

Multiculturalism in the Modern World

Vladimir Fokin^a, Vladimir Baryshnikov^a, Natalia Bogoliubova^a, Julia Nikolaeva^a, Igor Ivannikov^a, Mariya Portnyagina^a, Natalia Ryazantseva^a, Elena Eltc^a and Igor Chernov^a

^aSaint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, RUSSIA

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the analysis of the concept of 'multiculturalism', highlighting its complex structure, which consists of the real phenomenon of contemporary life, scientific theory, ideology and policy. It reveals the discrepancy in the content of these components and discloses manifold reasons for the failure of the policy of multiculturalism, based on the inconsistency of the neoliberal ideology, its one-sidedness. This research also shows the interrelation and contradiction between various elements of culture of the epistemic, social and cultural nature. The authors believe that the abandonment of the policy of multiculturalism does not mean the elimination of the cultural diversity of the surrounding world, which is objectively the basis for the human progress.

KEYWORDS

Multiculturalism, neoliberalism, cultural and national autonomy, theory of civilization, civilization of the East and the West

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 20 July 2016
Revised 19 September 2016
Accepted 23 October 2016

Introduction

Modern society is characterized by a high degree of social and cultural mobility, an increase of migration flows and an interaction of cultures of different nations. As a result of this process, most communities have lost their traditional ethnic and cultural homogeneity and acquired the multicultural character, i.e. have become culturally diverse. This situation gave rise to the problem of ensuring the stability of communities in the context of cultural and ethnic diversity. In the political literature, which is dedicated to multiculturalism, it is believed that it originated in the 60s-70s of the XX century. The concept of multiculturalism, which appeared for the first time at the end of the 1960s in Canada, belonged to migratory civilizations and gained

CORRESPONDENCE Julia Nikolaeva ✉ mollycat@mail.ru

© 2016 Fokin et al. Open Access terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) apply. The license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, on the condition that users give exact credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if they made any changes.

widespread use in Europe over two decades. In the 1980s, the principles of multiculturalism entered the political practice in most European countries.

The aims of the study are to analyze the background of the multiculturalism theory and its main ideas and to examine how they were implemented in modern international relations by the example of different countries.

Methodological Framework

The theoretical part of the study was conducted through the application of theoretical methods (analysis, synthesis, comparison, generalization), which allowed to identify the most important theoretical concepts of the theory of multiculturalism, to clarify the main ideas, benefits and limitations of this theory and justify the importance of it in the modern world.

Data, Analysis, and Results

In fact, the problem of the interaction of different cultures became the subject of attention of Russian thinkers back in the middle of the XIX century, when there was a confrontation between a number of European countries and Russia, caused by the aggravation of the Polish question, arising Balkan crisis and the Crimean or, as it was called in Europe, Eastern war. Thinking about the escalating wave of hostility towards Russia, N.Y. Danilevsky (1991) saw the confrontation of cultures of various cultural and historical type in it. The actual value of his argument consisted in identifying the role of cultural diversity in the progress of human civilization and recognizing the equivalence of each authentic culture. A direct follower of N.Y. Danilevsky (1991) was O. Spengler (1993), who rejected not only the progressive development of cultures, adhering to the discrete nature of their development, but also supported the idea of the absence of universal laws of their development.

The author of the concept of civilizations of various cultural and historical type was the British historian A.J. Toynbee (2001). He acknowledged the outstanding value of cultural interaction for the development of human civilization, but at the same time saw an insurmountable contradiction between them, expressed in a struggle for survival, which, according to A.J. Toynbee (2001), was bound to end in a victory of Western and Eastern civilizations. Even more radical view on this issue was presented by S. Huntington (1993) at the end of the XX century. He suggested a global conflict on the inter-civilization basis, arguing that only the Anglo-Saxon governance could save the world from a disaster (Jaspers, 1991). Finally, there was an idea of the synthesis of cultures as a natural process of their development and a source of the spiritual development of human civilization on the basis of the laws of dialectics.

The controversy generated by the interaction of cultures is a reflection of the complexity of the phenomenon of culture itself. Culture, as a manifestation of the creative nature of man, is pluralistic. It is divided not only into ethnic, national or civilizational clusters, but also into folk, classical and mass cultures, and includes numerous gender subcultures. Finally, culture has socially predetermined structures. They all interact with each other making the culture of human civilization.

The negative attitude towards various subcultures, including the cultures of other nations, which is present today in public opinion in different countries, has socio-psychological prerequisites. In the view of the Southerners, a person from the North is too cold and restrained, which may mean his/her disregard, and in the view of the Northerners, a person from the South is too excited and impetuous, which may be a manifestation of aggression. This conflict on cultural grounds, firstly, is a natural reaction to a collision with something unknown and unfamiliar, which is perceived as a threat due to the fear of the unknown. Secondly, it is a natural reluctance to rebuild one's own usual lifestyle and thought in accordance with the accelerating change in the surrounding reality. It may involve numerous conflicts in everyday life, for example, a conflict of parents and children. This causes complications in the conditions of the global development and formation of a multicultural society.

A special place in the general context of the interaction of cultures is held by the problem of crisis of the modern Western culture. This phenomenon is occasionally observed throughout the XX century. It reflects the crisis of spiritual life in Europe, the most striking manifestation of which was the two world wars that shook the world with their inhuman essence. In art, it is reflected in the loss of rational content by the contemporary artistic and aesthetic movements, the fluctuation of their moral and ethical foundations in anti-humanist and formalist aesthetics. Art loses its emotional and ethical regulatory role in society, which it fulfilled over the course of history. It often declares an unbridled individualism and an open disregard by any public values.

In cultural studies, it is seen as a manifestation of the freedom of creativity, the originality of contemporary art in the demonstration of human nature. At the same time, it is often forgotten that human nature is versatile and has a humanistic content, which always found support in a civilized society and constituted a significant part of social ideals. Naturally, such a unilateral encouraged development of artistic culture cannot but have a negative impact on the emotional life of society, the growth of aggressiveness and intolerance, the deliberate individual autarky of the personality.

Such circumstances, certainly, create problems of intercultural communications both on the personal and ethno-social level. Thus, in the scientific world perception, there are currently no common, well-established approaches to solving the problem of intercultural communication in the modern world. Scientific analysis helps to establish the essence of the processes taking place in the culture of our time and to give quite contradictory opinions about the prospects for the development of human civilization. This once again confirms the crisis in the spiritual life.

In politics, the problem of multiculturalism within a single state has become urgent for multinational empires as a result of the bourgeois-liberal reforms back in the XIX century. Under the pressure of the national democratic movements, the principles of cultural and national autonomy were formulated at the beginning of the XX century by the leaders of Austrian social democracy K. Renner and O. Bauer. (1924) They assumed the right of national minorities in multinational states to self-rule in their own culture (language, school, art and literature, press, etc.). This concept referred to traditional multicultural communities in the process of the formation of multinational continental empires and was opposed to the democratic demand for the right of peoples to

self-determination up to secession. Another antithesis of the concept of cultural and national autonomy was the reactionary policy of the assimilation of national minorities in the state-forming nation, which alleged the prohibition of cultures of small nations.

The problem of the interaction of different cultures was again placed on the agenda after the Second World War, when the newly independent former colonies of European countries entered the arena of international relations. This situation required the development of the principles of international interaction of different cultures. The international universal organization - the United Nations - established by that time, helped to develop the necessary system of ideas about how the interaction of cultures must take place in the international arena. These principles were formulated in November 1966 at the XIV session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). It adopted the Declaration, which defined the objectives of cooperation in the field of culture from the perspective of UNESCO: to disseminate knowledge and to enrich different cultures, to develop peaceful relations between nations, to promote the principles of the UN, to ensure that everyone has access to knowledge and the opportunity to enjoy the art of all peoples, to improve the conditions of material and spiritual life. The Declaration formulated the principles of equality, mutual respect, equal value of cultures and recognition of the identity of each culture (The Declaration, 1966). The need to preserve cultural diversity as a basis for the progress of human civilization was highlighted in the UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity (The Universal Declaration, 2011).

However, in the sphere of ideology, the principles proposed by UNESCO were opposite to those ideas that had been established in the Western world, where the dominant position was acquired by the concept of universality of the Western, or rather Anglo-Saxon, culture. It appeared in the 30s of the XX century and was specified in the paper by the Sorbonne professor H. Bergson (2010). In the postwar period, the concept was widely used in the writings of the American sociologist K. Popper (2011). In the context of international relations, this concept was embodied by Joseph J.S. Nye (2005) in his book dedicated to the US public diplomacy. The adherence to the exclusive role of Anglo-Saxon culture in world politics was confirmed by the US President Barack Obama in his famous speech (2015) at the UN General Assembly in 2015. This approach involves the gradual formation of monocultural human civilization under the leadership of the United States.

At the end of the XX - beginning of the XXI centuries, as a result of the expansion of migratory flows in the age of globalization, Europe faced with the difficult problem of changing the paradigm of the immigration policy. Since the second half of the XX century, the continent has been faced with the problem of additional labor intake. This helped to some extent to solve the demographic problems of the continent, the problems of labor cheapening and the social problems associated with the aging of the population belonging to the Europeoid race. At the same time, for decades, the basis for the immigration policy of European countries was formed by the idea that immigrants sought to work and assimilate into the European society. Initially, it was true due to the fact that such assimilation helped to quickly find an attractive job and to join European culture. The number of immigrants was small, and assimilation allowed them to

feel comfortable on their 'new homeland'. With the increasing immigration flows in European states, the policy of integration of the newly arrived citizens of Europe in the European society was formed. In fact, this policy included the adaptation process, i.e. acquainting immigrants with the culture of the host country, the rules of its social life and learning the language of the indigenous nation. Appropriate budget funds were allocated for their adaptation courses, and the process of assimilation took place relatively quickly and without conflict.

The renunciation of the assimilationist model of immigrants' integration, which was practiced in Europe within the XIX-XX centuries, and the transition to a multicultural model was driven by serious problems faced by European countries. The original slogan of unity in cultural diversity has been put forward in the framework of the European policy of integration and formation of the European Union. It was part of the concept of the "European idea". It was assumed that European nations shared a common tradition of European culture, at the origin of which were democratic traditions of the ancient culture and humanistic traditions of the Christian civilization in Europe. These common origins of European culture, according to the authors of European integration, would enable the successful integration of the cultures of European nations and their beneficial interaction. It was believed that in this way European integration would be strengthened by civilizational unity that despite all the vicissitudes of international relations had existed in the European mentality for a long time.

In these circumstances, it was multiculturalism that came to be regarded by politicians as a tool to promote mutual cultural enrichment and the formation of a harmonious society. The basis of this approach to the problem was formed by the ideology of neoliberalism, established in the Western society in the last decades of the XX century.

Multiculturalism is a policy, which is aimed at the preservation and development of cultural differences in a particular country and the world in general, and a neoliberal ideology justifying such a policy, which requires the parallel existence of cultures in the hope of their gradual integration into the mainstream of popular culture common to all mankind.

The ideology of multiculturalism consists in the idea that society has the capacity to welcome and integrate differences. Society is considered to be multicultural, when it consists of peacefully coexisting people who speak different languages and follow different traditions and religions. This is a "good" social state corresponding to the ideals of a free, open and pluralistic society. It is believed that all the parties benefit from this free coexistence of different groups. In the US, this ideology has resulted in the cultural representation of American culture as a "cabbage head". Its leaves are the cultures of immigrants, and the pillar - the "American dream" - is a system of value ideals, which were declared by the US founding fathers. At the same time, it is often concealed that American culture, from the very beginning, was shaped under the powerful impact of the Anglo-Saxon component, which for two centuries had been the dominant mental element in American culture, and remains a framework factor today.

The contradiction of multiculturalism consists in the fact that, on the one hand, the freedom of cultural identity is declared, and on the other - the state

does not allow this recognition to go against the established economic order and demands loyalty from representatives of different cultures. But the truth is that the state itself is a part of the political culture of society. It is an old tradition of liberalism, when special attention was paid to the personality, and his/her socialization was ignored. All people were declared equal citizens, and their social class, differences in their economic opportunities were hypocritically disregarded. The policy of multiculturalism is an attempt to return to the ideological concepts of the XIX century in the field of ethno-cultural relations. Therefore, public recognition in a multicultural state means just the recognition of the right to cultural differences. The recognition of the right to national identity does not mean the right to socialization of the individual within society. This leads to the fact that various ethnic groups, which did not achieve social equality, create a specific subculture that can be 'painted' in the national or religious tones and have an infantile or radical character, which again depends not on the equality of cultures, but on socialization of their bearers. This culture reflects their struggle for their rights in a real situation.

Although neoliberalism, on the contrary, admits the recognition of ethnic cultures, it launched a strong attack on the culture of the low-paid sectors of the population, including the restrictions on high-quality education and, consequently, the possibility of cultural development. The destruction of public goods, conquered by the Europeans in the course of a bitter social struggle, leads to the fact that instead of the collective pension system and public health care they receive private pension accounts and commercial insurance medicine. These counter-reforms, taking place around the world, are a consequence of the conscious effort to break down the social solidarity that emerged in most European countries in the 80s of the XX century. Today, the upper class does not recognize the existence of the culture of lower classes and struggles to destroy it.

The neo-liberal concept of multiculturalism admits the struggle for recognition, for example, of the civil rights of Afro-Americans and the indigenous peoples of Guatemala for the preservation of Mayan languages. However, it also puts significant limitations in the sphere of social relations. But these restrictions inevitably cause a backlash in the form of religious or nationalist extremism.

However, some peoples do manage to avoid the reevaluation of recognition, if they pay more attention to the fight against social inequality. For example, Afro-Brazilians have avoided the overuse of racial struggle in order to be actively engaged in the fight against poverty. The pride of their culture is the victorious war of national liberation in Angola, and their famous African music known worldwide. However, they do not believe their race is superior to others. Moreover, they do not use their national accents as a remedy to discrimination and inequality. Unlike the situation in the United States with a strong racial polarization and extreme, Afro-Brazilians are more open and friendly to other races and nationalities. Thus, the conflicts caused by the neo-liberal model of development, are successfully masked. It is not surprising that there are the following statements on the WB's website, "Ethnicity can be a powerful tool in the creation of human and social capital, but, if politicized, ethnicity can destroy capital. ... Ethnic diversity is dysfunctional when it generates conflict" (Fisk, 2005).

It is no accident that international financial communities act as ardent advocates of multiculturalism. The system of national states, in spite of its weakness in the modern world, is still a potential threat to the global financial market that does not recognize national borders.

In Europe, the US and even Australia, the government policy of multiculturalism, which more or less successfully helped to solve a number of economic, demographic and social issues related to immigration on a particular historical stage, failed to ensure the integration of society and the formation (maintaining) of a civil nation. Barriers have been formed in society, which, in fact, are supported by both sides. Immigrants are interested in preserving and emphasizing their "distinctiveness", as far as they benefit from it gaining some kind of a rent in the form of government support. Most of the indigenous population, in turn, is not interested in having to recognize them as "their own" people, who are different by birth, culture or phenotype, and moreover, often have some benefits and privileges. According to experts, if you take 100 citizens of France or Germany, then 70 French or Germans within this number should feed 30 immigrants of their age by their own labor and talents through social institutions (Multiculturalism vs nationalism, 2015).

As a result, competition and tension is growing not only among the indigenous population and ethnic communities, but also among diasporas themselves. Xenophobia and conflicts on religious grounds are becoming a serious concern not only for politicians, but also for the police. Increasingly, the policy of multiculturalism is opposed to nationalism.

It has resulted in a decisive rejection of the policy of multiculturalism in the European Union's leading countries. During 2010-2012, the leaders of the UK - D. Cameron, France - N. Sarkozy, and Germany - A. Merkel (2010) announced the refusal of the policy of multiculturalism.

What are the reasons for the failure of the policy of multiculturalism, which has quickly become a very important issue for all European countries, including the largest EU leading states? Financial crises, which shook the world at the turn of the century, followed by the economic instability in Europe, have forced European governments to refuse an active adaptive part of the immigration policy. In addition, the repercussions of the policy of creating a post-industrial society began to have an impact - they were expressed in the export of capital to the countries of Asia and Latin America and the transfer of industrial enterprises to the countries with cheap labor and liberal legislation in the field of ecology. At the same time, the growth of the service sphere has not led to the expected compensation for jobs. There was also a concurrent sharp increase in the flow of immigrants, caused by a number of major errors in the foreign policy of Western countries, which has resulted in the destabilization of the countries of North Africa and the Middle East.

Rapidly aging Europe, regularly suffering from a variety of economic, political and demographic factors, has faced an acute ethno-cultural problem. The policy of multiculturalism, created as a tool to control and create conditions for mutual existence, has led not to mutual understanding and enrichment, but to the incitement of ethnic and religious hatred. Numerous migrants, mostly from the Third World, flooded Europe, showed no readiness to get assimilated. Moreover, they were united in various closed ethnic communities that helped

them not only to survive in the new environment, but also to actively defend their rights, including the right to preserve their culture, traditions and customs that existed in their homelands.

The policy of multiculturalism in one form or another ("soft" or "stiff") has been implemented in almost all European countries over the past three decades. Today, all the EU countries suffer from immigrants to varying degrees. The indigenous people of European countries are increasingly calling to cancel the policy of multiculturalism and to return to the idea of supporting the titular nation of the state and restricting the rights of immigrants. It is important to note that the problems associated with the policy of multiculturalism in various European countries have similar repercussions - often migrants' defending of their national and cultural characteristics results in physical violence. Multiculturalism critic A. Fedoseev (2015) argues that the result is a complete destruction of the centuries-old cultural foundations, cultural traditions, as far as such mixing always leads to homogenization. In his opinion, if the low level of migrants' cultural development is undoubtedly rising, then the high level of culture of the target country of multiculturalism is invariably falling.

The loss of a number of jobs in the industry has not been offset by jobs in the service sector, as suggested by the liberal economic theory. The opposite has happened – because of the poorly educated migrant workers from the Third World countries, working in the service sector has been turned into the modern-day slavery, wages have become squalid and working conditions - beneath criticism. As a consequence, a great number of the Europeans suffer from chronic poverty.

What is European culture today? It is still magnificent but empty churches, open relationship and other factors that have a negative impact on the basis of any society - family. It is a huge gap between culture and the nature of the human race. Today, the demographic situation in Europe is characterized by a low birth rate, an increase in life expectancy and an overall decline of the Europeoid population. Forecast for the future is disappointing. The modern European society is very susceptible to spiritual ambivalence; there appeared numerous religious groups, teachings, sects, occult movements, and the ideas of Buddhist, Hinduism and even Satanism got widespread use. Each religious group has a spiritual leader who, of course, imposes his/her own worldview and culture on each member. It results in a huge number of disparate, often opposite in nature, bearers of various cultural and religious traditions, instead of a single European society. Moreover, if such a completely independent group of people could be somehow co-existed, then in the presence of external factors in the face of migrants, unlike the Europeans, united by common cultural and religious beliefs, it is dramatically losing its way and becoming a minority, in spite of the numerical superiority, which still persists in Europe.

The concept of "Christian culture" has lost its value in Europe, being replaced by the principles of "tolerance" and "multiculturalism". Secular culture, abandoning the religious content, even in the cultural and historical sense, failed to create an adequate humanistic content.

Conclusion

Radical changes are taking place in the political culture: traditional political movements are relegated to the background; new parties appear, reflecting the increased gap between the political elite and the wider layers of the European society. There is an increase of right-wing tendencies among the Europeans, based either on xenophobia or insulted national, patriotic feelings. The political elites of Europe have not been able to meet the challenges of the time and build a realistic policy, consolidating their society in the face of the current global challenges.

The most convincing political inconsistency of the elites is manifested in the globalized economy. Letting the multinational companies freely withdraw capital and production, the elites allowed them to dominate the national communities. They allowed the multinational companies to disregard the laws and to make profits by using cheap labor of immigrants and bribing politicians. The system of state-nations proved not to be ready for a new economic situation, and the ruling elites have no satisfactory model of state-building (Zorkin, 2011). Actions of the European Union bureaucracy cause an increasing discontent of the Europeans, undermining the foundations of supranational political institutions.

Therefore, one can say that the failure of the policy of multiculturalism in Europe was a direct consequence of the inconsistency of the ideology of neoliberalism, which in spite of a strong and comprehensive support from global financial institutions suffered a crushing defeat in a collision with reality and failed to offer a real ethno-cultural policy that would contribute to the consolidation of the European society. By virtue of its economic and social inconsistency, neoliberalism has put Europe on the brink of a dangerous scenario which is fraught with disaster.

The abandonment of the policy of multiculturalism does not mean the elimination of cultural diversity in the world and in the national states. The interaction of cultures in the context of the contemporary processes of globalization is increasingly becoming broad and extensive, and its humanistic content is deepening. This process is inevitable because it is one of the crucial conditions for the survival of humanity. Taking into account this objective circumstance, the national states, guided by the principles of international cultural cooperation, need to ensure the intercultural dialogue in creative forms of cooperation rather than destructive conflict.

Europe turned out to be a unique platform, where as a result of quite a tolerant migration legal frame there was an accumulation of different cultures. However, people, included in a certain cultural community, were not assimilated in it but lived in diaspora, enclaves, or whole districts. Thus, to some extent, it has become the model of the modern world as a whole. The situation in Europe somehow reflects the processes taking place in the world. Sooner or later, the whole world will face analogies. The positive experience in the implementation of the policy of multiculturalism at the municipal level can be found within the European Union. It shows that a combination of cultural and social measures promotes the effective co-existence of different ethnic groups, even in major metropolitan areas (Berson, 2011). It is important that a critical assessment of the failed policy of multiculturalism in a number of European countries should not undermine its positive experience. Multiculturalism, on a different

ideological basis, with regard to the entire complex of problems of cultural and social development, by all means, can exist.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Vladimir Ivanovitch Fokin is a Professor and Head of International Humanitarian Relations Department, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia.

Vladimir Nikolayevich Baryshnikov is a Doctor of Historical Sciences, Professor and Head of the Department of Modern and Contemporary Times History, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia.

Natalia Mikhailovna Bogoliubova is an Associate Professor of International Humanitarian Relations Department, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia.

Julia Vadimovna Nikolaeva is an Associate Professor of International Humanitarian Relations Department, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia.

Igor Vladimirovich Ivannikov is a PhD in History, Associate Professor of Department of European Studies, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia.

Mariya Dmitrievna Portnyagina is an Assistant of International Humanitarian Relations Department, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia.

Natalia Borisovna Ryazantseva is a PhD in History, Associate Professor of International Humanitarian Relations Department, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia.

Elena Edouardovna Eltc is an Associate Professor of International Humanitarian Relations Department, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia.

Igor Vyacheslavovich Chernov is a PhD in History, Associate Professor of World Politics Department, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russia.

References

- Barack Obama's speech at the UN General Assembly session. (2015). Published on 28/09/2015 on Radio Liberty website. Direct access: <http://www.svoboda.org/media/video/27275558.html>
- Bauer, O. (1924). *Die Nationalitätenfrage und die Sozialdemokratie*. Wien: Eles, 352 p.
- Bergson, H. (2010). *The two sources of morality and religion*. Moscow: KDU, 252 p.
- Berson, A.B. (2011). European metropolis and multiculturalism: Degree of compatibility. *Contemporary Europe, 1*, 57-70.
- Danilevsky, N.Ya. (1991). *Russia and Europe*. Moscow: Kniga, 544 p.
- Fedoseev, A. (2015). *The Crash of Multiculturalism in Europe*. Sozidatel': Informational and analytical portal. Direct access: <http://sozidatel.org/articles/analitika/3811-krah-multikulturalizma-v-evrope.html>
- Fisk, M. (2005). Multiculturalism and Neoliberalism. *Praxis Filosofica, 21*, 21-28.
- Huntington, S. (1993). The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs, 72(3)*, 22-49.
- Jaspers, K. (1991). *The origin and goal of history*. Moscow: Politizdat, 311 p.
- Kanarsh, G.Yu. (2011). Multiculturalism: social concept and social practices. *Knowledge, understanding and skill, 1*, 87-94.
- Merkel, A. (2010). *Attempts to build a multicultural society in Germany have 'utterly failed'*. Direct access: <http://www.rbc.ru/rbcfreenews/20101017070445.shtml>

- Multiculturalism vs nationalism. (2015). *Dialog.UA: Independent information and analytical resource focused on the public dialogue on the development strategy of Ukraine*. Direct access: <http://dialogs.org.ua/ru/dialog/page142.html>
- Nye, J.S. (2005). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 245 p.
- Popper, K. (2011). *The open society and its enemies*. Abingdon: Routledge Classics, 174 p.
- Spengler, O. (1993). *The decline of the West*. Novosibirsk: Nauka, 463 p.
- The Declaration of Principles of International Cultural Cooperation of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (1966). *The XIV session of the General Conference of the United Nations*. Direct access: http://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/declarations/culture.shtml
- The UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity. (2001). Adopted on 2 November 2001 by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Direct access: http://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/declarations/cultural_diversity.shtml
- Toynbee, A.J. (2001). *A study of history: Collection*. Moscow: Rolf, 335 p.
- Zorkin, V. (2011). *Modern state in the age of ethno-social diversity*. Speech of the President of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation V. Zorkin at the Global Policy Forum in Yaroslavl on September 7, 2011. Russian newspaper site. Direct access: <https://rg.ru/2011/09/07/zorkin-site.html>