



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.  
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898473*

RFC: AT1120618V12

**Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.**

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/>

**Año: VI**

**Número: Edición Especial.**

**Artículo no.:144**

**Período: Junio, 2019**

**TÍTULO:** Sujetos de un diálogo civil en la resolución de conflictos interétnicos en sociedades con diversidad etnocultural.

**AUTORES:**

1. Valery V. Kasyanov.
2. Tatyana M. Chapurko.
3. Maiga Sory Ibrahim.
4. Tauzhan M. Klimenko.
5. Sergey A. Merzakanov.
6. Sergey I. Samygin.

**RESUMEN:** El artículo demuestra la conveniencia de utilizar el diálogo civil como un medio eficaz para prevenir conflictos interétnicos. Demuestra que es aconsejable desarrollar un diálogo civil en sociedades caracterizadas por la diversidad étnico-cultural, sobre la base de un modelo de diálogo que identifique a los representantes de las estructuras estatales, civiles y tradicionales como sujetos del diálogo. La tipología de los actores de la sociedad civil se basa en los criterios para dividirlos en instituciones formales e informales.

**PALABRAS CLAVES:** Diálogo civil, sociedad civil, conflictos interétnicos, sociedad tradicional, estado.

**TITLE:** Subjects of a civil dialogue in the resolution of inter-ethnic conflicts in societies with ethno-cultural diversity.

**AUTHORS:**

1. Valery V. Kasyanov.
2. Tatyana M. Chapurko.
3. Maiga Sory Ibrahim.
4. Tauzhan M. Klimenko.
5. Sergey A. Merzakanov.
6. Sergey I. Samygin.

**ABSTRACT:** The article substantiates the expediency of using civil dialogue as an effective means of preventing interethnic conflicts. It shows that it is advisable to develop a civil dialogue in societies characterized by ethno-cultural diversity, based on a dialogue model that identifies representatives of state, civil and traditional structures as subjects of the dialogue. The typology of civil society actors is based on the criteria for dividing them into formal and informal institutions.

**KEY WORDS:** civil dialogue, civil society, interethnic conflicts, traditional society, state.

**INTRODUCTION.**

The study is relevant due to the fact that inter-ethnic conflicts are one of the most pressing problems of our time. In the context of global informatization of the social space, the development of the digital economy, they often become rampant, undermining not only the social stability of individual countries, but also creating new threats to the international community. However, the key vector of the modern development of societies in the 21st century is the intensification of intercultural communication [Gafiatulina et al, 2017]. This changes the social structure and dynamics of relations in almost all countries of the world.

It should be noted that today migration flows transform mono-ethnic countries into multi-ethnic ones [Shakbanova et al., 2018]. At the same time, in countries that traditionally have ethnocultural diversity, the intensity of inter-ethnic communication is rapidly increasing, since they are affected by internal migration processes [Gryshai et al., 2018]. At the same time, under the influence of socio-economic, political, informational processes of modernity, its content and direction change. In such a situation, the leading task is not just the coexistence of various ethnocultural traditions, but their close social interaction, cooperation, the effective organization of which is possible through civil dialogue.

The purpose of the study in the proposed article is to show the potential application of a civil dialogue for resolving inter-ethnic conflicts in societies with ethno-cultural diversity. Objectives of the study:

- To determine the possibilities of the subjects of a civil dialogue in resolving inter-ethnic conflicts in societies with ethno-cultural diversity.
- To show the concrete experience of solving inter-ethnic conflicts with the use of civil dialogue practices.

## **DEVELOPMENT.**

### **Methodology.**

The methodological basis of the research consists of conceptual provisions of sociological theory, revealing five basic concepts: “civil dialogue”, “ethnic conflict”, “societies with ethno-cultural diversity”, “identity” and “trust”, combining which on a single theoretical and methodological platform allows formulating methodological construct aimed at the study of the subject field of the study.

The study was conducted on the basis of the techniques and approaches through which, in a comparative aspect, the problem of civil dialogue in resolving inter-ethnic conflicts in societies with ethno-cultural diversity is studied. The study is based on the fundamental theoretical constructs of

sociological science, as well as conceptual principles, social ideas, methods of resolving inter-ethnic conflicts.

### **Results and discussion.**

Civil dialogue can be an effective practice for resolving inter-ethnic conflicts in societies with ethno-cultural diversity. This conclusion was based on the position of a number of authors who came to the conclusion that the potential of a civil dialogue is based on a number of its essential features, such as constructing a new social reality in the space of new meanings, teaching the practice of understanding, reconciling interests, maintaining the social stability [Vaskov, et al., 2018; Fauskanger & Bjuland, 2018].

At the same time, a very important aspect of our concept is that civil dialogue is possible not only through the activities of subjects of a mature civil society, but also through dialogue practices developed by the institutions of traditional society and incorporated into the mechanisms of the dialogue process [Gafiatulina, 2013; Martiana, 2018]. In the latter case, we are talking about informal institutions, that is, those dialogue practices that emerged as a result of the implementation of the experience of traditional society in emerging civil relations, where the center of the relationship of social actors is not ethnic, but state-civil affiliation [Shakhbanova, et al., 2018; Nurgaliyeva et al, 2018].

This understanding implies a typology of subjects of a civil dialogue, taking into account the emerging space of formal and informal institutions. Accordingly, it is necessary to classify the subjects of a civil dialogue, characteristic of societies with ethno-cultural diversity.

Considering the potential of a civil dialogue in resolving inter-ethnic conflicts in societies with ethno-cultural diversity, it is necessary to turn to the activities of informal institutions that represent a spontaneously formed system of social connections, interactions, norms and values of interpersonal, intergroup communication and relationships. They are fundamentally distinguished from formal

institutions by the fact that functions, means and methods of activity are not established by formal rules (that is, they are not clearly defined and not enshrined in special legislation and regulatory documents). Despite this, informal institutions, like formal ones, perform the functions of social management and control, as they are the result of social creativity, the will of citizens and their associations, including ethno-cultural and religious [Kovalev, et al., 2016; Bahremand, 2015].

We emphasize that it is informal institutions that have a significant, and sometimes priority, influence on social life in societies that are characterized by ethno-cultural diversity and corresponding traditions. This is largely determined by the fact the informal institution is based on personal choice of connections, associations, unions, and informal mechanisms for regulating interactions.

In complex societies, informal institutions are very strong, and therefore, often, in solving complex conflict situations play a key role. This is largely determined by the fact that it is informal institutions that perform the function of transmitting sociocultural experience and knowledge on ethnic history, traditions, norms, values and, thus, form the basis of the life activity of social clan relations. At the same time, the leading role is played by ethnic leaders - elders, kings, etc. They, as a rule, enjoy indisputable authority, act as opinion leaders within communities and regulate their relations.

Ethnic leaders also exercise social control on the basis of informal sanctions enshrined in customs, traditions, public opinion about proper behavior. Moreover, such control is often stronger for members of a specific ethnocultural community, since condemnation by a community leader can mean social death for its member [Lubsky et al, 2016; Ingavale, 2013]. Because of this, many community members sometimes prefer punishment from official structures rather than from an informal leader.

It should be noted that each ethnic community has traditional ways of resolving conflicts. Moreover, there are ethnocultural norms and prescriptions that regulate the behavior of participants in disputes, including the procedure for addressing informal structures in order to resolve it. Accordingly, we are

talking about traditional structures that have a significant impact on the lives of ethnic groups of multicomponent societies. Let us clarify that a traditional society is governed by a tradition rooted in consciousness, behavior, relationships, and everyday life.

One of the leading social priorities of such a society is the preservation of existing traditions. At the same time, the social structure is characterized by a rigid hierarchy and the presence of stable communities, the predominance of collectivist motives over the private and primacy of hierarchical structures, as a rule, clans. In this connection, elders with unquestioned authority play a major role. It is they who transfer the social experience accumulated over the centuries to new generations who continue to follow traditions [Bedrik, et al., 2016; Peres et al., 2018].

Taking into account the peculiarities of the traditional lifestyle, which ethnic groups adhere to in societies with ethno-cultural diversity, A.A. Kosorukov [Kosorukov, 2018] believes that the development of civil dialogue in such a society is most successful when the subjects of the dialogue represent the state, civil and traditional society.

We agree with this position, since the preservation of ethnicity in the system of social relations as a significant factor already in itself implies the existence of numerous informal prescriptions that go beyond the framework of communication along the formal line of state-citizenship.

The introduction of an additional group of subjects, the communication of which is regulated by the norms grouped into informal institutions, does not deprive such a dialogue the signs of a civil dialogue, because its target orientation is focused on providing conditions for the formation of a single civic nation, in fact, on strengthening state-civil ties [Pastukhov, 2018]. At the same time, the main principle of organizing an effective dialogue is inclusiveness, which implies the inclusion of leaders of all ethnic groups in a multi-part society. In this regard, the leading thesis is that social institutions are interrelated and represent a complex integrative system, where formal and informal dialogue institutions and practices have a strong influence on each other [Kovalev, Bortsov, et al., 2016].

The presented subjective model of the dialogue space, formed within the normative borders of formal and informal institutions, acts as a social platform for the negotiation process, having humanitarian means of preventing the development of ethnic conflicts and favoring interethnic dialogue based on the implementation of the protection of civil rights and freedoms, ensuring equality of participants, respect for dignity and creation atmosphere of trust. With such an understanding of the subject composition of the civil dialogue, it can be considered as an essential tool of public life in civil society. It acts as a means of reaching agreement or neutralizing the enemy on the basis of this agreement [Volkov, et al., 2017].

The dialogue is a direct expression of the real system of interrelations between social actors that exists in civil society. The goal of a civil dialogue is the optimization of these links, giving them an open and dynamic, productive character. However, in societies with ethno-cultural diversity, such a goal will not be achieved if the subjects of the traditional society are not involved in the negotiation process. Only in this case, within the framework of the dialogue, we can expect the establishment of a connection between the subjects, the formation of forces that update social relations and enhance their status.

Civic dialogue can regulate relationships, telling them a specific goal, coordinate the means to achieve it, unite participants and provide them with necessary information, directly engage in joint activities or take place in the form of preliminary discussion of problems and evaluation of the results [Gafiatulina, Vorobyev, et al., 2018]. Accordingly, today, the civil dialogue, acting as a factor of the harmonious development of various ethnic groups, is built taking into account the diversity of cultural traditions and ethnic interests. Thus, as the study of social practice shows, the activity of the subjects of a dialogue becomes successful only when it is focused on the search for unity and harmony in the conditions of cultural pluralism, without destroying the diversity and striving for homogenization and unification in public life. At the same time, successful subjects of civic dialogue act agreed, have the

ability to self-government, strive to increase the efficiency of interactions, and have the ability to produce new ideas and demonstrate willingness to coalition and compromise. Such practices in societies with ethno-cultural education become possible if the rules of formal and informal institutions are observed, which involves participation in the negotiation process of subjects not only representing the state and the civil society, but also the traditional society [Kovalev, Kasyanov, et al., 2016].

Based on that, the leading task of civil dialogue on the settlement and prevention of interethnic conflicts in societies as well as reducing socio-cultural trauma with ethno-cultural diversity is the formation of a common ideology and identity of citizens [Gafiatulina, Rachipa, 2018]. Actually, the entire negotiation process, if not in detail, then in its strategic direction, in which representatives of three types of selected actors participate, is focused on the formation of an ideology for identity. Otherwise, the achievements related to the conduct of civil dialogue procedures will be temporary and not sustainable. It is important to rely on the definition of ideology proposed by J. Thompson in the framework of the post-non-classical scientific paradigm. From the point of view of the scientist, ideology is a semantic construction expressed in symbolic forms, representing a wide range of actions and statements, texts and images [Thompson, 1990].

It is important to note that civic nationalism, which generates the corresponding nation, as a rule, appears in democratic states that have established strong institutions of civil society. At the same time, the formal institutions of civic dialogue perform the communicative function of social and civic control. Moreover, thereby, they contribute to the prevention of interethnic conflicts, the formation of common political and social values, national political identity, and civic culture [Frolova, Lubsky, 2015].

However, the implementation of the strategy of nation building is possible only with the settlement of inter-ethnic conflicts and the development by all ethnic communities of a common vision of implementing this strategy based on joint, concerted actions [Gafiatulina, Samygin. 2016]. This, therefore, is about organizing an effective civil dialogue between the state and society. This is due to the fact that civil dialogue in societies with ethno-cultural diversity is an effective way to prevent interethnic conflicts and acts as a factor in ensuring mutual respect for representatives of different ethnocultural groups, social trust and solidarity of societies.

We emphasize that communitarianism is considered as a moral and ideological platform for civil dialogue in multicomponent societies, which is an influential socio-political movement that is becoming increasingly popular in modern conditions, since it is based on a dialogue between the community and the individual. Communitarianism is guided by the values of common good and is aimed at building a civil society based on the global unity [Borisenko, 2013]. In addition, each person is considered as a product of a particular society and / or community. Particular importance in shaping the personality, values, and style of human thinking is given to society, which is socially responsible for its members.

It is important to note that, from the point of view of communitarianism, social actors express the intentionality of their consciousness in concrete actions, which eventually are embodied in social institutions and, above all, informal ones. At the same time, communitarian ideology is focused on various aspects of fraternity, considered as the optimal state of society and its ideal, the achievement of which is possible through collective social efforts. We emphasize that the introduction to the values of dialogue and civic culture occurs in the process of learning and socialization. At the same time, communitarianists believe that informal social management mechanisms are leading. A. Etzioni states: the activity of civil society institutions is determined by the predominance of public interests while maintaining individual freedom [Etzioni, 1998].

Thus, communitarianism offers a model of interaction between civil society and the state through the involvement of broad sections of society, the development of self-government and democratic freedoms. With this model, sociopolitical institutions are flexible, which makes it possible to respond in a timely manner to the challenges and urgent needs of society, level risks, resolve and prevent conflicts. Moreover, this is the result of the active interaction of society and the state [Chernous, et al., 2015].

Thus, it is obvious that the values of communitarianism correlate with the values of traditional societies, which also focus on common goals of the community, its interests and values, and a person is considered as a part of a clan. In this regard, in the opinion of modern scholars, the ideas of communitarianism can create the basis for constructive civil dialogue in the context of ethnocultural diversity.

In the second half of the 20th century, the term “civil dialogue” was actively used in scientific discourse, which expressed the idea of negotiations. This is demonstrated in the research position of J. Alexander and P. Smith, who define civil dialogue as a form of social interaction between public institutions and civil society, with the aim of exerting a real influence on current policies and political decisions to increase their legitimacy, effectiveness and accountability through negotiations, round tables, protests [Alexander, 1993].

This position is shared by many French scientists. For example, Professor Henri Rouillo notes, “a social problem often leads to serious conflicts, and the community struggles to negotiate a compromise every day” (Traore, 2005). Based on this point of view, a permanent civil dialogue is an opportunity to involve the public, which contributes to the successful modernization of social relations.

Related to the problem of a civil dialogue as a social practice of the regulation of inter-ethnic communication, the inclusiveness of a dialogue based on taking into account the interests, opinions and positions of all groups of society, including ethnic ones, is of priority importance. In this regard, S. Bieber interprets a dialogue as a complex creative process of interaction between subjects, carriers of two different ways of thinking, different value systems, different ideological positions, as a result of which a fundamentally new cultural phenomenon may arise” [Bibler, 1998].

In the context of the development of social practices of informal civil dialogue in societies characterized by ethno-cultural diversity, the approach of the Russian scientist A.V. Zaitsev is considered to be of great interest, according to which it is reasonable to understand a civil dialogue as “a process of real discursive interaction when people not only speak, but also listen to each other trying to understand the problems and subjects of concern of the other side” [Zaitsev, 2012]. At the same time, the goal of the dialogue is to find out points of view, come to an agreement on the issues under discussion, unite efforts, and most importantly, take concerted action. However, according to the Russian scientist A.V. Zaitsev, a civil dialogue is a form of a public dialogue, as it has an internal differentiation [Zaitsev, 2014].

## **CONCLUSIONS.**

Civil dialogue has the necessary potential to be an effective practice of resolving inter-ethnic conflicts in societies with ethno-cultural diversity. This statement is based on the position of a number of authors who concluded that the potential of a civil dialogue is grounded on a number of its essential features, such as constructing a new social reality in the space of new meanings, teaching the practice of understanding, reconciling interests, maintaining social stability.

A very important aspect of our concept is that a civil dialogue is possible not only through the activities of subjects of a mature civil society, but also through dialogue practices developed by the institutions of traditional society and incorporated into the mechanisms of the dialogue process. In

the latter case, it is necessary to talk about informal institutions, that is, those dialogue practices that emerged as a result of the implementation of the experience of traditional society in emerging civil relations, where the center of the relationship of social actors is not ethnic, but state-civic belonging. Such an approach suggests a typology of civil society actors based on the criteria for dividing them into formal and informal institutions.

The subjects representing formal institutions are official state structures and their representatives, as well as the subjects representing the elements of civil society: political parties, associations, cultural communities, religious institutions, and so on. The effectiveness of these actors and their share in the actual practices of a civil dialogue depends on the maturity of civil society. The second type of subjects of a civil dialogue is associated with communicative practices implemented by the state and elements of traditional society. At the same time, the leading role is played by ethnic leaders - elders, kings, etc. They, as a rule, enjoy indisputable authority, act as opinion leaders within communities and regulate their relations.

In this context, the leading task of a civil dialogue on the resolution and prevention of inter-ethnic conflicts in societies with ethno-cultural diversity is the formation of a common ideology and identity of citizens. The entire negotiation process, if not in detail, then in its strategic direction, in which representatives of three types of selected subjects participate, is aimed at the formation of ideology for identity. Otherwise, achievements related to the conduct of civil dialogue procedures will be temporary and unsustainable.

Summing up, we emphasize that it is advisable to develop a civil dialogue in societies characterized by ethno-cultural diversity based on a model that identifies representatives of state, civil and traditional structures as subjects of the dialogue.

**BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.**

1. Alexander J., Smith Ph. (1993). The Discourse of American Civil Society: A New Proposal for Cultural Studies // *Theory and Society*. 1993. Vol. 22. No 2.
2. Bahremand, A. (2015). The concept of translation in different teaching approaches and methods. *UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research*, 3(1), 5-9.
3. Bedrik A.V., Chernobrovkin I.P., Lubskiy A.V., Volkov Y.G., Vyalykh N.A. (2016). Value Policy: Conceptual Interpretation of Research Practices // *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*. 2016. February. Vol. 9 (5).
4. Borisenko OA (2011). from the dialogue of cultures to the international dialogue of cultures // *Bulletin of the Trans-Baikal State University*. 2011. No 11 (78).
5. Chernous V.V., Degtyarev A.K., Lubsky A.V., Posukhova O.Y., Volkov Y.G. (2015). The lifestyle in the development of ideological policy // *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 2015. Vol. 6. No 5.
6. Etzioni A. (1998). *Communitarianism: The New Golden Rule* Basic Books, 1998.
7. Fauskanger, J., & Bjuland, R. (2018). Deep Learning as Constructed in Mathematics Teachers' Written Discourses. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(3), 149-160.
8. Frolova A.S., Lubsky A.V., Posukhova O.Y., Serikov A.V., Volkov Y.G. (2015). Ideological grounds for Settlement of Inter-Ethnic Relations in Modern Russia: Competition of Ideas and Ideology of Humanism // *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 2015. Vol. 6.
9. Gafiatulina N.Kh. (2013). Modeling of socio-political processes in conditions of uncertainty. The manual in two parts. Part I. (2013). Rostov-on-Don: SFU – Azov. 164 p. (In Russ)
10. Gafiatulina N.Kh., Imgrunt S.I., Samygin S.I. (2017). *Social security and social health of Russian society*. Saarbrucken, 2017.

11. Gafiatulina N.Kh., Samygin S.I. (2016). Социальная коммуникация в профилактике конфликтов: учебно-методическое пособие. М.: RUSAYNS, 2016. 164 p. (In Russ)
12. Ingavale, D. (2013). An impact of advertisements on purchase decision of youth with reference to consumer goods. *Advances in management*, 3(1),18-22.
13. Natalya Kh. Gafiatulina, Andrey V. Rachipa, Gennadiy A. Vorobyev, Valery V. Kasyanov, Tatyana M. Chapurko, Irina I. Pavlenko, Sergei I. (2018). Samygin Socio-Political Changes As A Socio-Cultural Trauma For The Social Health Of Russian Youth (2018) // *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*. Vol. 8, Issue 5, May 2018. С. 602-609.
14. Gafiatulina N.K., Vorobyev G.A., Imgrunt S.I., Samygin S.I., Latysheva A.T., Ermakova L.I., Kobysheva L.I. (2018). Social Health of Student Youth in South Russia: Analysis of the Perception of Sociocultural Risks // *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*. 2018. Vol. 8. No 6.
15. Gryshai V., Gafiatulina N., Kasyanov V., Velikodnaya I., Kosinov S., Lyubetsky N., Samygin S. (2018). Social health of youth in the context of migration processes in russia: assessment of the threat to national security // *Вісник Національної академії керівних кадрів культури і мистецтв*. 2018. № 2. С. 141-145.
16. Kosorukov A.A. (2018). Civil dialogue in the management of public policy // *Theories and problems of political research*. 2018. Т. No. 2.
17. Kovalev V.V., Nagoy A.A., Goloborod'ko A.Y., Serikov A.V., Zhade Z.A. (2016). The problem of loss of the dialogue form of interaction between state and society as a threat to social stability // *Man in India*. 2016. No 7.
18. Kovalev V.V., Bortsov Y.S., Serikova I.B., Lyausheva S.A., Tenov T.Z. (2016). Public mind manipulation technologies as a mechanism against government and society dissociation // *Man in India*. 2016. Vol. 96. No 10.

19. Kovalev V.V., Kasyanov V.V., Sagalaeva E.S., Sericov A.V. (2016). Double standards in international relations as a threat to Russia's national security // *Man in India*. 2016. No 10.
20. Lubsky A.V., Kolesnikova E.Y., Lubsky R.A. (2016). Normative type of personality and mental matrix of social behavior in Russian society // *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*. 2016. Vol. 9. Iss. 36.
21. Maksim Vaskov, Alexander Rezvanov, Valery Kasyanov, Sergey Samygin, Natalya Gafiatulina, Dmitriy Zagutin, Lidiya Scherbakova (2018). Value Orientations of Russian Youth in the System of Managing the Moral Security of Society (2018) // *Herald National Academy of Managerial staff of culture and arts*. No 2. 2018. Pp. 134-140.  
<http://heraldnamsca.in.ua/index.php/hnamsca/article/view/309>.
22. Martiana, A., M. & S. (2018). Motivation and obstacles faced by women halal fashion entrepreneurs and role of the business on women's economic empowering Yogyakarta Indonesia. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 6(2), 106-110.  
<https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2018.6213>
23. Nurgaliyeva, S., Zeynolla, S., Tulenova, U., Zulkarnayeva, Z., & Yespolova, G. (2018). Features of institutional autonomy of the Kazakhstan's universities. *Opción*, 34(85-2), 302-336.
24. Pastukhov V.B. (2006). Lost World. Russian society and state in the intercultural space // *Social Sciences and the present*. 2006. No 2.
25. Peres, P., Moreira, F., & Mesquita, A. (2018). Are Really Technologies at the Fingers of Teachers? Results from a Higher Education Institution in Portugal. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering & Management*, 3(1), 08.
26. Shakbanova M.M., Gafiatulina N.Kh., Samygin S.I., Chapurko T.M., Levaya N.A. Bineeva N.K. (2018) Youth of the South of Russia: Specifics of manifestation of ethnic identity (on the example of the Dagestan republic). *Purusharta*. 2018. Vol. 10. No 2. Pp. 111-119.

27. Shakhbanova M.M., Zagutin D.S., Kasyanov V.V., Magomedova Z.A., Bineeva N.K., Samygin S.I. (2018). The Specificity of Religious Identity in Contemporary Russian society (on the example of the Dagestan Republic) // Purusharta. 2018. No 2.
28. Thompson John V. (1990). Ideology and Modern Culture. Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication. Oxford: Polity Press, 1990.
29. Traore Diagouraga (2005). Dakoura: mémoire intitulé, Amélioration de la vie en société, 2005.
30. Volkov Y.G., Vodenko K.V., Lubsky A.V., Degtyarev A.K., Chernobrovkin I.P. (2017). Russia is searching for models of national integration and the possibility to implement foreign experience // Information. 2017. Vol. 20. No 7.
31. Zaitsev AV (2012). Dialogue of Jürgen Habermas: the concept and essence // Philosophical Thought. 2012. No 2.
32. Zaitsev A.V. (2014). Dialogue of the State and Civil Society as a Type of Public Dialogue: Comparative Analysis // Sociodynamics. 2014. No.11.

#### **DATA OF THE AUTHORS.**

- 1. Valery V. Kasyanov.** Doctor of Social Sciences, Doctor of historical sciences, Professor, Faculty of history Sociology and International Relations, Department of Russian History of Russia Kuban state University, Russia. E-mail: [culture@kubsu.ru](mailto:culture@kubsu.ru)
- 2. Tatyana M. Chapurko.** PhD in Law, Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor Private Educational Institution of Higher Education "Southern Institute of Management", Russia. Email: [chapurko@mail.ru](mailto:chapurko@mail.ru)
- 3. Maiga Sory Ibrahim.** Post-graduate student, Department of theoretical sociology and methodology of regional studies, Southern Federal University, Rostov-on-don, Republic of Mali, Bamako. Email: [maiga.soryibrahim@yahoo.fr](mailto:maiga.soryibrahim@yahoo.fr)

**4. Tazhan M. Klimenko.** Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education «North Caucasus State Academy», Russia. Email: [chapurko@mail.ru](mailto:chapurko@mail.ru)

**5. Sergey A. Merzakanov.** Candidate of Sociological Sciences, Associate Professor, Head of the Humanities and Natural Sciences Department of the Tuapse Branch of the RSHU (St. Petersburg), Russia. Email: [gend\\_merzakanov@bk.ru](mailto:gend_merzakanov@bk.ru)

**6. Sergey I. Samygin.** Doctor of sociological sciences, Professor, Personnel management and sociology Department, of Rostov state economic university «RINH», Russia. Email: [samygin78@yandex.ru](mailto:samygin78@yandex.ru)

**RECIBIDO:** 3 de mayo del 2019.

**APROBADO:** 16 de mayo del 2019.