or the movements towards each other. How shall we mark where we are now in this conference and arriving to the next conference not to repeat again what has already been said? I would say that developing our dialogue should not be a kind of labour of Sisyphus. We have to move forward persistently, take decisions and register their fulfilment, work out respective means to achieve our goals, to work with politicians and governments. We have to have a very efficient management to lead the international dialogue.

And one more consideration, speaking of bridging cultures and peoples we are very often taken away just by talking for the sake of talking. We keep forgetting the saying that "the dry theory is very helpful, but the tree of the life should be watered". The representative from Iran quoted the medieval poet Jalyaletdin Rhumi, who is the most read poet following the Prophet Muhammad. His works are studied and were studied in special schools everywhere from India to Mauritania. Still this Persian poet-mystic, who lived more than 800 years ago is known not only in the Muslim world. Thanks to brilliant translation made by Collman Barks, he is one of the most popular poets in the USA; the number of editions of his works is bigger than editions of Shakespeare. His poetry is used to make up plots for new operas, for modern songs, theatre performances in the English speaking culture of the modern world in the XXI century. This is said to prove that the dialogue of civilizations, development of the global culture is an independent process, whether we participate in it or not, because Rhumi is a part of the cultural fund including the cultural fund of the Anglo-Saxon world.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you. The next one to speak is Mr. Shuvalov Konstantin.*

K. V. SHUVALOV¹: — Just because I am dealing with the issue of the alliance of civilizations I would like to say a couple of words to support what has been said by Mr. Fabio Petito. I do not think it is worth substituting the notion "intercivilization relationship" by the notion "intercultural relationships". Ethnic, civilization, religious self identification of people is something we are facing. Every time somebody makes an attempt to cancel or substitute any of the aforesaid, a counter reaction occurs, and it results in acute actions like hostilities.

Speaking of the Alliance of Civilizations, ours is a very difficult task- to respond using the ways and means available for us to ethnic, cultural, religious, linguistic hostilities and quarrels. This task can be achieved at different levels. At present we I would say are using emergency means instead of talking and agreeing on the diagnosis. These methods are very important but the diagnosis that can be fixed in course of the dialogue of civilizations is even more important. And possibilities for the dialogue like the Likhachev Readings are very important. My opinion the Alliance of Civilizations should analyse the ideas expressed here in the course of the dialogue and generalise the experience of different states in organising and conducting this dialogue.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — *Thank you very much. I am inviting Mr. P. Roell to speak.*

P. ROELL²: — In my paper I presented an observation focused on terrorism, especially marine terrorism and the threat to world trade. First observation- marine terrorism is not a fiction but it is a reality. And second the terrorist are looking for their mega-harbours, and they concentrate on the key points. And my third observation is if we understand security policy in a comprehensive way that means that political, economic, social, ecologic and military dimensions must be considered together and must be brought together. Then marine terrorism can only be fought successfully, in co-operation between state institution and the private sector.

E. V. MITROFANOVA: — Thank you very much. Dear Colleagues, what are events like Likhachev Conference for? Possibly in order to prevent discrepancies, global conflicts. This is the first thing. What allows us to use the world "global culture"? I think we have the right to use these words. First of all there are regulations in respect of the human rights as the global culture first of all means the respect to the man.

But there is something special, that was mentioned by Mr. Davydov, something we come across every time it is national traditions, national political ethics. In any political struggle inside any country the politicians collecting people for their own purposes together use the words "our" and

¹ Ambassador-at-large of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, Special Representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia on interaction with the Alliance of Civilizations, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. Works in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs since 1976. Worked in different diplomatic levels in the central office abroad, Deputy of the head of the Central Asia Department, Ambassador of Russia in Iran, Director of III Department in CIS countries, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

² President of the Consulting Institute in issues of strategy, politics, means of safety and economics (Berlin). Ph.D. Used to be in the position of the Advisor in Foreign Politics and Safety at the FRG Office in CE (Brussels). Author of a number of articles like "11 September of India", "Does Terrorism mean the War" and others.

“strange”. These “strange” things or people are always at hand, especially nowadays in the conditions of migration. It is difficult to combat such approaches whatever level we are facing this at. Studying any elections we can say that everything is done to the same scenario.

But here people were absolutely right saying that we have to respect other cultures and other people rights. And this respect is brought up in people via education. UNESCO is working on this; we have a job direction called “Human rights”. But this is not enough. We have to think over how we can influence them.

And the last thing, the global culture maturing is to some extent new communication systems, involving more and more people, it is global networks, where our children participated extending their world and finding new friends. It is also a part of our future we have to consider.

A. V. YAKOVENKO: — Dear Ladies and Gentlemen, First of all I would like to thank everybody for arriving

to St. Petersburg to participate in the Likhachev Conference. First of all I have to say that this practice should find its continuation in the future. And we will be glad to welcome you next year. Next, it is very difficult to summarise the discussion. First, because it was very interesting, second, because it is not reducible to a common denominator for the reports and speeches were very versatile. It is clear that the world is being changing. And we have to fix and study new tendencies. A lot depends on the external politics as well; hence a lot depends on the international organisations. It is clear that the international organisations should speak in way of dialogue. That’s why the word “dialogue” was in every speech and every report. What is also important (what Mrs. Zhdanok stressed in her report) is that the principles that are worked out in the international level should be implemented in national laws and in the home policies of states. A lot depends on this. I am very grateful for your participation.

INDEX OF NAMES

- Anastassopoulos G. 44, 45
Asadullin F. A. 44, 60
Bergmann W. 13, 24
Bogomolov O. T. 13, 34
Churov V. Ye. 13, 27
Clesse A. 13, 40
Davydov V. M. 44, 60
Delyagin M. G. 13, 36
Dutkiewicz P. 44, 52
El Zahaby M. 44, 54
Giger W. 13, 32
Gliniasti J. de 44, 52
Golutva A. A. 13, 20
Granin D. A. 13, 22
Guerra R. 13, 32
Guseynov A. A. 13, 21
Joshi M. M. 13, 26, 44, 47
Katagum M. 44, 56
Kibrik A. E. 13, 40
Kleiner G. B. 13, 38
Klestil-Löffler M. 13, 34
Kuvaldin V. B. 44, 57
Lisitsyn-Svetlanov A. G. 13, 29
Majidi M. R. 44, 59
Makarov V. L. 14, 29
Makarov Ye. I. 13, 20
Mamontov V. K. 14, 38
Manilova A. Yu. 14, 23
Mark J. A. 14, 26
Mitrofanova E. V. 14, 25, 44, 45, 61
Mushakoji K. 44, 50
Naumkin V. V. 44, 47
Nikandrov N. D. 14, 18
Peçi I. 14, 41
Perez Bravo A. 14, 31
Petito F. 44, 54
Piotrovsky M. B. 13, 15
Pivovar E. I. 14, 30
Popov V. V. 44, 51
Radvanyi J. 44, 51
Rava M. 44, 60
Roell P. 44, 61
Sanai M. 44, 55
Scheuer M. 14, 37
Shmakov M. V. 14, 28
Shuvalov K. V. 44, 61
Solonin Yu. N. 14, 23
Styopin V. S. 13, 16
Suebsith O. 44, 58
Tlili M. 44, 55
Torstendahl R. 14, 33
Yakovenko A. V. 13, 19, 44, 45, 48, 62
Yamamoto T. 44, 48
Yao Yao K. 44, 53
Yemelyanova A. A. 34
Zapesotsky A. S. 13, 14, 33, 42
Zhdanok T. A. 44, 49

Scientific edition

**DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND PARTNERSHIP OF CIVILIZATIONS:
THE MAKING OF A GLOBAL CULTURE**

Volume 2. Discussion materials
of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference
May 13–14, 2010

**(ДИАЛОГ КУЛЬТУР И ПАРТНЕРСТВО ЦИВИЛИЗАЦИЙ:
СТАНОВЛЕНИЕ ГЛОБАЛЬНОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ**

X Международные Лихачевские научные чтения
13–14 мая 2010 года
Том 2. МАТЕРИАЛЫ)

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

ISBN 978-5-7621-0572-9



Подписано в печать с оригинала-макета 17.08.10. Формат 60x90/8
Гарнитура Schoolbook. Усл. печ. л. 9,0. Заказ № 149

Санкт-Петербургский Гуманитарный
университет профсоюзов
192238, Санкт-Петербург, ул. Фучика, 15
Отпечатано в типографии СПбГУП