

Interreligious Dialogue: the Actual Meaning, Typology and Features of the Post-Soviet Space

Roman N. Lunkin^{1a}✉, Sergey V. Melnik^{2b}✉

¹Institute of Europe of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

²INION of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

^aromanlunkinn@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4312-4228>

^bmelnik.s.vl@yandex.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1491-7624>

Abstract. The article presents the authors' thoughts on the reasons for the growing role of the religious factor in modern international relations, and the risks associated with the politicization of religions. It is concluded that religious diversity and at the same time the commonality of basic values directly correlate with the emerging multipolarity of the modern world. It is noted that against the backdrop of the crisis of the Western liberal order and neoliberal ideology, religion and its institutions have become symbols of new fundamentalism, that is, an ideology that calls for a return to the foundations of faith and one's worldview and culture. The growing role of religion as an institution of civil society and the need to make this institution stronger, to integrate it into civil society and into the system of patriotic education are noted. A classification of types of interreligious dialogue (polemical, cognitive, peacemaking, partnership) and levels of interreligious dialogue (high, medium, low) is presented. The specifics of interreligious dialogue in the post-Soviet space and the features of post-Soviet religious and political identity, the new attitude of political authorities to the institutions of faith are determined: the desire to integrate them into the social structure of society and into social policy. A brief description of interreligious dialogue in the USSR and in the post-Soviet period is given. The prospects for the development of ethno-confessional relations in the post-Soviet space are considered. Recommendations are given for the development of interreligious dialogue at the present stage.

Keywords: interreligious dialogue, religious institutions, religious identity, post-Soviet space, values, identity

For citation: Lunkin R.N., Melnik S.V. Interreligious Dialogue: the Actual Meaning, Typology and Features of the Post-Soviet Space. *Russia & World: Scientific Dialogue*. 2024; 2(12): 52-65, [https://doi.org/10.53658/RW2024-4-2\(12\)-52-65](https://doi.org/10.53658/RW2024-4-2(12)-52-65)

Introduction

Religious institutions play a significant role in national and international politics, and heads of state often turn to the leaders of various churches, Muslim, Jewish, Buddhist. This is due to the fact that there is an active search for new ethical foundations for the modern world order, the ethics of international relations. They appeal to faith as a powerful source of legitimacy, values, identity, that is, as has always been the case in history, they seek support and justification for their interests, political demands, and tools for getting out of this or that crisis in religion.

Materials and Methods

The article is based on the scientific reports of Russian scientists presented at the session "Interreligious Dialogue for Peace and Cooperation" within the framework of the VIII international scientific and practical conference "Russia and the World: Dialogues – 2024. Forces of Attraction". The organizers of the foreign session in Minsk were the National Research Institute for the Development of Communications (NIIRC, Russia) and the International Public Association "Christian Educational Center named after St. Methodius and Cyril". The authors of the article used the methods of synthesis, comparison, generalization, historical analysis. The issues of interreligious dialogue are considered from the standpoint of systemic and institutional approaches. The materials and research methods are described in more detail in the works of the authors of the article [3-11].

Results

Religion in a Multipolar World: The Power of Faith and Values in the Dialogue of Civilizations (R.N.Lunkin)

The modern demand for religious ethics in international relations and in politics in general is due to objective reasons. In the 2020s, the growing influence of religion contrasted with the period of secularization, which began in the New Age and reached its peak at the end of the 20th century. In the context of socio-political and economic crises, the formation of new social inequality in the world [3], people began to turn to faith again for support, motivation to live and work. Religion has ceased to be perceived only as a source of culture, traditions and discussions about freedom of conscience, as it turned out to be in demand for corporate social responsibility, for the implementation of sustainable development goals in the field of ecology and in the labor market. Religion is also seen as a regulator of the moral paradigm in society [1]. The challenge for religion is that it has also become part of political construction, religiously motivated radicalism and extremism. Against the backdrop of

the crisis of the Western liberal order and the decline of neoliberal ideology [12], which opposes traditional identities, religion and its institutions have become symbols of a new fundamentalism, that is, an ideology that calls for a return to the foundations of faith and one's original worldview and culture. Communities of believers are natural defenders of traditional values, the foundations of society, even despite the fact that within Christianity and other faiths there are various currents and understandings of tradition, both ultra-liberal and ultra-right radical. The confrontation between anti-traditionalism and identism (identists, as supporters of sovereign values and tradition are often called in Europe) has become key to understanding the ideological divisions that have emerged in almost every country in the world since the 2010s. The reaction of traditional forces has shown that the monopoly of the liberal order is impossible. Religious diversity and at the same time the commonality of basic values directly correlates with the emerging multipolarity of the modern world, in which everyone values their sovereignty, tradition, culture, and in fact, each subject perceives itself as a civilization. At the same time, religious institutions, communities, and congregations create an atmosphere of social solidarity around themselves, rather than disunity and/or adaptation to the neoliberal demands of the "new ethics". The acuteness of the situation also lies in the fact that the world is experiencing not just a crisis or crises, but a transition to a new industrial order, digitalization, and the introduction of new technologies with unclear social consequences.

The situation is also acute because the world is experiencing not just a crisis or crises, but a transition to a new industrial order, digitalization and the introduction of new technologies with unclear social consequences.

The advantages of religion are evidenced by the peculiarities of the post-Soviet religious and political identity. First of all, religion is the embodiment of tradition and the custodian of the culture of the entire society, believers and non-believers. At the same time, for the majority of the population, following religious precepts is not a priority. Religion is an instrument and tool of national policy, the desire to create "one's own institution", and the securitization of religion leads to control over religious activity.

The process of socialization of religion is a natural process of turning its institutions into one of the significant elements of the third sector [14], part of civil society, and not a "museum". It is important for the state to make this resource stronger, to really, and not symbolically, to integrate it into a loyal civil society and a system of patriotic education. Religion has become part of political construction in the "liberal" ideological camp, a symbol of the preservation of identity. The goal of neoliberal values is not to destroy but to remake religious identity.

Religious values and identity are the core of global policy to create a multipolar world. The emphasis on interreligious dialogue and promotion of traditional values is made in the Concept of Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation¹, where, in particular, the task is contained to neutralize attempts to "impose pseudo-humanistic and other neoliberal

¹ Concepts of the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation. Approved by the President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin on March 31, 2023. № 229. Available from: <https://www.mid.ru/ru/detail-material-page/1860586/?lang=ru>.

ideological attitudes that lead to the loss of traditional spiritual and moral guidelines and moral principles by humanity..." (IV.18,9). The ideological basis for religious security is laid in the "Fundamentals of State Policy for the Preservation and Strengthening of Traditional Russian Spiritual and Moral Values"². In 2022, the President of Belarus Alexander Lukashenko also devoted part of the Address to the Belarusian people and the National Assembly in 2022 to the value-based approach: "Value stability has become the basis for agreement. We need to build a state based on our mental traditions. This is the fairway of state development. As soon as we deviate from it, try on someone else's patterns, we will fall into a bottomless abyss and never get out of there. In today's changeable and artificial world, it turned out that we, with our conservative and traditional thinking, are in a much more stable position. The main pillars of the value foundation are the desire for peace and unity, national and state identity, continuity and balance of cultures, harmony of ethno-confessional relations, respect for the family as a union of a man and a woman."³

Some other examples of the activation of religious policy show the new attitude of the authorities towards religious institutions and the desire to integrate them into the social structure of society and into social policy. For example, in Uzbekistan, the Law on Religion has been in force since 2021⁴, adopted under Sh. Mirziyoyev, softened many rules. Now 50 people are needed to register a religious association, it can be done electronically. This is important for the community, which does not have the right to do anything without registration. To register a community, it is no longer necessary to obtain permission from the mahalla, this permission is given by the khokimiyat at the regional level. The new law still prohibits the distribution and storage of any religious literature that has not passed the examination of the Committee on Religious Affairs. The Committee on Religious Affairs conducts an active religious policy at the local level and organizes meetings in the regions of religious associations, representatives of security forces, khokimats, and justice agencies.

In Kazakhstan, the state actively supports interreligious communication within the framework of meetings of leaders of religious communities (World Leaders Summit), trips to the regions, invitations to temples and mosques for the Day of Spiritual Harmony, summits of representatives of world religions, etc. Each akimat has its own specialists in religious associations in the Departments of Internal Policy, who are also employees of the National Security Committee of the Republic of Kazakhstan. The akimats have permanent clubs of religious leaders, which usually include Muslims, Orthodox, Catholics, Adventists, Pentecostals, Baptists, and followers of Ahmadiyya.

In Armenia, the Armenian Apostolic Church has the greatest influence, and it is with this historical church of the country that the state and politicians build relations. For

² The Principles of State Policy for the Preservation and Strengthening of Traditional Russian Spiritual and Moral Values were Approved by the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of November 9, 2022. № 809. Available from: <https://www.garant.ru/products/ipo/prime/doc/405579061/>.

³ Lukashenko A.G. Address to the Belarusian People and the National Assembly. January 28, 2022. Available from: <https://president.gov.by/ru/events/aleksandr-lukashenko-28-yanvaryabratitsya-s-ezhagodnym-poslaniem-k-belorusskomu-narodu-i-nacionalnomu-sobraniyu>

⁴ On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations: Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan dated 07/05/2021. № 3PY-699. Available from: <https://lex.uz/docs/5491541>.

society, the Armenian Apostolic Church is the path to salvation, the path to national unity, and love for the Motherland. The activities of the Armenian Inter-Church Charity Round Table of the World Council of Churches are characteristic.⁵ This is assistance to communities in various spheres - social, environmental, spiritual. Representatives of the organization consult with a priest in a village about the needs and problems with roads or drinking water. Infrastructure projects in villages and towns are organized with grants from the Ministry of Social Security (which are given for the development of local territories) of the republic and Western funds (40% at the expense of local forces, 60% at the expense of the Interchurch Round Table), schools, roads are built, water supply is installed. The projects are usually headed by a local priest, and there is a special training program for the clergy and other project partners, within the framework of which focus groups are held, it is discussed how to correctly assess a particular problem and then solve it.

An example of the formation of a solidary society is the activity of Metropolitan Filaret (Vakhrameyev), the Patriarchal Exarch of Belarus for more than three decades. In the service of Metropolitan Filaret, three areas can be distinguished that characterize him as a public and religious figure with strategic thinking and reflect the role that religious figures play in modern society in different countries of the world. Firstly, Metropolitan Filaret was the builder of the national Belarusian church; since 1978, he headed the Minsk and Belarusian Metropolitanate, then the exarchate. During the most difficult period of the restoration of church life, he determined the main trends of its development - the return of what was lost, the construction of churches, the establishment of relations with society. Secondly, with the active participation of Metropolitan Filaret, a strategy for state-confessional relations was created, the church made a real contribution to the development of the Law on Freedom of Conscience and Religious Associations⁶, where the role of the Orthodox Church and a number of other confessions as traditional and historically rooted in the republic was noted. In 2003, a "concordat" of the Church and the state was concluded, an agreement on cooperation, which is not present in many post-Soviet states. Thirdly, Metropolitan Filaret considered intercultural and interreligious cooperation, communication links that can only appear in the course of communication between peoples and religious leaders to be significant not only for the church community, but also for the country as a whole. From 1981 to 1989, Metropolitan Filaret headed the Department of External Church Relations of the Russian Orthodox Church, and at the end of the Soviet era, he not only raised the topic of peacekeeping, but also took part in forums uniting a wide range of different religions and confessions both in Russia and in Belarus. Dialogue of cultures and religions plays a major role in the future harmonious development of society and the development of state policy.

⁵ Armenian Inter-Church Charity Round Table of the World Council of Churches. Available from: <https://www.roundtable-act.am/>.

⁶ Law of the Republic of Belarus "On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations" of December 17, 1992. № 2054-XII (with changes and additions). Available from: https://krichev.gov.by/downloads/social/o_svobode.pdf.

Interreligious dialogue in the post-Soviet space: experience, specifics, development prospects (S.V.Melnik)

What determines and what is the specificity of interreligious dialogue in the countries of the former USSR, and accordingly, what are the prospects for the development of ethno-confessional relations? Firstly, this is the question of the forms of interreligious relations. Interreligious dialogue is a complex, multi-faceted phenomenon. There are different strategies for it [2]. We have developed a classification of interreligious dialogue [9], according to which we propose to distinguish four main types of dialogue: "polemical", "cognitive", "peacekeeping" and "partnership". These types of dialogue can be conditionally correlated with the questions around which relations are built: "who is right?" (disputes about the truth and superiority of religions), "who are you?" (studying the other), "how can we live together peacefully?" (concern for strengthening harmonious relations, conflict resolution) and "what can we do to improve the world?" (joint activities in areas of common interest). In each of the specified types of dialogue, different types can be distinguished. But all existing forms of interreligious dialogue can be attributed to one of the listed types.

In the polemical and cognitive types of dialogue, we are talking about comparing religions as worldview systems. In the peacekeeping and partnership types of dialogue, we are already talking about the interaction of religions as social institutions, about ensuring their harmonious coexistence and joint activities. We see interreligious dialogue either as a comparison of the ideas of different religions (theological, axiological, related to religious experience and spiritual practice, etc. within the framework of a polemical and cognitive dialogue), or as a tool for maintaining peace and harmony between believers, bearers of different religious worldviews (peacekeeping and partnership dialogue). The most common development of interreligious dialogue, in which official representatives of religious organizations participate, is manifested in the peacekeeping and partnership types of dialogue.

Secondly, this is the experience of implementing interreligious dialogue in the USSR. When speaking about interreligious dialogue, it is useful to distinguish three levels at which it can be implemented: "high" (religious leaders [13], official representatives of high-level religious communities), "middle" (scientists, experts) and "grassroots" (ordinary believers, youth, activist initiatives). Atheistic ideology dominated in the Soviet Union. The activities of religious organizations were subject to control, and religious communities were in a state of survival. In this regard, there is no point in talking about any kind of systemic, active interreligious dialogue "at the grassroots" level. The same can be said about the "middle level". If in the West during the 20th century interreligious dialogue developed freely, and various problems associated with it received a multifaceted and profound understanding, then we were on the sidelines of this process. Almost no attention was paid to the study of the problems of dialogue of religions - theological, religious studies, philosophical, cultural studies - in the Soviet Union. The only area in which interreligious dialogue was carried out in the USSR was the level of religious leaders. A number of large, including international, interreligious forums were held in the Soviet Union. The activities of religious communities

were coordinated and controlled by the state, the same applies to interreligious contacts. Interreligious forums were considered part of the Soviet Union's policy of fighting for peace and general disarmament.

The first meeting, which was attended by Christian leaders and representatives of other religions of the USSR, took place on November 27-29, 1951, as part of the Third All-Union Conference of Supporters of Peace. On May 9-12, 1952, the first interreligious conference in the Soviet Union was held in the Holy Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius. The second interreligious conference in the USSR "For Cooperation and Peace Among Nations" was held in the Trinity Lavra of St. Sergius on July 1-4, 1969. The event was attended by 175 delegates, including representatives of Muslims from foreign countries - Syria, Morocco, Jordan, Yugoslavia, Guyana and Senegal. The official greeting from the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR A. Kosygin said: "The Soviet government steadily and consistently pursues a policy of peace and friendship among nations, tirelessly strives to prevent the threat of a new world war and highly appreciates any efforts, including those of religious organizations, in achieving this goal." The greeting reflects the position of the state in relation to such interreligious events, which sought to use the "religious factor" to achieve the goals of its foreign and domestic policy. In 1977 and 1982, two major interreligious international forums were held in Moscow, which can be considered the two most notable events in the field of interreligious dialogue in the USSR. From June 6 to 10, 1977, the World Conference "Religious Figures for Lasting Peace, Disarmament and Just Relations between Nations" (1977) was held in Moscow. On May 10-14, 1982, the largest interreligious summit in the history of the USSR took place: the Moscow World Conference "Religious Figures for the Salvation of the Sacred Gift - Life from Nuclear Catastrophe" (1982). The event was attended by 590 delegates from 90 countries. Since the 1970s, the development of interreligious dialogue has been noticeable within the framework of two separate areas - cognitive dialogue (the center is the knowledge of other religions, the Catholic Church paid great attention to dialogue as a study, a way of "mutual enrichment", personal and spiritual growth) and peacemaking dialogue. Interreligious summits in the USSR were entirely related to the second area, there was no talk of any theological understanding of different religions, on the contrary, the participants emphasized that they did not touch upon doctrinal issues during the discussions. The final statement of the 1982 conference stated: "We do not seek to merge our worldviews. Our views of reality remain distinct. We hold uncompromisingly to our various religious beliefs. Despite these differences, we can affirm together much that is dear to us all"⁷. Among the followers of Orthodoxy and other traditional religions, there is a concept of the inviolability of the sacred sphere. rejection of attempts to invade from outside. It should be noted that such conceptual foundations of interreligious dialogue - refusal to discuss dogmatic issues and cooperation in strengthening peace and other social spheres of common interest - are also relevant for the organization of interreligious dialogue at the official level and in modern

⁷ Religious leaders for saving the sacred gift of life from nuclear catastrophe. World conference. Moscow: Moscow Patriarchate, 1983:7.

Russia. An example is the activity of the Interreligious Council of Russia, which unites the heads of the four traditional religions of the Russian Federation - Orthodoxy, Islam, Judaism and Buddhism. The most notable interreligious international project, which operates on a regular basis, is the Congress of Leaders of World and Traditional Religions in Kazakhstan, which has been held since 2003. At the Congress, only the social agenda is discussed, mainly peacekeeping, as well as the possible positive contribution that religions can make to public welfare (ecology, economic equality, justice, etc.).

Discussion

Based on the experience and specifics of implementing interreligious dialogue, several promising areas for the development of relations can be identified. The dialogue can be 1) "high", 2) "medium", 3) "grassroots". 1. One of the proposals is to hold a meeting of religious leaders of the Eurasian region. This event could contribute to the cultural dimension of Eurasian integration. After the collapse of the USSR, the peoples of the countries that were part of it are moving away from each other, new generations are growing up who know little about the common historical and cultural past and feel less and less community with their neighbors, the Russian language is being forgotten. In this context, a meeting of religious leaders of the Eurasian region, their discussion of common problems, and the broadcast of the meeting in the media would have symbolic significance. An example of good neighborliness and respectful relations, solidarity, unity would undoubtedly be important for believers, which many citizens of the post-Soviet countries are today. Such a meeting of religious leaders, at little cost, could contribute to the integration of the states and peoples of Eurasia on a spiritual and religious basis. 2. At the expert/conceptual level, a pressing task is to develop confessional or interreligious documents. The documents should offer a concept explaining why believers should live in peace and respect each other. Particular attention may be paid to traditional moral and spiritual values (in the context of the "secular-liberal standard" and the "religious-traditionalist value system"). This is a separate and very broad topic that requires attention. I would like to note that while the Roman Catholic Church has more than a dozen documents on interreligious relations, the Russian Orthodox Church does not have a single official document on this issue, which has undoubted social significance. In Russia, theological education and science have been actively developing in recent years, there are many opportunities for research, original ideas and creative approaches.

3. Over the past ten years, interreligious events have been held in Russia at the "grassroots" level among young people: the annual Interreligious International Youth Forum in Dagestan since 2013, the "Dialogue of Religions" project supported by the Moscow Government, which includes chess, football and volleyball tournaments between representatives of different religions. At the same time, there is no specific joint practical work of believers of different religions (youth, women's interreligious organizations, etc.) in the field of helping those in need, ecology, and socially useful initiatives.

Conclusion

The role of different churches and confessions in the post-Soviet space, Africa, Latin America, India, Southeast Asia, and Eurasia shows the potential of religious institutions for positive social capital, that is, solidarity, creation of values, formation of identity and originality. Religion in a social context is, first of all, cohesion around the community and sacred ideals, value motivation (justice, mercy, value of a person), trust at different levels of interaction between citizens and institutions - social consolidation. Religious associations as institutions of civil society are key participants in relations between countries and regions of the world. This was demonstrated during the last world crisis, launched by the Ukrainian conflict. Religion corresponds to the multipolar structure of the modern world, for modern believers, as a rule, there are no borders, therefore there is no problem of interaction between civilizations, there is no ground for discrimination regarding who shares "neoliberal" values and who does not, who fits "Western standards" and who does not, and therefore is "lagging behind", who is a full-fledged civilization and who is not. Although not all religious leaders share such a broad understanding of the equality of civilizations, it is in the religious sphere that the values of solidarity, identity and diversity are formed, the space of which is only narrowing in other spheres of life in modern post-industrial society.

References

1. Komleva V.V. Religious institutions as regulators of the moral paradigm in geopolitics. *Missiya konfessij* [Mission of confessions]. 2017; 24:8-12 [In English]. EDN ZRQMBD.
2. Kondrakov Z. Strategies of interreligious dialogue. *Vestnik Orenburgskoj duxovnoj seminarii* [Bulletin of the Orenburg Theological Seminary]. 2022; 2(23):171-185 [In Russian]. EDN DICLST.
3. Lunkin R.N. Social inequality in modern risk society. *Sovremennaya Evropa* [Modern Europe]. 2023; 7(121):176-191 [In Russian]. DOI 10.31857/S0201708323070148. EDN RWWTHD.
4. Lunkin R.N. Religion and European populism: the Christian factor in political discussions. *Sovremennaya Evropa* [Modern Europe]. 2018; 1 (80):102-113 [In Russian].
5. Lunkin R.N. Socio-political consequences of the pandemic for the Russian Orthodox Church: unlocking the internal potential of civic engagement and social service. *Vestnik Rossijskogo universiteta družby narodov* [Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia]. Series: Political science. 2020; 22 (4):547-558 [In Russian].
6. Lunkin R.N., Filatov S.B. International relations and the war of anti-traditionalism with identity. *Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* [World economy and international relations]. 2020; 64 (4):5-14 [In Russian].
7. Lunkin R.N., Filatov S.B. Interfaith differences in Europe and new ideological confrontations. *Sovremennaya Evropa* [Modern Europe]. 2018; 3 (82):102-114 [In Russian].
8. Melnik S. Classifications of types of interreligious dialogue: analysis of existing approaches. *Gosudarstvo, religiya, Cerkov' v Rossii i za rubezhom* [State, religion, Church in Russia and abroad]. 2018; 36 (4): 87-118 [In Russian]. DOI 10.22394/2073-7203-2018-36-4-87-118. EDN YVFMCD.
9. Melnik S.V. Classification of forms of interreligious dialogue. Research work: grant № 18-311-00337. M.: Russian Foundation for Basic Research, 2018 [In Russian]. EDN FMPTRV.
10. Melnik S.V. Cognitive interreligious dialogue: objectives, principles, forms of implementation. *Vestnik Russkoj xristianskoj gumanitarnoj akademii*. [Bulletin of the Russian Christian Humanitarian Academy]. 2019; 20 (2):209-227 [In Russian].
11. Melnik S.V. Theology and interreligious dialogue: from polemics to cooperation. *Voprosy teologii* [Questions of theology]. 2019; 1 (3):307-333 [In Russian].
12. Religion and liberalism / Ed. A. Bodrova and M. Tolstoluzhenko (Series "Modern Theology"). Moscow: BBI Publishing House, 2022:221 [In Russian]. ISBN 978-5-89647-405-0

13. Toksanbaev A. World religious leaders and intercultural dialogue in the 20th – early 21st centuries: dissertation... CandSc (Philos.): 5.7.9. St. Petersburg, 2023:368 [In Russian]. EDN TRLSGC.
14. "Third sector" in the world: models of civic activity in the 20th – 21st centuries / V.A. Avatkov, E.S. Alekseenkova, N.A. Borisov [and others]. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities, 2021:452 [In Russian]. ISBN 978-5-7281-3048-2. EDN UQAJYA.

About the authors

Roman N. LUNKIN. DSc.(Polit.). Professor of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Deputy Director of the Institute of Europe of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Editor-in-chief of the magazine "Modern Europe". <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4312-4228>. Address: 11-3, Mokhovaya str., Moscow, 125009, Russian Federation. romanlunkinn@yandex.ru

Sergey V. MELNIK. DSc.(Philos.). Senior Researcher, Head of the Philosophy Department of the Institute of Scientific Information on Social Sciences of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Associate Professor of the General Church Postgraduate and doctoral studies, senior researcher at the Center for Interreligious Dialogue of the Bulgarian Islamic Academy. <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1491-7624>. Address: 51/21, Nakhimovsky Prospekt, Moscow, 117418, Russian Federation. melnik.s.vl@yandex.ru

Contribution of the authors

The authors declare no conflicts of interests.

Article info

Received: April 20, 2024. Approved after peer review: April 22, 2024. Accepted for publication: April 25, 2024. Published: May 15, 2024.

The authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Peer review info

«Russia & World: Scientific Dialogue» thanks the anonymous reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.