

RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
ST. PETERSBURG INTELLIGENTSIA CONGRESS
ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

under the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia



GLOBAL WORLD: SYSTEM SHIFTS, CHALLENGES AND CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE

The 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference
May 18–20, 2017



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

RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
ST. PETERSBURG INTELLIGENTSIA CONGRESS

ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

under the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia

GLOBAL WORLD: SYSTEM SHIFTS, CHALLENGES AND CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE

The 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

May 18–20, 2017

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

The conference, originally called 'The Days of Science in St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences' is the 25th in number and the 17th in the status of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference

To implement the project 'The 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference' state funds are used. The funds are allocated as a grant in accordance with the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of April 5, 2016 No 68–рп and the tender held by the National Russian public organization "The Russian Rectors' Union"



**St. Petersburg
2017**

БКБ 72

Г52

Scientific editor

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

Responsible for publication

Professor **S.A. Pesina**, Doctor of Philology, Doctor of Philosophy,
Head of the English Language Department of the SPbUHSS

Recommended to be published by the Editorial and Publishing Council
of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences

Г52 **Global World: System Shifts, Challenges and Contours of the Future: the 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 18–20, 2017. St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2017. – 242 p., il.**

ISBN 978-5-7621-0930-7

This collection contains materials of the Plenary Session, Panel Discussions and the Round Table of the 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference held on May 18–20, 2017 in St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences in accordance with the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin “On Perpetuating the Memory of Dmitry Likhachov”. On the list of the participants of the 17th Conference were guests from over 20 countries.

Among the 61 authors of the collection are outstanding Russian scientists, members of the Russian Academy of Sciences: A.I.A. Gromyko, A.A. Guscynov, A.S. Zapesotsky, V.I. Kvint, G.B. Kleiner, V.A. Lectorsky, A.G. Lisitsyn-Svetlanov, V.I. Makarov, V.V. Mironov, A.D. Nekipelov, V.S. Styopin, Zh.T. Toshchenko, V.A. Chereshev and others; directors of academic institutions and research centers, representatives of higher education institutions, media leaders, well-known state and public figures: M.V. Shmakov, Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia; K.I. Kosachov, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Federation Council of Russia; G.A. Hajiyev, Judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation; G.M. Gatilov, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation; A.A. Pankin, Director of the Department for International Organizations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation; V.A. Sevrikov, Deputy Plenipotentiary Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the North-Western Federal District; A.V. Yakovenko, Ambassador of the Russian Federation to the United Kingdom; M.S. Gusman, First Deputy Director General of TASS Russian News Agency; H.M. Reznik, Vice-President of the Federal Chamber of Lawyers; A.I. Ageev, Director General of the Institute for Economic Strategies of the Russian Academy of Sciences; A.S. Maksimov, Chairman of the Committee for Science and Higher Education of St. Petersburg Administration; V.T. Tretyakov, Dean of Higher School of Television of Lomonosov Moscow State University and many others.

Among the foreign authors of the collection are: A.A. Akayev, President of Kyrgyzstan (1990–2005), academician; Egemen Bağış, Minister for EU Affairs of Turkey (2011–2013); J.J. Wiatr, Minister of National Education of Poland (1996–1997); Ch.T. Gadio, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Senegal (2000–2009); G.W. Kolodko, Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance of Poland (1994–1997, 2002–2003), academician; M.A. Moratinos, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Spain (2004–2010); J.A. March, Ambassador of Spain to the Russian Federation (2008–2011); members of foreign academies of sciences: E. Agazzi (Italy), V. Prodanov (Bulgaria), P.P. Tolochko (Ukraine); professors: A. Bebler (Slovenia), L.C. Bresser-Pereira (Brazil), C. Varga (Hungary), P. Dutkiewicz (Canada), V. Ingimundarson (Iceland), H. Köchler (Austria), R. Matthews (Great Britain), V.V. Popov (Canada), V.I. Rossman and B.J. Silver (USA), T. Türker (Turkey), J.A. Scholte (Sweden) and others.

President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin highly appreciated the role of the Likhachov Conference, noting in his welcoming address that “the organizers and participants of the Conference keep the established traditions alive and pay the most serious attention to challenging pivotal issues of development of civilization and dialogue of cultures.”

БКБ 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

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 Sergeevich 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 Sergeevich Likhachov' No 587, May 23, 2001).

The co-founders of the Conference are the Russian Academy of Sciences, 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. Piotrowski). Since 2007 the conference has enjoyed the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, in 2013 had the support of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg).

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', 'Dialogue of cultures under globalization', 'Contemporary global challenges and national interests', 'Global world: system shifts, challenges and contours of the future' 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, G. A. Arbatov, N. P. Bekhtereva, O. T. Bogomolov, V. N. Bolshakov, Yu. S. Vasilyev, S. Yu. Glazyev, M. K. Gorshkov, R. S. Grinberg, An. A. Gromyko, A. A. Guseynov, A. V. Dmitriyev, T. I. Zaslavskaya, M. P. Kirpichnikov, M. I. Kleandrov, G. B. Kleiner, A. A. Kokoshin, A. B. Kudelin, V. A. Lektorsky, A. G. Lisitsyn-Svetlanov, I. I. Lukin, D. S. Lvov, V. L. Makarov, V. A. Martynov, V. V. Mironov, N. N. Moiseyev, V. V. Naumkin, A. D. Nekipolov, R. I. Nigmatulin, Yu. S. Osipov, A. M. Panchenko, N. Ya. Petrakov, V. F. Petrenko, E. I. Pivovarov, M. B. Piotrowski, N. A. Plateh, V. M. Polterovich, E. M. Primakov, B. V. Rauschenbach, Yu. A. Ryzhov, N. N. Skatov, A. V. Smirnov, V. S. Styopin, M. L. Titarenko, V. A. Tishkov, J. T. Toshchenko, V. A. Chereshev, A. O. Chubarin, N. P. Shmelyov, B. G. Yudin, V. L. Yanin and others. Academicians of the Russian Academy of Education who have taken part in the conference are the following: S. A. Amonashvili, V. I. Andreyev, G. M. Andreyeva, A. G. Asmolov, A. P. Beliayeva, M. N. Berulava, I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada, A. A. Bodalev, E. V. Bondarevskaya, G. A. Bordovsky, V. P. Borisenkov, G. N. Volkov, Yu. S. Davydov, A. V. Darinsky, E. D. Dneprov, S. F. Yegorov, V. I. Zagvyazinskiy, I. A. Zimniaya, Yu. P. Zinchenko, V. G. Kineliyov, I. S. Kon, A. S. Kondratyev, V. G. Kostomarov, V. V. Kravetsky, 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, F. A. Asadullin, N. S. Bondar, A. E. Busygin, G. A. Hajiye, G. M. Gatilov, Al. A. Gromyko, M. S. Gusman, A. K. Isayev, S. L. Katanandov, K. I. Kosachov, S. V. Lavrov, E. I. Makarov, T. A. Mansurov, V. I. Matviyenko, V. V. Miklushevsky, A. A. Pankin, V. N. Pligin, H. M. Reznik, 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, N. V. Burov, 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. Rjazanov, G. V. Sviridov and others.

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

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

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

In 2001, 2004, 2006, 2009–2012, 2016, 2017 the hosts and participants were greeted by Presidents of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin and D. A. Medvedev, in 2008, 2010–2017 by Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation.

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

CONTENTS

Decree of President of the Russian Federation 'On Perpetuating the Memory of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov'	3
Greetings of Vladimir PUTIN to the participants of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference.....	4
Welcome Addresses to the participants and guests of the 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference	7
About the International Likhachov Scientific Conference (Information)	11

REPORTS

E. AGAZZI , <i>Professor of the University of Genoa (Italy), foreign member of the RAS, Ph.D.</i> A SYSTEMIC WAY OF THINKING FOR APPROACHING THE PROBLEMS OF GLOBALIZATION	16
A.I. AGEEV , <i>Director General of the Institute for Economic Strategies of the RAS, Head of Chair at the National Research Nuclear University MEPhI (Moscow Engineering Physics Institute), Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i> "SCOURING THE ATTRACTOR", OR STRATEGIC TASKS OF RUSSIA IN THE HEGEMON CHANGE EPOCH	18
A.A. AKAYEV , <i>President of the Kyrgyz Republic (1990–2005), foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Engineering), Professor</i> ON THE FUTURE OF SUSTAINABLE MULTIPOLAR WORLD ON THE BASIS OF CIVILIZATIONAL PARTNERSHIP	22
A. BEBLER , <i>Professor, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana (Slovenia), Ph.D. in Political Science</i> THE BALKANS AND EUROPE'S SECURITY CHALLENGES	26
L.C. BRESSER-PEREIRA , <i>Emeritus Professor of Getúlio Vargas Foundation (Brazil), economist, sociologist</i> HOW TO NEUTRALIZE THE DUTCH DISEASE NOTWITHSTANDING THE NATURAL RESOURCES CURSE	31
V.A. CHERESHNEV , <i>Director of the Institute for Immunology and Physiology (the Urals Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences), Academician of the RAS, Dr. Med., Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS;</i> V.N. RASTORGUEV , <i>Professor of the Chair of Philosophy of Politics and Law at Lomonosov Moscow University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy)</i> MODERNITY AND THE CHOICE OF THE FUTURE IN TERMS OF POLITICS AND FORECASTS	36
B. DESGARDINS , <i>General Manager of Banque Eric Sturdza (Geneva, Switzerland)</i> INTERNATIONAL ISSUES: ECONOMIC AND SOCIETAL CHALLENGES.....	38
P. DUTKIEWICZ , <i>Director of the Centre for Governance and Public Management at Carleton University (Canada), Ph.D., Professor;</i> D. KAZARINOVA , <i>Associate Professor, Comparative Politics Department, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (Moscow), Ph.D. in Political Science</i> THE END OF GLOBALIZATION: REASONS AND CONSEQUENCES	44
G.M. GATILOV , <i>Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary</i> ON SOME NEW CHALLENGES AND THREATS IN THE GLOBAL WORLD AT THE CURRENT STAGE	47
AI.A. GROMYKO , <i>Director of the RAS Institute of Europe, corresponding member of the RAS, Chairman of the Coordination Council of RAS Professors, Dr. Sc. in Political Sciences, Professor</i> GLOBAL (IN)SECURITY: NATIONAL INTERESTS OF RUSSIA	51
A.A. GUSEYNOV , <i>Principal Adviser for Academic Affairs of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, full member of the RAS, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> THE FUTURE WITH NO FUTURE	54
M.S. GUSMAN , <i>First Deputy Director General of TASS Russian News Agency, Professor, Merited Man of Culture of the Russian Federation</i> NEWS AGENCIES AND TODAY'S INFORMATION CHALLENGES	57
G.A. HAJIYEV , <i>Judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, Doctor of Law, Professor, Honored Lawyer of the Russian Federation, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> ON WHITE SPOTS AND MINEFIELDS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW	59
V. INGIMUNDARSON , <i>Professor of Contemporary History at the University of Iceland (Reykjavik), Ph.D.</i> US–RUSSIA RELATIONS: RECONFIGURING A POLITICAL PAST IN THE PRESENT	60
G.B. KLEINER , <i>Deputy Director of the Central Economics and Mathematics Institute of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i> SYSTEM SHIFTS AND BENCHMARKS OF WORLD DEVELOPMENT	63
G.W. KOLODKO , <i>Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Poland (1994–1997, 2002–2003). Director of the Research Institute at the Kozminski University (Warsaw), foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i> AN ASIAN ERA WITH THE EURO-ATLANTIC CIVILIZATION AS A BACKGROUND?.....	66

H. KÖCHLER , <i>President of the International Progress Organization (Vienna, Austria), professor at the University of Innsbruck, Ph.D.</i> WORLD ORDER IN AN AGE OF TRANSITION.....	70
V.L. KVINT , <i>Head of the Financial Strategy Department at the Lomonosov Moscow State University, foreign member of the RAS (USA), Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i> FORMATION, DEVELOPMENT AND CATEGORIZATION OF THE GLOBAL EMERGING MARKET.....	73
V.A. LEKTORSKY , <i>Chief Researcher of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i> CHALLENGES OF TODAY'S GLOBAL WORLD: WHAT TO EXPECT, WHAT TO HOPE FOR, WHAT TO DO.....	78
A.G. LISITSYN-SVETLANOV , <i>Chief research fellow of the Institute of State and Law of the RAS, academician of the RAS, Doctor of Law, Professor</i> ECONOMY AND LAW: SYSTEM SHIFTS, CHALLENGES AND CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE.....	82
G. LITTLEJOHN , <i>Economist, sociologist (Great Britain)</i> EMERGING COUNTER-STRATEGY TO BRICS.....	84
E.I. MAKAROV , <i>Deputy Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, scientific advisor of the Center of Monitoring and Analysis of Social and Labor Disputes, SPbUHSS</i> RUSSIA IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBAL CHANGES.....	87
J.A. MARCH , <i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain in the Russian Federation (2008–2011)</i> GLOBAL WORLD: SYSTEMIC CHANGES, CHALLENGES AND PROFILES OF THE FUTURE. AT THE CROSSROAD BETWEEN THE PRIMACY OF THE INDIVIDUALS AND THE NEW WAVE OF NATIONALISM.....	90
A.P. MARKOV , <i>Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Doctor of Cultural Studies, Doctor of Pedagogy</i> “AXIAL AGE” OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION: CHANGE OF CIVILIZATION MATRICES.....	92
R. MATTHEWS , <i>President of the International League of Strategic Management, Assessment and Accounting, Professor at the Kingston University (Great Britain)</i> UNITY, INTERDEPENDENCE AND RELATIVISM AS CHALLENGES FOR THE FUTURE.....	96
G. METTAN , <i>President of the United Chamber of Industry and Commerce “Switzerland – Russia and CIS States”, Executive Director of the Swiss Press Club (Geneva)</i> THE GLOBAL WORLD AND THE NEW WESTERN EMPIRE.....	100
V.V. MIRONOV , <i>Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy of Lomonosov Moscow State University, corresponding member of the RAS, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor</i> DIALOG OF CULTURES AND DEFORMATION OF THE NOTION OF TOLERANCE IN TODAY'S GLOBALIZING WORLD.....	103
M.F. MONTES , <i>Senior Advisor on Finance and Development, The South Centre (Geneva, Switzerland), Doctor of Economics</i> THE INTERNATIONAL LIBERAL ORDER VERSUS HUMAN RIGHTS.....	106
M.A. MORATINOS CUYAUBÉ , <i>Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010), Dr., Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> GLOBAL WORLD: SYSTEM SHIFTS, CHALLENGES AND CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE.....	109
D.V. MOSYAKOV , <i>Head of the Center for Southeast Asia, Australia and Oceania Studies at the Institute of Oriental Studies of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor</i> CONTOURS OF THE GLOBAL WORLD: COUNTRIES OF SOUTH-EAST ASIA BETWEEN BEIJING AND WASHINGTON.....	114
A.D. NEKIPELOV , <i>Director of the Moscow School of Economics at the Lomonosov Moscow State University, academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> PROTECTIONISM OR FREE TRADE: A FALSE DILEMMA.....	115
V.V. POPOV , <i>Chief research fellow at the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the RAS, Professor and researcher at the Institute of European, Russian and Eurasian Studies at the Carleton University (Canada), Dr. Sc. (Economics)</i> WHY GROWTH RATES DIFFER.....	118
VASIL PRODANOV , <i>Professor of the Department of Political Economy of the University of National and World Economy (Sofia), corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Philosophy</i> FROM GLOBALIZATION TO DEGLOBALIZATION.....	121
H.M. REZNIK , <i>Vice-President of the Federal Chamber of Lawyers, candidate of sciences (Law), Honoured Lawyer of Russia, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> CORRUPTION CULTURE AND ITS EVOLUTION.....	124
V.I. ROSSMAN , <i>Professor of the North American University (Houston, Texas, USA), Doctor of Philosophy and Political Sciences</i> THE CAPITALS OF COMPROMISE AND THE PROBLEMS OF NATION- AND STATE-BUILDING.....	127
J.A. SCHOLTE , <i>Professor of the Peace and Development Department at the University of Gothenburg (Sweden)</i> TOWARDS GLOBAL REDISTRIBUTION.....	129
B.J. SILVER , <i>Director of the Arrighi Center for Global Studies at the Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, USA), Doctor of Sociology, Professor</i> THE REMAKING OF THE GLOBAL WORKING CLASS: THE POST-2011 UPSURGE OF CLASS-BASED PROTEST IN WORLD-HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE.....	134

V.S. STYOPIN , <i>Head Section of Philosophy, Political Science, Sociology, Psychology and Law of the Department for Social Sciences of the RAS, academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>	
THE 21st CENTURY – RADICAL TRANSFORMATION OF THE TYPE OF CIVILIZATION DEVELOPMENT	136
P.P. TOLOCHKO , <i>Member of the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Honorary Director of the Institute of Archeology of the NAS of Ukraine, foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>	
WE ARE TO AWAIT WHAT WE'LL DO OURSELVES.....	140
Zh.T. TOSHCHENKO , <i>Head of the Department of Theory and History of Sociology of the Russian State University for the Humanities, Chief Researcher of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Chief Editor of the RAS journal "Sociological Studies", Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i>	
GLOBAL WORLD'S AND MICROWORLD'S DIALECTICS IN PUBLIC CONSCIENCE OF THE RUSSIANS	142
V.T. TRETYAKOV , <i>Dean of the Higher School (Department) of Television of Lomonosov Moscow State University</i>	
EUROATLANTIC UNION: NEW WORLD ORDER AND OUR (EURO-ATLANTIC) CIVILIZATION	146
T. TÜRKER , <i>Director of the Research Centre for Eurasian, Russian and East European Studies, Professor, Doctor of Political Sciences Faculty at the Ankara University (Turkey)</i>	
CASES OF MODERNIZATION AND POST, POST-POST OR NEO MODERNITY.....	148
C. VARGA , <i>Professor emeritus of the Institute of jurisprudence at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the Peter Pazman Catholic University (Budapest), Ph.D.</i>	
GLOBAL FUTURE, SYSTEMIC CHALLENGES (Changes in the Profiles of Law?).....	149
J. WIATR , <i>Minister of National Education of Poland (1996–1997), deputy to the Polish Parliament (Sejm) (1991–1997, 2001), Dr. Sc. (Sociology), Professor</i>	
TOWARD A NEW WORLD ORDER OF THE 21st CENTURY	152
A.V. YAKOVENKO , <i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Doctor of Law (International Law), Professor</i>	
PRAGMATISM AND MESSIAHSHIP IN WORLD POLITICS: BATTLE OF PARADIGMS	154
A.S. ZAPESOTSKY , <i>President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation;</i>	
E.F. CHEBERKO , <i>Professor of the Department of Economics of enterprise and entrepreneurship at the St. Petersburg State University, Professor of the Department of Economics and Management at the SPbUHSS, Dr. Sc. (Economics)</i>	
TRANSFORMATION OF ECONOMIC RELATIONS IN THE ENVIRONMENT OF TODAY'S CIVILIZATION CRISIS.....	155
Plenary Session	
"GLOBAL WORLD: SYSTEM SHIFTS, CHALLENGES AND CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE"	159
Part I	159
Participants: E. Agazzi, E. Bağış, V.A. Chereshnev, P. Dutkiewicz, A.A. Guseynov, G.A. Hajiyev, K.I. Kosachov, H. Kochler, V.L. Kvint, V.L. Makarov, A.S. Maksimov, J.A. March, M.A. Moratinos Cuyaube, A.A. Pankin, J.A. Scholte, V.A. Sevrikov, M.V. Shmakov, V.S. Styopin, V.T. Tretyakov, J. Wiatr, A.S. Zapesotsky	
Part II	175
Participants: L.C. Bresser-Pereira, G.B. Kleiner, V.A. Lektorsky, A.G. Lisitsyn-Svetlanov, V.K. Mamontov, G. Mcttan, M.F. Montes, A.D. Nekipelov, A.A. Pankin, H.M. Reznik, B.J. Silver, Zh.T. Toshchenko, T. Türker, C. Varga, A.S. Zapesotsky	
Panel Discussion "WORLD STABILITY UNDER A THREAT: CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES AND RELEVANT ANSWERS"	
	186
Speakers:	
J.A. MARCH , <i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain in the Russian Federation (2008–2011) (moderator)</i>	
A. AKAYEV , <i>President of the Kyrgyz Republic (1990–2005), foreign member of the RAS</i>	
E. BAĞIŞ , <i>Minister of European Union Affairs of the Republic of Turkey (2011–2013)</i>	
B. DESGARDINS , <i>General Manager at Banque Eric Sturdza (Geneva, Switzerland)</i>	
M.A. MORATINOS CUYAUBE , <i>Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010), Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>	
A. PANKIN , <i>Director of the Department for International Organizations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation</i>	
M. SHMAKOV , <i>Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, Vice-President of the International Confederation of Trade Unions, Vice-President of the European Regional Council of Trade Unions</i>	
A. ZAPESOTSKY , <i>President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS</i>	
Panel Discussion "GLOBAL WORLD: SYSTEM SHIFTS, CHALLENGES AND CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE"	
	194
Speakers:	
A. ZAPESOTSKY , <i>President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS (moderator)</i>	
P. DUTKIEWICZ , <i>Director of the Centre for Governance and Public Management at Carleton University (Canada), Ph.D., Professor</i>	
G. KOLODKO , <i>Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Poland (1994–1997, 2002–2003), Director of the Research Institute at the Kozminski University (Warsaw), foreign member of the RAS</i>	
A. NEKIPELOV , <i>Director of the Moscow School of Economics at the Lomonosov Moscow State University, academician of the RAS, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>	

V. PLIGIN, *Member of the Supreme Council of the All-Russian political party "United Russia", leading researcher of the law and state theory sector at the Institute of State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences*

J. SCHOLTE, *Professor of the Peace and Development Department at the University of Gothenburg (Sweden)*

T. TÜRKER, *Director of the Research Centre for Eurasian, Russian and East European Studies, Professor, Doctor of Political Sciences Faculty at the Ankara University (Turkey)*

Panel Discussion "WHAT TYPE OF CIVILIZATION ARE WE HEADING TO?" 202

Speakers:

A. ZAPESOTSKY, *President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS (moderator)*

E. AGAZZI, *Professor of the University of Genoa (Italy), foreign member of the RAS*

A. GUSEYNOV, *Principal Adviser for Academic Affairs of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, full member of the RAS, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*

V. LEKTORSKY, *Chief Researcher of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, academician of the RAS*

A. MARKOV, *Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies at SPbUHSS*

G. METTAN, *President of the United Chamber of Industry and Commerce "Switzerland – Russia and CIS States", journalist, writer (Switzerland)*

V. STYOPIN, *Head Section of Philosophy, Political Science, Sociology, Psychology and Law of the Department for Social Sciences of the RAS, academician of the RAS, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*

Round Table "CONTOURS OF WORLD ORDER IN THE 21st CENTURY" 213

Speakers: A.I. Ageev, A. Bebler, L.C. Bresser-Pereira, I.I. Buzovsky, V.A. Chereshev, B. Desgardins, P. Dutkiewicz, Ch.T. Gadio, V. Ingimundarson, G.W. Kolodko, H. Köchler, V.L. Kvint, G. Littlejohn, R. Matthews, M.F. Montes, M.A. Moratinos Cuyaubé, A.A. Pankin, V. Prodanov, H.M. Reznik, V.I. Rossman, J.A. Scholte, Ya.G. Shemiakin, B.J. Silver, P.P. Tolochko, Zh.T. Toshchenko, V.T. Tretyakov, C. Varga, J. Wiatr

INDEX OF NAMES 241

GLOBAL (IN)SECURITY: NATIONAL INTERESTS OF RUSSIA

The conflict between Russia and the “collective West” passed in the acute phase in 2014 represents a part of the “great destabilization” that swept many regions of the world in the last 20 years. Fragments of the Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations, which have become universal, remain; in the first place, it is the UN and fragments of a unipolar world. From the beginning of the XX century, the floors of polycentricism have been built over them. Historically, the transitions from one model of international relations to another have always been accompanied by outbreaks of violence and confrontation. However, this does not mean that the product of such destabilization should be the consolidation of the strategy of hostility and of game for competitor suppression designed for decades to come. It is much more rational to seek to reach an early conclusion of compromises and mechanisms of interaction, which, without eliminating the competition, even fierce one, would not call into question the fundamental national interests of the parties. That was after the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, after the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and after the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962.

Destructive processes in the sphere of international security is one of the most difficult problems that threatens to increase the vulnerability of the world community. We are talking about such disturbing phenomena as degradation of the norms and mechanisms of international security developed in the second half of the XX century, strengthening of the tension between the norm of territorial integrity and the right of nations to self-determination, weakening of control over nuclear weapons. The question of whether the global community will develop effective conflict prevention mechanisms remains unanswered. So far, the challenge is how to keep the existing agreements, primarily on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, from dismantling.

Indeed, it would be incorrect to say that in the field of international security there have not been positive developments in recent decades. For example, the number of inter-State conflicts taking the form of military confrontation has decreased. However, intra-State conflicts no less dangerous to global stability have come to the fore.

The events in Ukraine had only confirmed the urgency of these outstanding issues and the need for the early resolution. Ukrainian and a number of other initially intra-State crises have demonstrated how conflicts of this kind can lead to a sharp deterioration of relations between major powers.

¹ Director of the RAS Institute of Europe, corresponding member of the RAS, Chairman of the Coordination Council of RAS Professors, Dr.Sc. in Political Sciences, Professor. Author of more than 150 scientific publications, including monographs: “Political Reformism in Great Britain”, “Modernization of the UK Party System”, “Images of Russia and Great Britain: Reality and Prejudices”, “Building Good Neighbourly Relations: Russia in the Territory of Europe” (co-author), “Ten Years of Negotiations Are Better than One Day of War: Reminiscences about Andrei Andreyevich Gromyko” (author and compiler), “Reminiscences about Nikolai Shmelev” (editor and compiler); etc. Chief Editor of “Modern Europe” journal. Chairman of the Council of Experts of the Institute of Linguistic, Civilizational and Migratory Processes under the “Russkiy Mir” Foundation. President of the Russian Association of European Studies, member of the Department of Global Problems and International Relations of the RAS, member of the Academic Council of the Security Council of the Russian Federation and the Academic Council of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Honorary Doctor of the Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv (Bulgaria). Laureate of the Prize of the National Science Support Foundation (2004, 2006).

The accumulation of the problems with a new force stimulates discussions on the need for reform of the UN and the UN Security Council, on strengthening the peacekeeping capacities of the OSCE, on the NATO ambitions, on the importance of preventing the dismantling of the institution of “neutrality” in Europe.

Particular attention should be given to the center-periphery relations. In the global GDP structure, in 1980–2013, the US share decreased from 21.5% to 18.4%, the EU share (27 countries without Croatia) fell from 28.1% to 18.9%, while the China’s share increased from 1.9% to 15.5% and the India’s share rose from 2.3% to 6.1%. Another vivid example: in 1970, the share of 16 developed countries in the global GDP was 76%, while in 2013 the figure was 55%.² Projections confirming trends may be cited, for example, notes from the report of the Center for Strategic and International Studies “Defense 2045”. So, it is expected that by 2030 (compared to 2011), the US real GDP will yield precedence to China, India will rise from 10th to 3rd place, while Brazil until 2050 will shift from 6th to the fourth place following Delhi. In this same period, Japan will drop from 3rd to 5th place, Germany from 4th to 9th place, France from 5th to 10th place, while Italy and Britain will completely leave the top ten largest economies of the world³. It must be said that in these calculations Russia will rise from 9th to the 6th position.

These changes are accompanied by the accumulation of contradictions and disparities within the current model of globalization. However, those who are interested in keeping their dominant positions block major changes. But such a blocking cannot go on forever due to piling-up defects.

The US, Russia and China are the three leading states with global ambitions and the desire to implement them. The resources they have for it vary widely, but in their capacity these players are in comparable categories. For example, these three countries, the world leaders in the field of cyber technologies, the only full-fledged space powers, the owners of the most advanced military-industrial complex (in this respect, Beijing is still inferior to Moscow and Washington). They have a strong fundamental science and some of the world’s most experienced diplomatic and intelligence services at their disposal. These nations can concentrate quickly resources for the solution of the tasks set.

India has the potential of a global player that has yet to be fulfilled in the next decades. In some respects, the European Union belongs to this category. However, if a further increase of Delhi in the political weight in world affairs is a matter of time, then it is not necessary to predict definitely the same in relation to the EU. As they say for decades, this political giant has not yet turned into a political heavyweight. It is unclear whether the new Global Strategy⁴, an-

² RAS Academician V.V. Zhurkin and others. Chapter 2.2. European countries and the EU. Global governance: opportunities and risks. RAS Ans. Ed. Acad. V.G. Baranovsky, RAS Acad. N.I. Ivanova. M: IMEMO RAS, 2015. Series “Library of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations”. P. 184. RAS Corresponding member V.M. Davydov and others. Chapter 2.6. Latin America. Ibid. P. 284.

³ Miller D. T. Defence 2045. A Report for the CSIS International Security Program. Rowman & Littlefield. 2015. Nov. P. 11.

⁴ Shared Vision, Common Action: A Stronger Europe. A Global Strategy for the European Union’s Foreign and Security Policy. 2016 (https://europa.eu/globalstrategy/sites/globalstrategy/files/about/eugs_review_web_4.pdf)

nounced in June 2016 will help it to find its foreign policy essence. It is an ambitious document aimed at turning the EU into a full-fledged global player in politics and security.

A number of theses of the Strategy are of interest. Probably for the first time an official EU document states that the global governance system requires transformation and not renovation. It is unexpected to hear from Brussels that the "European model" is not necessarily suitable for "export" and that cooperation with other projects of regional integration can bring mutual benefits. The global strategy is less ideological than other EU policy documents; the notion of "principled pragmatism" was introduced. One of its refrains is the thesis of "strategic autonomy", which implies a greater foreign policy independence of the EU from Washington. A consistent focus on the central role of the UN in the global governance deserves support.

However, the global strategy in several of its paragraphs cannot but cause concern. The desire to build up the EU's own military identity, which ignores the US geopolitical interests and now those of Britain, should bring it dividends in the future. However, the emergence of additional military capabilities in Western and Central Europe, apart from NATO, will certainly be taken into account in the Russia's military planning. The most problematic aspect of the Global Strategy lies in the fact that Russia is declared in it as "a key strategic challenge", while "the European security order" is equated to security order solely for the European Union.

Much in Western and Central Europe will depend on political leadership, primarily in Paris, Berlin and Rome, in the capitals of the Visegrad Group countries. If eventually it is recognized that it is futile for the EU to move towards a multinational state or expand its "Neo-Empire", then the idea of a "Greater Europe"¹ may get a second wind. It appears to be an alternative to insolvable problems of "the EU as an Empire" or the "EU as a state". In this case, the increase of the EU geopolitical power would occur at the expense of a mutually beneficial strategic partnership with Russia. A definite movement on this path has already been made in the past. One of the essential components of this project is the formation of the pan-European security system. Until that happens, the EU policy continues to be a factor in the potential increase of confrontation with Russia right up to the deployment of a "new cold war".

In the meantime, the situation in the European security represents a gloomy picture. The system of measures of trust, control, prevent of further militarization of the region is in a dysfunctional state. The mechanisms of the Russia-NATO Council have not yet resumed its work. Military spending is growing. Extra military units with heavy weaponry are deployed in Europe. First of all, the new militarization affects the Baltic States, Poland, and Romania. More and more countries are being drawn into military escalation. The voices of those calling to reconsider the neutral status of Finland and Sweden² are increasing. The confrontation on the anti-missile defense system is growing; the European component infrastructure of the US global missile defense system is being built and put into operation.

The confrontation imposed on Russia based on the idea of a "new cold war" continues to escalate. However, this happens not only in real, but also in an imaginary dimen-

sion. The political establishment of the Baltic States insists stubbornly on its version that any day now Russia will invade the nations. In Lithuania, sabotage instructions are distributed in case of a new "occupation". With this background, the discrimination against the Russian-speaking population continues.

While discussing these processes, the lessons of the Cold War as a specific form of international conflict are extremely important³. Whichever model of new structural competition (hard or soft) Russia and the West may expect it is necessary to maintain the basic principle pained in the 1940–1980s: the rivalry as the interweaving of competition and cooperation. This balance should not exclude even the elements of alliance, on which now for the first time after the Second World War, both sides are pushing grandiose dangers, primarily international terrorism.

Terrorism in the broad sense of the word is as old as the history of human civilization. Previously, it was mainly talked about the different manifestations of domestic terrorism, such as those in Spain or in the UK, in Corsica or in South Tyrol, but not about international terrorism. This is a fairly new phenomenon, which is not more than 15–20 years old. This type of terrorism is not connected with the domestic or the national liberation struggle. It has a different nature. The struggle is against a certain system of values, lifestyle, identification, and finally, against civilization.

International terrorism cannot be defeated by military means, as for example the activities of the Basque ETA or the Irish Republican army. Military means are nothing more than a mean of suppression of its most smashing manifestations. The main danger lies in the fact that the ideology of international terrorism sits deep in the minds of several hundreds of thousands of people around the world. It can be called indoctrination or barbarism, but many believe in what they are doing, destroy people and turning into living bombs (at least for themselves) not only for money.

What are the roots of this kind of terrorism? In this phenomenon, internal and external causes have mixed up. International terrorism is as inevitable as the globalization itself, which in its current form leads to increased disparities. Where social inequality exceeds certain limits, there will always be people ready to struggle, including by terrorist means, for some kind of idea. However, on the scale of international terrorism, external as well as internal causes are "to be blamed" in approximately equal proportions.

In many ways, what is happening in the world is an artificial phenomenon. In Western countries, the term "a denial of the obvious" is widespread. Still, few are those who are willing to admit that their foreign policy was one of the reasons why international terrorism has taken unprecedented scale and shape.

No country in the world is able to cope with this danger alone. The following also aggravates the problem: first, for many countries of the world, international terrorism has not yet turned into an existential threat. In their system of priorities and risks, international terrorism stands high on the scale of the most dangerous challenges, but it is not the main one. Secondly, the centers of international terrorism are far from the "core" countries of the liberal model of globalization. The backbone of international terrorism is 30–40 thousand people, which are concentrated in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya and Yemen. In this sense, for the United

¹ *Shmelev N.P., Gromyko A.I.A.* Greater Europe: future reality or utopia? Greater Europe. Ideas, Reality, Perspectives. Ed. by A.I.A. Gromyko, V.P. Fedorov. Moscow: Ves mir, 2014.

² *Gromyko A.I.A., Plevako N.S.* On the possibility of Sweden's and Finland's membership in NATO // Modern Europe. 2016. No 2.

³ *Kremenyuk V.A.* Lessons of the Cold War. Moscow: Aspect Press, 2015. P. 22.

States international terrorism is a dangerous phenomenon, but still concentrated far from its borders. In this sense, in the future, some countries will be more interested in fighting against it than others.

The way out beyond the permissible limits of confrontation between large centers of power, beyond which they break into confrontation, is no less dangerous. As for the structure of competition, it is a mistake to equate them with confrontation structures. The argument of the supporters of a “new cold war” is a reference to the so-called “eternal” contradictions between the great powers, in particular between Russia in its various historical phases and Western countries. In this interpretation, the complex history of interstate relations boils down to one option – confrontation, although the latter is just one of the forms of rivalry that does not exclude the possibility of cooperation, joint crisis management and even in certain areas of the alliance.

Forthright arguments about the “eternal” enemies and friends leads into logical dead ends and primitivize history. So, in the recent past it was believed in the USSR and China that they are strategic opponents (irrevocably and finally, as it seemed, after the battles for the Damansky Island in 1969). At the previous stage of their relationship, the Communist character of the two political systems was considered as a pledge of eternal friendship. Now, speaking of the strategic partnership between Moscow and Beijing, we should remember that such a scenario seemed so unlikely even 30 years ago. For a long time, France and Germany, Germany and Poland, Japan and (South) Korea and many other countries were considered to be “programmed” enemies. There was a time when the US and the UK were fighting.

In the arguments about the determinants of history, there is certainly a grain of truth. Indeed, there can be structures of confrontation, which for a long time in one form or another remain in place when passing from one model of international relations to another. Thus, in the 19th, in the 20th, and now in the 21st century, rivalry dominated in relations between Russia and Britain. Relations between Moscow and Washington also could not escape a deeply entrenched dislike, despite the seemingly fundamental change in the international environment at the turn of the 1980s–1990s. Moreover, such cases are numerous. Their nature is at least twofold.

We are talking about major subjects of world politics with their own geopolitical projects and global approaches, which for a number of parameters have comparable resources, or, on the contrary, about relations that are characterized by a large asymmetry, when small countries are afraid of the domination of large neighbors. States of the first category are usually located at a distance from each other, for example, Russia and the United States, China and the United States, the second category are bordering nations (China and Vietnam, Russia and the Baltic countries, the United States and Cuba, etc.). The factor of geographical proximity in most cases eventually causes the major players to find compromises and agree on mutual benefits. France and Germany, Russia and China came along this route. Apparently, India and Pakistan, India and China tend to use this formula, while Iran and Saudi Arabia are still betting on confrontation in the struggle for regional leadership.

Thus, history shows that even in the era of hyper globalization the factor of geographical location continues to have considerable weight. Being at a distance from each

other, large and mainly equal players can afford for a long time to be in a state of tough competition, even confrontation, especially if their economic relations are weak. Nevertheless, since the second half of the 20th century, they can no longer afford to follow the course of complete suppression of a major enemy, primarily in the military sense. For the same reason, they do not have enough motivation to embed their rivals into the wake. Obviously, the balance of tough competition will be no less characteristic of the 21st century than of its predecessors.

Paradoxically, the argument for a “new cold war” may be that it is a mechanism for managing the confrontation, without which the confrontation could reach the level of a third world war. However, it was not the Cold War, including its regulatory component, that in the 1940s–1980s prevented a new “world” war, but the creation of nuclear weapons in 1945, i.e. when the Cold War had not yet begun. In the relations of the nuclear powers, atomic weapons make it impossible a settlement of the conflict by means of war. In other words, it was not so much the Cold War that helped prevent the use of nuclear weapons, as the latter, among other things, did not allow it to develop into a hot one. Since nothing in the near future does not forebode abandonment of the “big bomb”, a “new cold war” would only aggravate the issues of WMD control and the nonproliferation regime.

The election in November 2016 of the new US President raised pressing issues before the states and organizations of the Old World and Eurasia. From the point of view of Europe, Donald Trump belongs to the category of Eurosceptics and even to critics of the liberal model of globalization. In this, thanks to the support of half of the population of his country, he went up against the remnants of the inter-party consensus of the Democrats and Republicans. Political polarization in the United States has already reached new heights under President Obama, but it was not as pronounced in the foreign policy. The template of the latter, according to a frank statement by Ben Rhodes, the Deputy National Security Advisor, was formed in 1990 – 2002: “We could push through the UN Security Council everything we wanted with a small exception. Frankly, we could interfere in the internal affairs of other states in many ways. We could rely on the fact that Russia would not oppose NATO’s expansion. We had time left before China began to influence the situation along its borders”.¹

Trump is reluctant to maintain automatically the existing ideology and practice of relations with the European Union or within NATO. He refused to absolutize the idea of free trade and withdrew his country from the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP). There is virtually no chance of a resumption in the near future of negotiations on the conclusion of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP). Barack Obama left hopes of ratification of the TPP, while negotiations on the TTIP were bogged down in contradictions long before the new president came to power. In many ways, the Trump phenomenon barely revealed the old differences.

Russia and the West have all the reasons to help the world to leave the area “the great destabilization” on terms of structural polycentricism, instead of enlarging its area with the dangerous farce of a “new cold war”. The most important task of the world’s leading centers of influence is to

¹ Rhodes B. A dust-up with the Iranians or the Chinese could get out of hand very fast // Politico. Jan. 19, 2017. P. 16.

find a *modus vivendi* appropriate to the global challenges. Consolidation of structural competition in the form of confrontation would be an attempt to reuse patterns of thinking of the previous historical era.

Such a fixation on conditions of hostility, i.e. on the terms of the worst variant of the Cold War – threat containment, hard power and fragmented cooperation – would bring special threats to the world. In other words, it is structural competition as a variation on the theme of the Cold War in the period before the Cuban Missile Crisis and until the establishment of a strategic balance in the 1960s–1970s. This type of a cold war, let's call it “hard”, is not so much frozen, as a deferred “hot” conflict. Its delay in the confrontation between the USSR and the US was based on poorly calculated risks of exchanging nuclear strikes, even with asymmetric strategic arsenals and the absence of military parity of opponents. This deferment was almost “overcome” in October 1962. If this had happened, we would not have had the opportunity to be in this room.

As for a “soft” type of a cold war, in analogy with the detente of the 1970s, it was possible in the unique conditions of a “parity” bipolar world that had gone to the past with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp. Theoretically, bipolarity in the first half of the 21st century has a chance to return, if in addition to the US the second side in its dual core would be China headed by a certain group of satellite countries. Today, there is little evidence that history will follow this path. At the same time, the appearance in recent years of the elements of de-globalization, in case of fixation of this trend, can develop into a split of the world in one way or another.

It is important to emphasize that the essence of the problem of a “new cold war” is deeper than the unacceptability

of the revival of any of its known types. After all, justifying the admissibility of restarting a cold war in its “hard” or “soft” version, one can simply refer to history, pointing out that there was no precedent for its escalation into a big hot war; to refer to the fact that today there is a strategic parity and the two leading nuclear powers continue to adhere to the doctrine of “guaranteed mutual destruction”.

It seems that the vulnerability of such arguments lies in the fact that the “big bomb”, in contrast to the 1940–1980s, does not already guarantee the world free from the “big” and small wars. The danger of uncontrolled escalation scenarios increases. In the context of the weakening of the nonproliferation regime, the emergence of nuclear weapons in poorly controlled states, the development of new high-precision weapons, the destruction of the ABM regime agreed upon in the 1970s, the strengthening of international terrorism, including in the territory of nuclear states (primarily Pakistan), the rapid development of cyber technologies and their militarization, the risks of dangerous conflicts between great powers – direct or through involvement in conflicts on the periphery – are acquiring a new quality.

In this situation, the structural competition in the form of a “new cold war” between Russia and the “collective West” would only pander to destructive processes in international relations. Structural competition based on a constructive polycentricism, on the contrary, would give Russia and the West the opportunity to reduce jointly the risks of regional and global conflicts, to develop, within the framework of acceptable and generally accepted rules, their competitive advantages, focusing on rational and desirable interaction and recognizing strategic interests of each other where it is obvious.

A.A. Guseynov¹

THE FUTURE WITH NO FUTURE

The general subject of the section “The Crisis of Civilization: the Future of Man and Mankind” combines the ideas of the crisis of civilization and the future. The offered notes are dedicated exactly to this conjugation.

1. The combination of words “the crisis of civilization” has been firmly established in our common humanitarian vocabulary. In my opinion, it has no strict conceptual contents and more likely it is a concept defining a big aggregation of various phenomena, when success that people are striving for and achieve turns into threats and dangers for them as, for example, it happened in case of achievements in nuclear physics, which turned into nuclear weapons, or in case of the boost of industrial development that, as many

experts are sure, became the reason of dangerous climate warming. We're speaking not just about contradictoriness and difficulties of civilization development but about a special – apocalyptic – perception of them. There is a lot of evidence of such a perception. Here are just several of them at random. The cyclical theories opposing the ideas of linear progress became popular in the philosophy of history, e.g. N.Ya. Danilevsky's and A. Toynbee's teachings. There were three great moralists in the 20th century who were world famous and acknowledged – Leo Tolstoy, Mahatma Gandhi, Albert Schweitzer – and all three of them were against the modern civilization in its most important aspects. The catastrophe plots (war against aliens, robots rebelling against people, etc.) became nearly prevailing in science fiction. Pessimistic forecasts of sociologists arise a lot of interest and attract public attention, e.g. S. Huntington's articles on the clash of civilizations, F. Fukuyama's papers on the end of history. Another fact. The academic journal of the Chicago University, *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, has been printing the Clock set at several minutes to midnight since 1947. Midnight is in this case symbolizes a global nuclear war meaning death of the mankind, and the design got the name of the Doomsday Clock. The board of

¹ Principal Adviser for Academic Affairs of the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, full member of the RAS, Doctor of Philosophy, Professor. Author of over 500 scientific publications, including books: “The social nature of morality”, “The Golden Rule of morality”, “Great moralists”, “Language and conscience”, “Philosophy, morality, politics”, “Ancient Ethics”, “Negative ethics”, “The great prophets and thinkers. Moral teachings from Moses to the present day”. Managing editor of the year book “Ethical Thought”, the journal “Social Science” (in English), the member of the editorial boards of the journals “Philosophical Sciences”, “Problems of Philosophy”. Vice-president of the Russian Philosophical Society. Laureate of the State Award of the Russian Federation in the field of science and technology. Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS.

Scientific edition

GLOBAL WORLD: SYSTEM SHIFTS, CHALLENGES AND CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE

The 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

May 18–20, 2017

(ГЛОБАЛЬНЫЙ МИР: СИСТЕМНЫЕ СДВИГИ, ВЫЗОВЫ И КОНТУРЫ БУДУЩЕГО

XVII Международные Лихачевские научные чтения

18–20 мая 2017 года)

Выпускающий редактор *Я. Ф. Афанасьева*

Художественное оформление *А. М. Бриль*

Технический редактор *Л. В. Климкович*

ISBN 978-5-7621-0930-7



Подписано в печать с оригинал-макета 30.09.17. Формат 60x90/8
Гарнитура Times New Roman. Усл. печ. л. 30,25. Тираж 300 экз. Заказ № 99

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