

- RORTY, R.** Nahodilost, ironie, solidarita. DOXAI : Praha 1996, s. 213.
SARTORI, G. Pluralismus, multikulturalismus a přistěhovalectví. Esej o multikulturní společnost, Dokořán : Praha 2005.
SOKOL, J. Tolerance, pluralism and postmodernism. In the textbook Democracy and constitutionality. Various authors. Karolinum : Prague 1999.
TAYLOR, CH. Zkoumání politiky uznání. Multikulturalismus. FÚ AV ČR : Praha 2004.
WALDENFELS, B. Znepokojivá zkušenost cizího. OIKOYMENH : Praha 1998.

UDK 13 + 316.7 + 37.0

RUSSIA IN THE WEST-EAST CULTURAL DIALOGUE IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALIZATION

S. V. Kamashev, V. I. Parshikov (Novosibirsk, Russia)

***Abstracts.** The authors address the problem of the cultures' dialogue in the context of globalization and its role in the West and East rapprochement that is topical in modern time. In the article the role of Russia is considered, a twofold nature of its culture allows it to become an intermediary between East and West in formation of the integrated civilization. The conclusion is that the cultures' dialogue in the context of globalization being a reality of the modern world becomes a condition of mankind's self-preservation.*

***Key words:** Globalization, global problems, culture, global culture, dialogue, dialogue of cultures.*

Parshikov Vladimir Ivanovich – Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, the pro-rector-director of Institute of additional vocational training «Novosibirsk state agrarian university».

E-mail: idpo@ngs.ru

Kamashev Sergey Vladimirovich – Candidate of Philosophical Sciences, researcher at the Scientific Research Institute of Philosophy of Education Novosibirsk State Pedagogical University.

E-mail: kvs200@ngs.ru

Паршиков Владимир Иванович – доктор философских наук, профессор, проректор-директор Института дополнительного профессионального образования ФГОУ ВПО «Новосибирский государственный аграрный университет».

Камашев Сергей Владимирович – кандидат философских наук, научный сотрудник научно-исследовательского института философии образования ФГОУ ВПО «Новосибирский государственный педагогический университет».

РОССИЯ В ДИАЛОГЕ КУЛЬТУР «ЗАПАД»—«ВОСТОК» В УСЛОВИЯХ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИИ

С. В. Камашев, В. И. Паршиков (Новосибирск, Россия)

***Резюме.** Авторы обращаются к проблеме диалога культур в условиях глобализации и его роли в сближении «Запада» и «Востока», что является актуальным в современных условиях. В статье рассматривается роль России, двуединая природа культуры которой позволяет ей стать посредником между «Востоком» и «Западом» в становлении единой цивилизации. Делается вывод о том, что диалог культур в условиях глобализации, являясь реальностью современного мира, является условием самосохранения человечества.*

***Ключевые слова:** Глобализация, глобальные проблемы, культура, глобальная культура, диалог, диалог культур.*

The modern world development is characterized by the globalization processes. Being a historically conditioned objective process of the human civilization development, globalization is a set of complex integration processes that covers all the areas of human society: the economic-financial, social, political, cultural ones, etc. Many authors define globalization as a process of technological (including informational), economic, cultural and political integration of humanity, therefore it radically changes the world structure and world order [12, p. 4].

In present time a new look at global problems has been formed and it is seen not only as a result of modern social order which is based on economics and technology, making the person dependent on his/her position, but also as awareness that the destiny of mankind is closely related to the questions of his/her spirituality and morality. In the reports to the Rome Club scientists point out that the process of overcoming global challenges, including issues of culture, presupposes the efforts of the entire international community [7, pp. 76–78]. Thus, an important feature of the new worldview of the global change era is its turning to the person and to the spiritual foundations of his/her existence.

The global culture («Westernization») that is offered to the world community is American in its content. Globalization and “Americanization” cannot be equated, but these processes are the prevailing tendency of the modern world that manifests itself and it is likely to occur in the foreseeable future. Westernization, in our view, leads to “degeneration” of culture that is manifested in the cultural relations of technological substitution, in the emergence of multiculturalism whose ultimate aim is “Individual Culture”, the suppression of basic cultural values, the formation of mass culture whose sole purpose is to get pleasure.

Culture is a property of all mankind as a historical result of the people interaction. According to S. Artanovsky, the world culture “forms a unity which has a structure that is located in two dimensions – spatial (ethnographic)

and temporal (ethno-historical)” [1, p. 43]. Uniqueness of each culture means that in some respects different cultures are equal. The phrase “culturally backward” is unacceptable in relations between different nations. The uniqueness of national, regional characteristics of each culture puts it on the level that is comparable with other cultures. Multiculturalism is the objective reality. The unity of the world culture is determined by the unity of the historical process, the universal nature of work, and creative activity in general. Each national culture expresses universal mankind content.

Globalization primarily urges the process of culture individualization in a globalized world multiplying the amount of fast transient social relationships of the individual and thus weakening the importance of stable relationships with the value-spiritual content. Globalization processes lead to unification and dehumanization of modern society. The result is the emasculation of national cultures which leads to impoverishment of the world civilization. Such a situation may lead to a unified one-dimensional form, lacking values of national cultural identity. Every nation has such features that are associated with historical peculiarities, national traditions, and cultural level of the people. It is no coincidence that we talk about American efficiency, German pedantry, Russian unreliability, etc.

The world community has developed some fixed notions of “East” and “West”. The most interesting aspects of this problem are the interaction between Western and Eastern civilizations (cultures) and the place and role of Russia in this historical process. However, what do we have in mind when we use these concepts? For the first time these concepts as theoretical terms were introduced by G.F.V. Hegel, who combined three cultural-historical worlds under the concept of “East”: Indian, Chinese and Middle East. There are two aspects in Hegel’s interpretation of the term “West”: a wide aspect that includes the antiquity and the Christian culture of Western European nations and narrow aspect involving only the Christian culture of Western European nations. Moreover, it should be noted that the German philosopher did not include Russia or contemporary for him American states into the concept of “West”, and he also did not find any place for them in the world history philosophy. It is necessary to pay special attention to the fact that the opposition of the concepts “West” and “East” are treated not as a geographical, but as geo-sociocultural.

The Western type of civilization (cultural) development had its background in ancient times (the first philosophical systems, ancient democracy, examples of theoretical science), as well as in the Christian Middle Ages (aiming at rational comprehension of the existence’s meaning, morality) that contributed to the formation of technological civilization. Desire to master the forces of nature and wealth, technological development, dynamism, focus on novelty, individualism, rationality, the priority of private property, etc. characterize the “West”.

Traditional cultures belong to the “East”: Ancient India, Ancient China, Ancient Egypt and the Muslim world. Eastern perception of the world is characterized by the dominance of moral-volitional orientation to contemplation, serenity, self-

mystical merging with the being, the absence of dividing the world into the world of nature and society, the natural and the supernatural. The East is characterized by denial of individualistic origin; focus on teamwork, setting the adaptation of the individual to the current social environment, not changing it; non-interference in the natural processes.

Separation of cultures into the Western and Eastern also implies different mentality of the people that live in these areas, i.e., differences in the techniques and methods of the world perception, scientific, religious, artistic, aesthetic and spiritual values, basic world outlook, socioeconomic and political structures.

For more than one and a half century the world community discusses the interaction of Russian culture and Russian mentality with the cultures of the West and East. The concept of dialogue in the cultural process has a broad meaning: it is a dialogue of creators and consumers of cultural values, this intergenerational dialogue, and dialogue of cultures as a means of interaction and understanding among peoples, [4. 309]. According to Kosenko T. S., the dialogue in contrast to the exchange of monologues is a collision of different minds, different truths, dissimilar cultural positions that form a single mind, a single truth and a common human culture [8, pp. 205]. The interaction of cultures that assumes the cultures' dialogue is the foundation for international relations. The most necessary condition for the dialogue is the recognition of the existence of different opinions, worldviews, languages, cultures, communication rules, etc. The processes of cultural interaction are more complex and are not merely the "pumping" of the achievements of a highly developed culture into the less developed, contributing to the progress of the last culture.

In the context of globalization the importance of international cultural dialogue increases, which enhances mutual understanding among peoples, enables self-awareness of national identity. While it seemed before that the culture of East and West do not cross each other, in modern time the points of contact and interaction are outlined. This is not only connected with the interaction but also shows complementary and enriching. The existence of other cultures more often remind us about the functioning of two inseparable principles "yin" and "yang" [14, p. 33]. Today, Eastern culture as never before starts exerting a major influence on the American and European culture and lifestyle. Millions of people in the world (including Russians) have been actively practicing yoga, the ancient Chinese wellness exercises, religions are influenced by the effects of the East; the Eastern idea of inner harmony of things is gradually winning hearts and minds of citizens in Europe and America, etc.

The concept of dialogue between cultures has become extremely relevant in today's reality in many different fields of knowledge: sociology, cultural studies, philosophy and other fields. "Dialogue is a dialogue with the culture, the realization and reproduction of its achievements, is revealing and understanding the other cultures values, way of assigning the latter, the possibility of removing political tensions between nations and ethnic groups. It is a necessary condition for scientific

search for truth and for the creative process in art. Dialogue is the understanding of “Self” and communication with others. It is universal and the universality of the dialogue is well recognized [10, p. 9].

Globalization and global issues contribute to the dialogue of cultures. In general, the problem of openness to dialogue and mutual understanding in the modern world deepens. However, the goodwill only is not enough to understand and to be able to lead a dialogue, but the cross-cultural literacy (understanding other cultures) is also necessary, which includes: “... awareness of differences in ideas, customs, cultural traditions inherent in different nations, the ability to see similarities and differences between diverse cultures and to look at the culture of your own community through the eyes of other nations.” [9, p. 47].

The urgency of the cultures’ dialogue problem is explained by the following factors: firstly, in the context of globalization for successful interaction in the global political, economic and cultural areas there should be not only a language but also cultural awareness of people that belong to different countries. Secondly, at a time when the global information society is being formed not only information has a special role but also the ability to establish an ongoing dialogue of different language systems is urgent, thus providing a stable contact between different beliefs, cultures and national traditions. Thirdly, the issue of dialogue between cultures is fundamentally important for Russia, where European and Asian traditions of civilization coexisted and still exist, and due to its special geographical position Russia is open to a variety of influences from the outside, from East and West.

Dialogue as a form of interpersonal communication has existed since ancient time but as in modern time the problem of dialogic relations was considered by the German philosophers Immanuel Kant, I. Fichte, F. Schelling, who explored the problems of the subject and its cognitive abilities as well as subjective and intersubjective relations. Feuerbach in the early XX century started developing the ideas of I. Fichte about the interdependence of “Self” and “other” and it is a beginning of the dialogue research. I. Herder believed that the interaction of cultures is a way of preserving the cultural diversity. He asserted that cultural isolation leads to the loss of culture. However, in his opinion, the changes should not affect the base (the “kernel”) of the culture.

Modern cultures are formed as a result of numerous and long-cultural interaction. However, to understand the language of another culture one must be open to one’s own national culture. The only way to understand the best of other cultures is from the native to the universal. Only in this case the dialogue will be successful. Participating in the dialogue of cultures, one must know not only one’s culture but also the neighboring cultures and traditions, beliefs and customs. The depth of the dialogue is largely determined by the interest of creative individuals, by the opportunity to meet their needs. The main way of cross-cultural contacts is informal contacts, because when there are functionaries representing different organization as a vehicle of administrative

principles the cultural contact does not occur. There is a need of the dialogue of cultures.

Dialogue involves active interaction of equal subjects. The interaction of cultures assumes some common cultural values. It can lift the tension to create an environment of trust and mutual respect. The process of interaction is a dialogue, and the forms of interaction represent different types of dialogic relations. "A new culture of communication is being formed in the in-depth idea of the cultures' dialogue. Other person's thinking and being is not only deepened in all of us, it is a different mentality, a different consciousness, internally vital to our existence" [3, p. 80].

In present world the dialogue between cultures becomes more difficult because of some complex circumstances. There is a connection between the interaction of different nation's cultures and contemporary manifestations of the fundamental problems. Special characteristics of the solutions to these problems lie in a systematic dialogue between cultures, rather than in one culture even if it be a successful culture. A. Gordienko fairly believes that "the solution to these problems involves a globalization of cultural interaction in space and time at which self realization of each and every culture through the interaction of each and each with all others becomes a reality. ... This process forms a "straight" perspective of human history". [5, pp. 76, 78].

"Dialogue is a dialogue only in the case when it can be implemented as an endless development and a formation of new styles of each person who enters into a dialogue of the culture phenomenon. During the complex, multi-cultural dialogue the human values are being formed". [6, p. 141].

Intercultural interaction involves two types of interaction: the cultural-direct when cultures interact with each other through communication at the level of language, and indirect when the interaction and interpenetration of cultures is a consequence of the culture dialogue with itself, as though the dialogue of "their" and "alien". The essence of the dialogic can be found in the productive interaction of sovereign positions that form a single global and diverse semantic space and common culture.

Dialogue is an indicator of the general culture of society. "Dialogue is not a means but it is an end in itself. "To be" means to communicate dialogically. When the dialogue ends, everything ends. Therefore, the dialogue, in fact, cannot and must not finish" [2, p. 433]. According to M. Bakhtin, every culture lives only in the questioning of another culture and a great phenomenon in the culture is produced only in the dialogue of different cultures, just at the point of their intersection. The ability to develop a culture of reaching out to the other is one of the sources of its life. "Alien culture only in the eyes of another culture reveals itself fully and deeply ... starts as a dialogue that overcomes the isolation and unilateralism ... <of these cultures >... In such a dialogic encounter of two cultures, they do not merge and do not mix, but they are mutually enriched" [13, pp. 354].

Imitation of a foreign culture or the complete rejection of it must be turned into a dialogue. For both sides the dialogue of cultures can be successful. "We ask

new questions to a foreign culture which it never stated for itself, we look for its response to those our questions, and the foreign culture responds to us opening up its new aspects and new semantic depths” [13, p. 335].

In the dialogue of cultures it is important to reveal the universal values of cultural interaction. One of the main objective contradictions inherent in all world cultures is the contradiction between the development of national cultures and their convergence. Therefore, the need for dialogue between cultures is a prerequisite for the mankind’s self-preservation. The formation of spiritual unity is a result of the contemporary cultures’ dialogue.

In the global socio-cultural development process, as it was already noted, the dialogue of Western and Eastern cultures play an important role by that it enriches the mankind’s values in modern time. Considering the question about Russia’s role in the world history and trying to understand its identity, scientists very often turn to the philosophical-historical scheme of the West and East. Russia is considered to belong at the same time whether to West or East, or taking into account its own specificity defining it as standing apart from the West and East. For the first time the problem of West – East – Russia was raised by P. Y. Chaadayev in his “Philosophical Letters”. “Westerners” have argued that Russia belongs to the European cultural and historical tradition. Slavyanophily (conservatives) viewed Russia as a distinctive religious formation that is the most prepared for the adequate perception of the Christian worldview truths. There is also a cultural understanding of Russia as Eurasian where the impact of Western and Eastern, and Byzantine cultures on Russia are taken into account which were synthesized in the unity that represents a “third force” which forms a special world, quite comparable with the first two, although unique and unrepeatable.

Thus, P. Y. Chaadaev with the concept of Russia raised the issue of the “third force” in world history; which, having a specific geographical location, could become a bridge between West and East, combining in its own culture two great beginnings of spiritual nature that are the mind and imagination. Russia can be characterized by such features as: state centralization, the subordination of human society and state, legal nihilism, collectivism directions, the propensity for violence and kindness, the breadth of mind and freedom. The dual nature of Russian culture allows it to be a mediator between East and West. Russia has a long experience of intercultural dialogue and a lot to share with West and East. The interaction of cultures in Russia occurred in different areas with various degrees of intensity. Dialogue between cultures was and remains a principle in the development of Russian society. Throughout the centuries and millennia mutual enrichment of cultures occurred that make up the unique mosaic of Russian civilization.

Dialogue is the most important methodological principle of cultural understanding: through dialogue to learning. The essential characteristics of culture are manifested in the dialogue. Dialog is a universal principle which provides culture’s self-development. All cultural and historical phenomenons are the products of interaction

and communication. During the dialogue of cultures and people linguistic forms were developed and creative thinking was formed. The dialogue happens in space and time running through the cultures vertically and horizontally. The idea of the cultures' dialogue is based on the primacy of human values. Culture does not stand on a single mind or single opinion; it is dialogic in nature and essence. Dialogue is the true form of international communication involving both mutual enrichment of national cultures and the preservation of their identity. National culture can only thrive when the human culture is flourishing.

Interaction is one of the most important driving forces for the national cultures development. National culture cannot adequately exist without interaction with other cultures. The interaction of cultures is a mutually conditioned, two-way process, i.e., the changes in the state, content, consequently, functions of one culture as a result of the foreign impact must be accompanied by changes in another culture. There is a law in the cultures' interaction: culture does not reject culture. While before the late 1980-s the main tendency in the cultures' interaction was the orientation to their synthesis, since 1990-s the plurality of cultures, the recognition of the real diversity of cultural and historical systems and dialogical principles of their interaction have been in priority.

There are no nations that can exist and develop in isolation from their neighbors. The most intimate communication of neighboring ethnic communities happens at the crossroads of ethnic territories where ethno-cultural communication have the greatest intensity. Contacts between the peoples always were a powerful stimulus for the historical process.

Dialogue of cultures leads to a cultural self-development deepening, to the mutual enrichment by virtue of other cultural experiences both within specific cultures and in the global culture. The need for dialogue between cultures is a prerequisite for self-preservation of mankind. Interaction, dialogue of cultures in the modern world is a complex process which is sometimes painful. It is necessary to ensure optimal interaction, dialogue between peoples and cultures for each of the parties to benefit from this interaction and in the interests of society, government, international community.

REFERENCES

1. **Artanovsky S. N.** Historical unity of mankind and the mutual influence of cultures: Philos.-methodology. analysis of present-day. abroad. concepts. – L.: Education, 1967. – 268.
2. **Bakhtin M. M.** Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics. – M.: Sov. Russia, 1979. – 318.
3. **Vostryakovo Y.** Problems of knowledge in the dialogue area of modern culture / Philos.-methodology. problems of science and technology. – Samara, 1998.– P. 78–81.
4. **Global Studies:** encyclo. / Ch. Ed. I.I. Mazur, A. N. Chumakov, Center for Scient. and butt. program “Dialogue”. – Moscow: Raduga, 2003. – 1328.

5. **Gordienko A. A.** Anthropological and cultural background of co-evolution of man and nature: a philosophic-anthropological model of the co-evolution development. – Novosibirsk: CSA, 1998. – 87.
6. **Ivanova S. Y.** On the ethno-cultural interaction // Northern Caucasus in the context of globalization. – Rostov-na-Donu, 2001. – pp. 140–144.
7. **Kamashev S. V., Michalina O. A., Nalivayko N. V.** Security Problems of the national system of education: monograph. – Novosibirsk: Publishing House SB RAS, 2007. – 330.
8. **Kosenko T. S., Nalivayko N. V., Panarin V. I.** The dialogue in the development of traditions and innovations of modern education / philosophy of education. – 2009. – no. 3 (28). – pp. 204–211.
9. **Lapshin, A. G.** International cooperation in the field of arts education: the prospect of cross-cultural awareness / cross-cultural dialogue: comparative studies in pedagogy and psychology. Sat Art. – Vladimir, 1999. – pp. 45–50.
10. **Saiko E. V.** On the nature of space and the “action” dialogue / social and cultural space of dialogue. – Moscow, 1999. – pp. 9–32.
11. **Chaadaev P. Y.** Philosophical Letters // Philos. history in Russia. – Moscow, 1996. – pp. 54–56.
12. **Yuldasheva O. U., Arenkov I. A., Mamre A. N.** Marketing organization and the globalization of the economy: survey data by the business leaders of St. Petersburg // Marketing and marketing research in Russia, 2002. – no. 3 (39). – pp. 4–19.
13. **Aesthetics of verbal creativity:** Sat. fav. Proceedings M. M. Bakhtin / Comp. S. G. Bocharov. – 2 ed. – Moscow: Art, 1986. – 445.
14. **Yatsenko E.** East and West: the interaction of cultures / culture in the modern world. – Vol. 1. – Moscow, 1999. – pp. 32–37.

UDK 13 + 316.7 + 37.0

TO THE QUESTION ABOUT EASTERN AND WESTERN PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION: SIMILARITIES AND SPECIFICS

A. V. Nalivayko, N. V. Nalivayko (Novosibirsk, Russia)

***Abstracts.** Consideration of the Eastern and Western concepts of education in the aspects of similarities and specifics is connected with the search for holistic knowledge about education that provides people with cultural, educational, spiritual and moral potential, diverse socialization and dignified, non-conflict existence in society of the XXIst century. Methodological basis for understanding the integration process is a thesis about the dialectical unity of education and society. Education has a little chance for successful development without social*