

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND PEOPLES

DOI: 10.53658/RW2022-2-1(3)-160-174

Some features of the modern dialogue of civilizations

Rakhat D. Stamova

Institute of philosophy, law and socio-political researches named after A.A. Altymyshbaev of the National Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz Republic (Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan)

Abstract: The concept of civilizations dialogue has emerged relatively recently but has undergone a number of changes during its existence. Not to mention the fact that there is no consensus in the scientific community on what exactly should be considered as a dialogue of civilizations. However, it is obvious that there have been and still exist mutual relations between peoples belonging to different civilizations, those relations that, in general, fall under the concept of “dialogue of civilizations”. And it is also obvious that depending on a specific historical period of time or epoch, specific circumstances and many different conditions, this dialogue changed its forms. However, the essence of this dialogue and its basis, as it seems to us, remained unchanged, which was due to the very nature of a man. The article, as far as the scope of the article allows, reveals the essence and natural basis of the dialogue of civilizations. In addition, the article finds out what forms this dialogue has taken at the global level in recent decades and what caused the transformation of these forms. The world is changing rapidly, the pace of changes will only rise over time, and analysis of the above is needed.

Keywords: civilization, culture, dialogue of civilizations, peculiarities of modern interaction of civilizations.

About the author: Rakhat D. Stamova. DSc (Philos.). Professor. Head of the Department of Social Philosophy, Aesthetics and Ethics of the Altmyshbayev Institute of Philosophy, Law and Socio-Political Sciences of the National Academy of Sciences. ORCID 0000-0001-5888-1371. Address: 720001 Kyrgyzstan, Bishkek -01, Kievskaya str., house No. 112, sq.40. stamrah@mail.ru.

Introduction

One of the main basic features of the modern world is its extremely fast development, predicted with difficulty, fairly hard to be forecast. Within the course of one or two generations the world can change beyond recognition. Back in the early eighties of the XX century, few people could have predicted the collapse of a huge and powerful empire in the face of the USSR, the transformation of a bipolar world into a unipolar one. Even ten or twenty years ago, it was hard to imagine that the unipolar world rapidly start transforming into a multipolar one, and Eastern civilizations would rapidly regain their leading position in the world, which they had lost several centuries ago. Of course, in such conditions, relations and interaction between peoples and civilizations, on the one hand, are sharply intensified, and on the other hand, they become utterly more complicated. What are these relationships and interactions

really like at the present time? Of course, we will not be able to give not only an exhaustive, but also a sufficiently complete and accurate answer to this question. Nevertheless, we will make an attempt to give a definite concrete answer.

The relevance of the topic is due to the fact that we, modern people, exist in the context of this dialogue, and it is obvious that the nature of our destinies and the fate of all peoples on the planet largely depends on its nature. The purpose of this article is to clarify the nature and some features of modern inter civilizational relations. The objectives are to identify the nature of man, which ultimately determines the nature of the dialogue of civilizations, as well as the relationship between culture and civilization, which in the context of this article largely coincide with each other.

Materials and methods

They are determined by the subject matter, i.e. by the very phenomenon of the dialogue of civilizations, which implies the use of primarily civilizational and historical approaches. The article uses the works and articles by such classic authors of philosophical and political thought as F. Nietzsche, O. Spengler, S. Huntington, etc., as well as by a number of contemporary authors, the list of which is presented in the list of references.

Results

Anyone who makes an attempt to determine the nature and consequences of the so-called dialogue of civilizations, from the very beginning faces several rather difficult for their solution problems due to the polysemousness of both concepts. Therefore, let us clarify what exactly we will understand by a dialogue of civilizations, and, of course, explain our own choice.

As for the dialogue, in accordance with the etymology of this word (from the Greek. Διάλογος – «разговор») it means (at least in the original and familiar sense of the word) association, conversation, communication, an interview that takes place between two or a large number of people. However, everything becomes much more complicated when the term “dialogue” is no longer used in relation to specific people, but to civilizations. Obviously, dialogue in a civilizational context can mean a certain kind of contacts and interaction between the peoples and civilizations that are represented by these peoples. In this context, the dialogue of civilizations, if not identical, is at least very close to the concept of “dialogue of cultures”, which is usually understood as interaction, mutual influence, interpenetration or mutual repulsion, hostility, rejection of different historical or modern cultures, as a form of their confessional or political coexistence. This opinion is supported by the fact that the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute was established in 2016, which is an international independent non-profit organization. The main goal of the Institute is to promote the growth of international security by developing and proposing recommendations aimed at preventing

conflicts or, if they are already occurring, eliminating them and reducing tensions in various regions of the world. The Institute is composed of scientists of various profiles, intellectuals, current or former politicians, entrepreneurs, artists and cultural figures from different countries of the world, representing a wide range of civilizations. It should be pointed out that there are authoritative analytics and researchers who do not make an identity mark between the dialogue of cultures and civilizations. Thus, the well-known Russian statesman and public figure V. I. Yakunin states:

The civilizational approach to history has been a reality for a century and a half... In this respect, civilization is considered as the ultimate concept that denotes all of humanity as a whole in its historical development, as a synonym for the concept of "cultures". But there is another way of interpreting civilization, which is more acceptable in the civilizational paradigm, where civilization is conceived as a set of independent plans of historical development that arose on a special national-territorial basis (Yakunin 2012).

The vagueness, or rather the vastness and polysemantic nature of the concept of "civilization" itself naturally creates certain difficulties in defining the two-part concept of "dialogue of civilizations". As the Russian researcher B. S. Erasov rightly points out:

the blurring of the definition of civilization – is the result of significant changes in social thought, which perceives shifts in scientific constructions, but often has a significant and sometimes deforming effect on these constructions (Erasov 1998).

Another Russian researcher M. V. Kharkevich draws attention to the fact that:

there are many civilizations in the world, understood in general terms as macrostructures organized around certain cultural, social and / or economic relations. The content of research within the framework of this approach consists in operationalizing the definition of civilizations, identifying the characteristics of their behavior, interaction, and the specifics of their internal structure and development (Kharkevich 2015).

It goes without saying that a dialogue between people and separately taken individuals is far from being the same as a dialogue of civilizations. As the Russian political scientist I. V. Sledzевsky writes, a dialogue of civilizations is a conceptual meaningful formed formula (Slednevsky 2011). It should be pointed out that no matter how a dialogue of civilizations is understood, or, in the words of I. V. Sledzевsky, a meaningful formed formula, it, this formula, presupposes interaction between civilizations. And, in fact, this interaction in practice is the dialogue of civilizations, which is supported, in particular, by the nature and direction of the above-mentioned institute "Dialogue of Civilizations".

And this interaction of civilizations is not only peaceful, but also often of a conflict nature. In this regard, it is necessary to point out the important fact that almost the entire history of mankind is permeated by conflict relations between different peoples and civilizations. And these conflicts often took the most acute form - of military confrontation, war. If we turn to specific historical examples, the first civilizations on Earth are Ancient Mesopotamia, Indian civilization, Ancient Egypt, Ancient Greece, Ancient China, Hittite civilization, Mayan

Civilization, Ancient Rome, etc. - emerged as a result of successful military expansions. This is quite natural and even inevitable, since the emergence of the first civilizations was associated with the capture and protection of territories most suitable for life. The state – namely, the emergence of the first most developed civilizations in the history of mankind is connected with them - is a form of organization of certain ethnic communities, the purpose of which was primarily to ensure the protection of their own territories from external encroachments. However, in conditions when some communities were ahead in their economic or military terms (or in both respects) of other societies, the situation inevitably arose when the societies that were ahead in their development in one way or another got use of the advantage they had. More often, this happened, as it follows from many historical facts, in the form of military expansion. Thus arose the first powerful empires, which were nothing more than the first states that went beyond their original limits and expanded. Almost all of the above civilizations were formed in this way. The constant and persistent expansion of the first civilizations necessarily led to the fact that different civilizations came into contact with each other and then entered into single combat with each other. Thus, the Persian Empire during the reign of the dynasty The Achaemenids stretched at the time of its greatest power from the Indus River in the east to The Aegean Sea in the west, from the first rapids of the Nile River in the south to Transcaucasia in the north, covering more than 80 nations. The Persian Empire itself was eventually defeated by Alexander the Great, whose intention was to conquer the entire world known to the ancient Greeks. Ancient Rome, which captured most of the territory of Western Europe, turned the Mediterranean Sea into an internal one. The history of China from the Qin Empire, which arose between 221 and 206 BC, to the Qing Empire, which existed from 1645 to 1911, was the history of empires that won victories over their neighbors, or suffered defeats from them, for example, from the Mongol Empire, which was the most extensive in the history of mankind. The examples can be continued indefinitely. But it is not necessary, since it is quite obvious that the peoples who created empires expanded them to the most possible extent, and ceased their advance if they confronted with significant resistance and were no longer actually able to expand. The population in the subordinate territories, as a rule, was partially exterminated, that very part that did not abandon military resistance, and the remaining part were subjected to assimilation. Thus, Ancient Rome subjected its subordinate peoples to Romanization processes in the duration of several centuries, during which French, Spanish, Portuguese, Romanian and other languages emerged, which now make up the Romance group of languages. Later, the Spanish, Portuguese and French created their own empires, having introduced their own languages and culture in the conquered territories. Romance languages are now spoken by about 600 million people (Romance languages)¹. Chinese is currently spoken by over 1.3 billion people worldwide (Chinese)². In the modern world, about 1.5 billion people on the planet speak English, which is approximately 20 % of all people living today. At the same time, for about 360 million people, English is their native

1 Romance languages [Electronic resource]. URL: https://www.krugosvet.ru/enc/gumanitarnye_nauki/lingvistika/ROMANSKIE_YAZIKI.html

2 Chinese language [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kitaiski> Kitaisky yazyk Areal i chislennost#

language, for the rest it is the second language, but they speak it almost fluently (English).³ The Kyrgyz, as is known, were part of the Russian Empire for some part of their history, which at a certain historical stage was transformed into the USSR, in which the Russian language was undoubtedly dominant. According to data published in "Language Monthly" magazine No. 3, 1997 about 300 million people around the world speak Russian, while only 160 million people considered it their native language (Russian).⁴

The dialogue of civilizations, therefore, was in fact reduced, as it follows from the above examples, to a large extent to the imposition of their own culture and language on other peoples and cultures. This phenomenon, in our opinion, should be attributed to the phenomena of a universal order. In other words, people belonging to a particular society tend to consistently and persistently defend their interests, which inevitably leads to the process of cultural and linguistic assimilation. And here the difference between nations consists only in the fact that some nations do it more or less successfully, while others do not. This fact, which is connected with the desire of peoples to subjugate other peoples, and then assimilate them into their own culture and language, can be explained, as it seems to us, by the very nature of man, who naturally strives for domineering, or in any case does not tolerate or internally does not want to be dominated by other peoples and cultures.

We will try to explain this fact, circumstance, based on certain philosophical approaches, or rather, to the fundamental position, the concept in F. Nietzsche's view on human nature, formulated by him as the will to power. The will to power, according to the thinker, is the main driving force in people, manifested in their natural desire for achievement, ambition and desire to achieve the greatest possible advantage, position in life. This aspiration is a direct manifestation of the will to power, about which Nietzsche wrote, in particular, the following:

If the deepest essence of being is the will to power, if pleasure accompanies every increase in power, and displeasure accompanies every sense of the impossibility of resistance, the sense of the impossibility of gaining the upper hand, can we then accept pleasure and displeasure as cardinal facts? Is will possible without these two extreme points; without yes and no? But who feels satisfied?.. But who wants power?.. Ridiculous question! When every being is itself a will to power, and consequently a feeling of pleasure and displeasure! Nevertheless, it feels the need for opposites, for resistance, i.e. relatively, for other units that strive to expand their limits (Nietzsche 1994).

Thus, the will to power, according to Nietzsche is the fundamental essence of all living on Earth, and not just a man, who, being endowed with an instinct for life, inevitably reaches out to it, seeks to avoid death. However, due to the fact that a person is endowed with intelligence, his will to power is embodied in a much more complex form than that of other living beings. In particular, it is implemented through a system of cultural relations and values, as well as language. And for this reason, the will to power in the sphere of interaction between different

³ The English language is known by 20 % of the Earth population. How did it happen? [Electronic resource]. URL: <https://magazine.skyeng.ru/history-of-english/>

⁴ The Russian language in the world [Electronic resource]. URL: [#Russprostranenie_v_mire](https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russky_yazyk_v_mire)

peoples necessarily takes the form of a confrontation of cultures and languages, when each of the peoples participating in the interaction seeks, at a minimum, to preserve its own culture and language, and at a maximum, to impose them on the other people. Such a desire, in the conditions of ethnic and national existence, inevitably takes the form of a competition of cultures, one of the most important elements is language. At the same time, the interests of other peoples and states are often ignored, consciously or unconsciously ignored, or taken into account to the extent that they are opposed.

The principle described above has worked and continues to work at the present time, and it underlies the interaction or, in other words, the dialogue of civilizations. Human nature itself, aspiring, in the words of F. Nietzsche's approach to power leads to the fact that peoples and civilizations, interacting with each other, strive in one way or another to a dominant position, and if they are obviously unable to occupy this position, they behave in such a way as to reduce and mitigate the influence of the opposite side. Russian researcher I. V. Kucheruk rightly points out that the dialogue of civilizations in the real historical process often took place and continues to take place in conditions of asymmetry, i.e., inequality or non-equality of the parties to the dialogue, which is a qualitative characteristic of the situation:

intersubjective dialogue, including the dialogue of civilizations and cultures, based on the disequilibrium of the positions of its subjects, their statuses and resources (Kucheruk 2013).

A particularly dramatic character is attached to the dialogue and conflict of civilizations by the fact that civilizations often adhere to different value systems, which do not only coincide with each other, but also deny each other and cannot, in fact, be brought to a common denominator. So, at present, we are not only witnessing, but also actually participating in two systems of values – traditional and so-called liberal. Their mutual difference is of principled and fundamental nature. In connection with this difference, in particular, Patriarch Kirill said the following:

It is necessary to distinguish the values invented by man from the values that the Lord revealed. The former are relative, transitory, and often change with the course of history and the development of the laws of human community. The latter are eternal and unchangeable, just as God is eternal and unchangeable. The first ones are often based on personal interests of a person and aim to achieve earthly well-being and receive immediate benefits. The latter urge us to despise the benefits of earthly life for the sake of higher goals and values. ... The Church has always testified to the importance of following traditional, God-bequested moral ideals, because they ensure spiritual immunity, stability and vitality of the entire society. (Kirill Gundyayev) 2013).

However, it should be clarified that the relations between civilizations were and are not only of a conflict nature. Everything was determined and is ultimately determined by the current balance of power. It should also be pointed out that conflict has always been at the heart of the development of the human species. No matter how unpleasant and undesirable it may be in itself, conflict, or rather, the fear of being defeated in an actual or potential, possible conflict, was and remains to this day the strongest incentive in the development of peoples and

civilizations. It will be appropriate to cite the idea of Engels, who, describing the inner essence of not only European, but also any other civilization, wrote:

Low greed has been the driving force of civilization from its first to the present day; wealth, once more wealth, and thrice wealth, the wealth not of society, but of this particular miserable individual, has been its sole, defining goal. If, at the same time, science developed more and more in the depths of this society and the periods of the highest flourishing of art were repeated, it is only because without this all the achievements of our time in the field of wealth accumulation would have been impossible (Engels 1961, p. 177).

Thus, the basic principle on which relations between the first civilizations were built, has not, in our opinion, undergone any major changes and continues to act as a fundamental one in the modern system of international and inter civilizational relations. Only the forms of these relationships change, which adapt to the current reality and the technical, military, economic and other capabilities of modern states and civilizations.

Let's turn to today's reality, which, as we pointed out in the introduction, is characterized by extremely rapid variability. To do this, we will clarify what we will understand by civilization in relation to the current reality. The modern philosopher A. A. Gritsanov points out, not without reason, that the category of civilization at present is the following:

a highly eclectic and multi-valued concept that denotes: 1) one of the different qualities of the society, in its change in real historical time; 2) a stage in the evolution of human society, that has come to replace "primitive barbarism"; 3) the sum total of organizational tools (programs actively) through which people strive to achieve the social goals that are set by the existing universal standards of culture and the fundamental symbols of the latter.⁵

This term has a rather long history, which explains its highest degree of eclecticism and ambiguity. The first person to use the term "local civilization" was the French philosopher Sh. Renouvier, who published his scientific work "Guide to Ancient Philosophy" in 1844. Since then, the term "civilization" began to "wander" in various scientific works, acquiring new meanings and senses, still continuing at the present time.

The most authoritative scientific work devoted to the problem of civilization is still recognized as the fundamental work of the German philosopher and cultural critic, one of the founders of the philosophy of culture O. Spengler "The Decline of Europe", published in 1923. It should be pointed out that O. Spengler, having experienced a certain influence of Nietzsche's philosophy, like the latter, contrasted two such phenomena as culture and civilization.

Every culture has its own civilization. Civilization is the inevitable fate of culture. .. Civilization is the most extreme and artificial states that the most superior kind of people is capable of achieving. They are completion, they follow as those who became as such after their formation, as in the same way as death follows life, as immobility follows the development, as mental old age... They are the inevitable end, and yet they were always arrived at with an inner necessity (Spengler 1993).

⁵ The newest philosophical dictionary. / Comp/. A.A. Grizanov. – Mn.: Publ/. V.M.Skakun, 1998. S. 799.

Culture and civilization are the living body of the soul and its mummy (Spengler 1993).

It is - a civilization instead of a culture, an external mechanism instead of an internal organism, intelligence as a soul fossil instead of the extinct soul itself (Spengler 1993).

O. Spengler was far from the only one who opposed culture and civilization, considering the latter the death of culture. In the context of this article, such an understanding of civilization is hardly acceptable. We adhere to the interpretation of civilization, which belongs to the famous American sociologist and political scientist of the XX and early XXI centuries, the author of the concept of ethno-cultural division of civilizations, S. Huntington, who wrote the following in his article "Clash of Civilizations" published in 1993, and which caused a sensation:

It is now much more appropriate to group countries based not on their political or economic systems, not on their level of economic development, but on cultural and civilizational criteria (Huntington 1994).

At the same time, civilization, in the understanding of S. Huntington,

represents a certain cultural entity. Villages, regions, ethnic groups, peoples, and religious communities all have their own distinct cultures, reflecting different levels of cultural heterogeneity (Huntington 1994).

We can define civilization as a cultural community of the highest rank, as the broadest level of cultural identity of people ... Civilizations are defined by the presence of common features of an objective order, such as language, history, religion, customs, institutions – as well as by the subjective self-identification of people. There are different levels of self-identification... Civilization is the broadest level of community with which it relates himself. The cultural identity of people can change, and as a result, the composition and boundaries of a particular civilization change (Huntington 1994).

Identity is at the level of civilization, in his opinion

it will become increasingly important, and the shape of the world will largely be shaped by the interaction of seven or eight major civilizations (Huntington 1994),

what is related, by S. Huntington, according to a number of important reasons. First, the real difference between modern civilizations, which is difficult to eliminate. Secondly, a significant narrowing of the living space, which is due to the rapid quantitative growth of the world's population, accompanied by a noticeable growth in the economies of states. Third, intensive modernization processes that have led to significant social changes on a global scale, accompanied by a blurring and painful change in the traditional identification of people and a weakening of the role of the nation-state, which acts as the main source of people's identification. Fourth, the growth of civilizational consciousness, which is a reaction to the dominant role of the

West, which is guided in its relations with the rest of the world by the desire to lead and regulate the process of globalization. Fifth, they are less susceptible to changes in the cultural characteristics of peoples compared to the economic and political components of civilizations, and for this reason they are more resilient and less susceptible to compromise. Sixth, the process of economic and political regionalism, which has noticeably increased in recent decades. In connection with this process S. Huntington pointed out that “economic regionalism can be successful only if it is rooted in the commonality of civilization” (Huntington, pp. 38-40). Summing up the conclusions of his reasoning, S. Huntington noted that

in class and ideological conflicts, the key question was: ‘Which side are you on?’ And a person could choose which side he was on, as well as he could change his chosen positions. In the conflict of civilizations, the question is posed differently “ ‘Who are you?’ It is about what is given and not subject to change (Huntington 1994).

S. Huntington was wrong, in our opinion, when he claimed that it was “about what is given and not subject to change.” Cultural change and identification are also subjected to change. However, it is fair to say that it is cultural and mental transformations that occur most slowly and painfully. And for this reason, we can, in general, agree with the opinion of S. Huntington’s, what

in the emerging world, the main source of conflicts will no longer be ideology or economics. The most important borders that divide humanity and the predominant sources of conflicts will be determined by culture... The forthcoming conflict between civilizations is the final phase of the evolution of global conflicts in the modern world (Huntington 1994).

Discussion

On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that S. Huntington, being an ardent supporter of US global domination, framed his preferences and desires in a concept, gave them a theoretical scientific form. The United States, no matter how powerful it was in the nineties, nevertheless did not have sufficient human, material, economic and military resources and capabilities to subjugate the entire world. And for this reason S. Huntington developed the concept of consolidation of the West, which continues to be, in fact, a program document for the subordination of all other civilizations and peoples to Western civilization. To justify his view, S. Huntington put down the following idea:

In relation to other civilizations, the West is now at the peak of its power... A military conflict between Western countries is unthinkable, and the military power of the West is unparalleled. With the exception of Japan, the West has no economic rivals. It dominates the political, security spheres and together with Japan the sphere of economics (Huntington 1994).

Thus, a dialogue of civilizations, according to Huntington, is ultimately reduced to the establishment of unconditional dominance in the world of the United States and Western

civilization as a whole. The same point of view, in fact, was held by the well-known Brzezinski, who wrote:

America and its leadership must reassess the strategic environment in order to begin the country's internal and external renewal, aimed at reviving its global role (Huntington 1994).

However, the modern world, as we have repeatedly stated, is subject to rapid changes. And at almost all possible levels - local, regional and global. A little over 25 years have passed since the writing of the article we are quoting, and the situation has changed radically. Over the past time, Russia, despite all the catastrophes that took place in it after the collapse of the USSR, managed to recover as a military power and regain the status of a great empire, became one of the poles of power in the modern world. China has surpassed the United States in gross domestic product and, in fact, has become the world's economic leader. Since then, the United States, like the West as a whole, has acquired astronomical foreign debts and is unlikely to be able to repay them. According to experts' forecasts, in the current decade, India is to surpass the United States also in terms of GDP. The West or Western civilization, as current events show, was not a truly consolidated force, as various Western experts and politicians tried to imagine. It can already be asserted that the West has missed its historic chance to become the undisputed dominant force, a civilization in the world. However, all these facts do not in any way contradict the provisions of S. Huntington regarding the nature of relations between modern civilizations, the principles that these relations are built on, or, in other words, on which the dialogue of civilizations takes place.

The changed global balance of power has already led to the fact that the so-called liberal values, not being accepted by Russian, Chinese, Indian, Muslim and other civilizations, do not actually claim to play a dominant role in global civilization. So, the Italian authors of Ferrari and F. Petitot, seeking to find a compromise between the liberal Western and traditional value systems, insists that in the modern world it is necessary to realistically recognize the emergence of a new multipolar world of "multiple contemporaneities". At the same time, the fusion of "modern" political values and practices with traditional ways of life, which are expressed in religious traditions, will "more likely to be the rule than the exception" (Ferrari, Petitot 2013). However, such a compromise is quite painful for Western politics and humanitarian thought, as evidenced, in particular, by F. Petitot, who is somewhat surprised and, perhaps, annoyed by the inconsistency of Western scientists with their

suspiciously ambivalent attitude of the scientific community: on the one hand – unanimous analytical denial and moral rejection of the concept "A clash of civilizations, and on the other hand, ignoring or, more appropriately, justifiably indifferent to the concept of "Dialogue of Civilizations" (Ferrari, Petitot 2013).

Obviously, as changes in the global balance of power will change, the attitude of the Western scientific community to the relationship of civilizations will change, and so that the "dialogue of civilization" will ultimately prevail over the "clashes of civilizations", as the weaker side in any case is forced to submit to a stronger one and best thing for it is to make certain compromises.

It should be pointed out that the conflict nature of the dialogue or, what is the same thing, the interaction of civilizations does not mean the fatality of the historical process, but on the other hand, the relatively peaceful coexistence of civilizations and their positive interaction. As the well-known Soviet and Russian historian and specialist in the theory of civilizations I. V. Sledzevsky writes:

Over the long course of its history, crises and upswings in its development, humanity has created such mechanisms of social interaction that not only restored, but also expanded the sphere of stability of the world order through constant (and even growing) disturbances of balance. None of the political cataclysms of the twentieth century, primarily related to the two world wars, led, despite the horrific human losses and catastrophic material losses, to the global collapse of the world order; on the contrary, it was in the twentieth century it has been strengthened and established a clear legal and institutional framework. This phenomenon can be explained by the growth in the last century of various ways, forms and procedures for coordinating international actions, relations between society and the state, and domestic and foreign policies of states (Sledzevsky 2011).

On the other hand, I. V. Sledzevsky points out that

among all the opportunities and preferences of a particular state, the “power factor” has the greatest weight. Globalization and its contradictions are destroying - rapidly and on a large scale - this type of political intersubjectivity, both inside and outside national states. Global relations give all the main components of world politics unprecedented complexity, mobility, variability in terms of the number, interests, and possible actions of world players... ((Sledzevsky 2011).

As for the Kyrgyz people and other peoples like them in terms of their real potential to influence the course of world events and the relationship of civilizations, which are very modest, I must say, their fate largely depends on which polis of power they join. In our opinion, the most successful and appropriate choice for the people of Kyrgyzstan would be Russia and, accordingly, Russian culture, which is due to both historical, cultural, linguistic and geographical factors, as well as the deep coincidence of strategic interests of Russia and Kyrgyzstan.

Conclusions

1. The dialogue of civilizations in practice, in its real manifestations, means a certain kind of contacts and interaction between peoples and civilizations. In the context presented in the article, the dialogue of civilizations, if it is not identical, but at least it is very close to the concept of “dialogue of cultures”, which is usually understood as interaction, mutual influence, interpenetration or mutual repulsion, rejection, rejection of different historical or modern cultures, as a form of their confessional or political coexistence.

2. Almost the entire history of mankind is permeated by conflict relations between different peoples and civilizations. And these conflicts often took the most acute form - military

confrontation, a war. This is quite predictable and even inevitable, since the emergence of the first civilizations was associated with the capture and protection of territories most suitable for life. At present, the nature of relations between civilizations is largely determined by two factors: the struggle for global dominance of states and civilizations and the fight for natural resources.

3. For a long historical time, as, indeed, at the present time, the dialogue of civilizations in practice has been reduced to imposing their own culture and language on other peoples. And this feature of the dialogue should be attributed to the phenomena of a universal order. People belonging to a particular nation tend to consistently and persistently defend their interests, which inevitably flows into the process of cultural and linguistic assimilation. And here the only difference between nations is that some nations do it more successfully, while others do not.

4. Human nature, which is focused on power, leads to the fact that peoples and civilizations, interacting with each other, strive for a dominant position, and if they are obviously unable to occupy this position, they behave in such a way as to reduce and mitigate the influence of the opposite side. However, relations between civilizations were and are not only of a conflict nature. Everything was determined and is ultimately determined by the current balance of power.

References

- Brzezinski Z. (2013). Strategic view. America and the global crisis. – M.: AST, Astrel, 2013. – 288p. Erasov B.S. (1998). Comparative study of civilization: reader [Text] / B. S. Erasov. – M.: Aspect-Press, 1998. – 428p. (In Russian)
- Kirill (Gundyaev) (2013). Patriarch of the MP ROC. Traditional values and the modern world. Higher education today. M.: Publishing house “Logos”, 2013, - No 2 – With.5. (In Russian)
- Kucheruk I.V. (2013). Asymmetry Phenomenon in the Dialogue of Civilizations and Cultures. Philosophy of Education. – 2013. – (2(57)). – 132-136 p. (In Russian)
- Nietzsche, F. (1994). The Will to Power: An Experience of Reassessing All Values: In 3 volumes. Volume 1 / Friedrich Nietzsche. – M.: REFL-book, 1994/ -352 p. (In Russian)
- Petito F. (2008). Dialogue of Civilizations as a Global Political Discourse: Some Theoretical Reflections. Bulletin of the World Public Forum “Dialogue of Civilizations”, No. 1 (2). 2008. – 19-24. (In Russian)
- Sledzhevsky I.V. (2011). Dialogue of Civilizations as a Semantic Field of World Politics. Social Sciences and Modernity. – 2011 – No 2 – p.141-157. (In Russian)
- Ferrari, S., Petit F. (2013). Promoting Religious Freedom and Peace through Intercultural Dialogue. Milan: ISPI, 2013, 520 p. (In Russian)
- Huntington, S. A (2015). Clash of Civilizations? [Text] / S. Huntington. Polis, 1994. No. 1. – P. 33-48. (In Russian)
- Kharkevich M.V. (2015). Civilizations in world politics: factors of clash and dialogue. Bulletin of MGIMO University, no: 4 (43), 2015. – P. 159-165. (In Russian)
- Spengler, O. (1993). Decline of Europe [Text] / O. Spengler. – Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1993. – 592 p. (In Russian)
- Engels, F. (1961). The origin of the family, private property and the state [Text] / F. Engels // Marx, K., Engels, F. Soc. – Ed. Second. – Vol. 21. – M.: The State Publishing House of Political Literature. – 23-178 p. (In Russian)
- Yakunin V. I. (2012). Civilization diversity as a condition for the success of global changes. Speech at the Tenth Session of the World Public Forum “Dialogue of Civilizations”, 3-8 Oct. 2012 [Electronic resource] / V. I. Yakunin // World Public Forum “Dialogue of Civilizations”. – URL:http://wpfdc.org/images/docs/Rhodes_2012_Vladimir_Yakunin_Opening_plenary_speech_rus.pdf. (In Russian)