

Part III
PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION OF THE EAST AND WEST
(A CROSS-CULTURAL ANALYSIS)

Раздел III.
ФИЛОСОФИЯ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ ВОСТОКА И ЗАПАДА
(КРОССКУЛЬТУРНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ)

UDK 13 + 316.7 + 37.0

**CULTURE AND THE POSSIBILITIES OF MULTICULTURAL
EDUCATION**

Naděžda Pelcová (Prague, Czech Republic)

***Abstract.** This article examines the relationship between culture and the possibilities of a multicultural education, it asks which concepts of multiculturalism in today's diverse world can different cultures coexist in. It analyses the axiological dimension of the concepts of multiculturalism with an emphasis on the values of tolerance, reverence and respect and the dialogical character of multicultural education.*

***Key words:** Culture, multicultural education, tolerance, identity, learning, reverence, respect, dialogue.*

Doc. PhDr. **Naděžda Pelcová**, CSc. works at the Pedagogical faculty of Charles University, in the department of civil education and philosophy. Her professional interests are focused on the problems of the philosophy of education and philosophical and pedagogical anthropology.

Пелцова Надежда – доктор философских наук, доцент, заведующая кафедрой философии и гражданского воспитания Карлова Университета.

E-mail: nadezda.pelcova@centrum.cz

КУЛЬТУРА И ВОЗМОЖНОСТИ МУЛЬТИКУЛЬТУРНОГО ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ

Надежда Пелцова (Прага, Чешская республика)

***Аннотация.** В данной статье изучается взаимоотношение между культурой и возможностями мультикультурного образования. Ставится вопрос: в рамках каких концепций мультикультурности различные культуры могут сосуществовать в современном многообразном мире? Анализируется аксиологическое измерение концепций мультикультурности, делается акцент на ценностях толерантности, почтения и уважения, а также диалогичном характере мультикультурного образования.*

***Ключевые слова:** Культура, мультикультурное образование, толерантность, идентичность, учение, почтение, уважение, диалог.*

A basic assumption for the possibilities of multicultural upbringing is the need to define multiculturalism and multiculturalism. This must be done before any thought of a multicultural education, its content and appearance, as they have so many different meanings. I would say this is the basic assumption for the possibility of multicultural education – what concept of multiculturalism do we want and can we relate it to the multicultural education of our children?

At present we can outline 5 semantic spheres for the meaning of the term multiculturalism.

1. **Multiculturalism** as the “**ideal** realization of tolerance and respect of others. In this sense multiculturalism is an abandoned opportunity which if realized would prevent various forms of oppression – marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, violence, exploitation.”¹ According to this: “A multicultural society is characterized by cultural diversity, plurality. Several cultures can live side-by-side, not isolated but mutually interacting and communicating, leading to cooperation, dialogue, shared influences and mutual enrichment. The ideal of multiculturalism is a celebration of cultural diversity, e.g. linguistic or religious; but it is also the opposite of an insensitive assimilation of race, ethnicity, and immigrants.”² Multiculturalism as an ideal has become an integral part of the upbringing and educational strategies of many European countries.

Multiculturalism in this respect refers to plurality based on tolerance. Nevertheless, the Italian sociologist Sartori describes multiculturalism as being the opposite of pluralism because it aspires not to differentiated integration but to multiethnic disintegration. He expresses the most common objection of critics of the concept of multiculturalism as an ideal, also it does not remove but it calcifies

1 TAYLOR, CH. Zkoumání politiky uznání. Multikulturalismus. FÚ AV ČR : Praha 2004, page 183.

2 Ibid.

ethnic, racial, cultural and social diversity. Multiculturality and pluralism in his opinion cancel each other out.

His main question is: to what degree can society remain open without destroying itself? How many refugees and immigrants can Europe accept and still be Europe? Toleration can never be without boundaries, unrelenting. He presents three criteria for the so-called flexibility of tolerance: the first is the reason (humane, economic); the second is no maltreatment (we do not have to tolerate behavior which causes us injury); the third is mutuality (if we are tolerant we assume that others will be tolerant to us)³. It was a criticism of Taylor's concept of political recognition that first formulated the ideal multiculturalism. His work on the subject is unquestionable; he says that tolerance is a civil virtue of modern man living in a democratic society. Similarly, Sartori says that tolerance is a question of scale, what is 'tolerable' and what is not. In this article we deal mainly with this scale of tolerance.

How can we resolve the first argument that flares up? We must make it quite clear the tolerance that we are talking about.

The word tolerance comes from Latin, where *tolerantia* means patience or forbearance. The dictionary states that⁴ *tolerō, āre* means: 1. to bear, endure; 2. withstand, suffer; 3. sustain, keep. To tolerate is not only to suffer and withstand unpleasantness but also to trade, maintain, to conserve that which is well-conserved.

From a sociological point of view tolerance or forbearance is an important human trait not only for the existence of the individual but for each and every society. From a psychological point of view tolerance is a characteristic of the social nature of man, we are not born with it, we learn it through coexisting with others; it is shaped from our life experiences. Tolerance has permeated throughout history in several forms separating into more specific terms.

More specifically, tolerance relates to religious consciousness and freedom, it originated during the renaissance and reformation and culminated in enlightenment e.g. in Lock's *Listech o toleranci* on religious freedoms. A wider concept of tolerance formulated by both natural and legal theorists bases tolerance on the emancipation of man as a citizen and links it with a citizen's right to political freedom, freedom to express their opinion and conviction. In modern times tolerance has spread as a concept and is related to a person's right to their individuality, diversity, and freedom to act based on their own needs and interests. In moral and political philosophy tolerance is something which is between individuals and between citizens and the state. For purely religious and later political reasons tolerance has become a general moral requirement which affects all areas of individual and social

3 SARTORI, G. *Pluralismus, multikulturalismus a přistěhovalectví. Esej o multikulturní společnosti*, Dokořán : Praha 2005.

4 ŠENKOVÁ S. *Latin – Czech, Czech – Latin dictionary*. Olomouc publishers: Olomouc 1999, page 123.

life. Jan Sokol links⁵ tolerance (the tolerance zone) with the technical sphere in the sense of the acceptable level of error e.g. manufactured components. Tolerance is expressed by technical standards that set the level of acceptability providing the reliable working of a component (the center of a ball bearing must rotate). A similar technical term “level of tolerance” can be used to express the material characteristics of a product, e.g. every leather boot is made slightly differently. However, not even technically tolerated differences must be tolerated by those for whom they are intended, i.e. the buyer. Tolerance is something ambiguous even in areas and contexts with precisely set criteria.

On what levels does tolerance work? In regular life we are often required to endure something we do not like and is in some way different from what we want. We tolerate difficult conditions, loud neighbors, gossiping colleagues, arrogant bosses. Why do we stand it? Because it does not bother us too much (level of tolerance), or we have no choice (necessary for survival), or we expect reciprocity (what I do for you, you do for me) or we have other reasons (curiosity, interest). Is this the tolerance on which we can build cohabitation and cooperation between cultures?

The first two meanings imply a negative assessment of that which we tolerate. The relationship with toleration is passive, indifferent, often attached to a lack of interest; the level of tolerance develops from not intervening in one’s own spheres of interest (if I am not intruded by others). Tolerance is not used like this in relation to pleasant or valuable things.

All tolerance is conditioned by a particular level of acceptance. Sartori says that to be tolerant means to increase the level of that which is still acceptable without it destroying us. Therefore the second case, forced tolerance, never lasts for long. Sokol, however, draws our attention to another trait: tolerance cannot relate to everything i.e. things that form the basis of our society – laws, and also key values, standards and regulations of our cultural life. The boundary of what matters and what does not matter is unclear; things which are tolerated during periods of calm, peace, and cohabitation are not tolerated in times of stress, conflict or danger.

What must educators know about tolerance?

From a philosophical point of view tolerance can only be based on culture i.e. the most original meaning of what must be raised, what must be taken care of, what can be educated (Lat. colo, ere: raise, take care of, educate). The basis of tolerance that is active, accepting, and self-confident as an expression of one’s own values, is education and learning, thus culture. The approach to a multicultural upbringing is therefore the development of learning. Culture and learning are prisms through which we understand the world, they are a screen which brings structure to the world; culture is always symbolic thus it inspires us and encourages interpretation and understanding. Therefore, multiculturalism cannot be cultivated without culture

5 SOKOL, J. Tolerance, pluralism and postmodernism in the textbook Democracy and constitutionality. Various authors. Karolinum : Prague 1999, page 229.

being conceived not as a closed system of values, standards, regulations, or ideas which we separate from others (culture as a tolerable limitation), not as a vague postmodern system of units without margins, definitions or limitations (e.g. without distinguishing between art and kitsch, truth and lies), but as an internal, integrated, living system of pivotal supports (A. Gehlen refers to it as “Schutzpfeile” or “supporting columns”), which let us live and understand the world and other people. What are these pivotal supports on which we can build tolerance?

For modern western culture it is firstly **our own identity**, self-conception, self-confidence, self-assurance, self-respect, and sometimes even subjectivity, authenticity, that which is individually our own. For me to define someone, I must know who I am, what are my possibilities. This is a level of self-understanding and understanding of others as a unit, collective and diverse (through personal, social, cultural, national or even religious identity). Each individual identity has its own social dimension, expressed philosophically by the relationships I-thou, I-we, I and others (it, them), the same and different, the self and the other, near and far, joint-existence. The relationship character of identity is not determined by the antitheses of two poles but by that which links the poles. Therefore, tolerance is not only an expression of a relationship with others but at the same time it is an expression of the understanding of one’s self.

This relates closely to **motivation** – understanding of that which determines my behavior (conciseness, values) and the behavior of others (understanding of the different thinking and attitudes of members of different cultures, and also generations, people who thinking and live differently, different contexts of values). The motivation to be considerate to others, however, does not always have a rational character and represents an open opportunity to remain “otherwise” (cowardliness, awkwardness, self-reverence, shame are often motives of considerate behavior, as we can see in contemporary films, e.g. *Musíme si pomáhat* (in English “Divided we fall”). To quote R. Rorty, the greatest task of an multicultural upbringing is to develop “the ability to see more and more traditional differences (of tribe, religion, race, customs, and the like) as unimportant when compared with the similarities with respect to pain and humiliation”⁶ The resounding key in motivation is the “man, parent, citizen like me ...”.

Another pillar of modern western culture is **historical consciousness**, the greatest invention of the modern age (according to Gadamer), the rejection of a naïve following of a tradition or traditionally accepted fact. Historical consciousness has been built as it were on the ruins of **tradition**. Gadamer says, “Historical consciousness does not listen religiously to voices from the past but ponders on it and brings it back into context, where it grows in order to determine the relevant meaning and value which it belongs to.”⁷ Historical consciousness does not relativize as it is often criticized for doing, historical consciousness is an instantiation of context – an

6 RORTY, R. Nahodilost, ironie, solidarita. DOXAI : Praha 1996, page 213..

7 GADAMER, H.-G. Problém dějinného vědomí. Praha : NFÚ AV ČR, 1994, page 28.

analysis of relations between traditions and morals, systems of values, or particular historical conditions, the same as the future conditions included here.

However, historical consciousness cannot be “set free” from tradition as objectivists want it to. Humanities are a part of history, they develop from tradition – we as historical beings carry an imprint of the past within us (e.g. our western way of thinking, our speech, our ability to snub out a tradition or to bring it back to life, slowly eroding conservation, remembering and forgetting). In order to preserve a tradition it must transcend the generation threshold, there must be the desire for repetition from the older generation and the willingness and readiness to listen from the younger generation.

This reveals the relationship between historical consciousness and tradition as an ontic and ontological basis for the possible tolerance of others.

2. In Huntington’s conservative account of the nature of American identity *Kam kráčíš Ameriko?* he labels multiculturalism as an **anti-European**⁸ and **anti-western movement**. According to the author it is a culmination of a long-term neglect in teaching American and western history, the English language and nationality. Multiculturalism is regarded as a deconstructivistic attack on traditional American values”.⁹ The author considers the conflict between supporters of traditional American values, the exclusive status of the English language and American national culture on the one hand and followers of multiculturalism, bilingual education and ethnic culture on the other hand as the basic characteristics of current American political life and he estimates its development in relation to possible terrorist threats to the USA.

We cannot connect such a model of multiculturalism to our multicultural upbringing as its objective is to liberate the bearer of any differences with the majority. Regardless of which side our sympathies lie (conservative or liberal), the specific character of this multiculturalism is confrontation (ethnic, gender, values, generations, traditions), and a deepening of the awareness of differences. Hand in hand with this is the assurance of one’s own uniqueness and the right to the truth on both rival sides. This can only lead to an escalation in tension.

3. **Multiculturality** as a concept of mutual respect between natives and immigrants, between members of different cultures within a single society on the basis of civic and political equality is a **political fabrication**, a **strategy** of the political representation of a liberal democracy. As the authors (Barša, Baršová) of the paper *Farewell multiculturalism* put it, multiculturalism began in Europe in the 1960s. For example in Great Britain it is associated with the image of the empire, in which various ethnic cultures coexist under one political roof. The main objective of this political strategy was to provide level opportunities with respect to cultural

8 HUNTINGTON, S. P. *Kam kráčíš Ameriko? Krize americké identity*. Rybka Publishers: Praha 2005, page 182.

9 Ibid.

diversity in an environment of social tolerance”.¹⁰ This political strategy has gone through a certain evolution. Prior to the attack on the London underground a range of signals hinted at the hatred the children of immigrants felt towards their “new home country”. The weakness of the concept of multiculturalism as a political strategy is that it does not take into account differences between the generations and their relationship with their original traditions (cultural, religious etc.). Education (and assimilatory) strategies need to understand the nature of cultural identity, the character of religious faith and the relationship with ancient cultural traditions which differ from those of the first generation immigrants who were grateful of their new home country, and their children and grandchildren whose original cultural identity was ignored and not revived. Second and third generation immigrants and children of immigrants coming to the west do not belong anywhere. There is no conflict between individual and cultural identity (individual freedoms based on a western example and cultural roots in other cultures) as mentioned in *Politikách uznání*, but a **loss** of cultural identity and the associated loss of personal identity. This is both a political and educational failure. European schools did not teach values to their pupils, the children of immigrants, they cannot be artificially implanted, but merely cold calculus. They did not teach civil virtues (belonging to their original culture) nor did they contribute to an awareness of responsibility (in contrast they contributed to a denial of several e.g. fundamental Muslim values). They neither belong to their parents (traditional tradition) nor the host nation (western tradition). According to Erik Erikson the result is a compensation of neurosis expressed by means of “all feelings of safety and identity originating from the position of a man who is owed something”.¹¹ A feeling which can lead a desperate person to violence.

The current strategy in European politics does not focus on cultural but on political and linguistic assimilation, and analogously to Huntington’s remarks on the need for patriotic schooling in the USA, in Europe, e.g. in Britain, they speak of “Britishness” and British identity. There has been a shift in integration policy. To quote the previously cited authors (Barša, Baršová) there is a new governmental strategy (since January 2005) based on the strengthening of British identity which does not contradict cultural diversity (no set of values should be preferred). The result is a rejection of the idea of a so-called melting pot in which original diversity is reformed into new units; metaphorically speaking the strategy is expressed as a salad bowl made up of various ingredients while preserving their principles. Nevertheless, the symbolism does not lose the image of a vessel (society, its values and culture) unifying these differences. As the strategy declares, it does not expect full cultural but political (the acceptance of Britishness is obligatory) and

10 BARŠOVÁ, A., BARŠA, P. Farewell multiculturalism. Islamic revival causing a reversal in European integration policies. In *Lidové noviny* (People’s News) from the 3rd of Sept 2005.

11 ERIKSON E. H. *Dětství a společnost*. ARGO : Praha 2002, page 112.

linguistic assimilation. Without the acceptance of culture, however, social mobility and success (so desired in western society) are not possible. There is a rejection of the original concept of multiculturalism as the creation of level opportunities.

As a political project multiculturalism is now exhausted. Creators and supporters of the political concept of multiculturalism now know only one thing: after multiculturalism, old western eurocentrism must not return.¹²

4. Multiculturality (in the sense of a plurality of cultures) as a term describing the state of the global world, in which unification of basic processes of communication and life style occurs as well as commercialization, technologization, optimization and economization of all social processes. In the global world the meeting and coexistence of cultures is typical, it does not have to lead to influence or enrichment but merely coexistence based on tolerance as forbearance. Cultural differences become folklore extraneous for the creation of cultural identity (Maasai warriors on the Maasai Mara) and they are often commercialized, e.g. ethnic specificity can inspire trends in fashion.

What is the global world? The author of the study *První globální revoluce. Svět na prahu nového tisíciletí* speaks of a world created by an “unparallel mix of geostrategic movements and a set of economic, technological, ecological, cultural and ethnic factors, the combination of which leads to obscurity.”¹³ The world is not stable, not certain, not consistent. This can be illustrated through the attempt of several of the most progressive companies to elaborate new methods of planning and management under vague and uncertain conditions. Therefore, in recent times the Nobel Prize has been won by economists for the theory of management conceived as game theory.

What is culture’s place in the globalized world? Well culture has always been proof – certainty. It is a prism through which we understand the world. Without culture we could not live as people. The danger of such a global or rather globalistic multiculturalism is that we remain “between” cultures without being inside any of them. From cultures we only use values and patterns of behavior which we want and need. We often transform cultural behavior into completely new forms which have little or no link to their origins, e.g. European Hare Krishnas, yoga and other exotic things.

5. Multiculturality as a product of western thinking

We can pose the question: Where in western thinking can we find support for understanding the assumptions of multicultural upbringing? Or even: **What does knowledge and behavior that display the other look like without being**

12 BĚLOHRADSKÝ, V. Twilight of multiculturalism. In Salón. Literature periodical Práva from the 15th of June 2006.

13 KING, A., SCHNEIDER, B. První globální revoluce. Svět na prahu nového tisíciletí. Bradlo: Bratislava 1991, page 16.

integrated together? This is important because it does not only ask a question but it also reveals that which must be asked.

A critical analysis of the concept of multiculturalism must come from European dialogical thinking which can appreciate the self and the other, near and far, internal and external, uniformity and diversity. This type of thinking does not support an illusory and enforced unit. It does not accept the existence of a preordained range of diversity. It is an open form of linkage which means that one accepts the requirements of others, like during dialogues which are inexhaustive in their application. The dialogic character of western thinking has its origins in Socrates' dialogue. It is not an exchange of opinions or transfer of information; it is a formalization which in this sense changes all that participate in it. Modern interpretation of Plato's dialogues (Patočka, Mittelstrass etc.) distinguishes between agonal and elenctic dialogue. The aim of a sophist in an agon would be to defeat their opponent, to influence or ridicule them, to make weak opinion stronger. In an agonal dialogue the rivals' only objective is to win. Socrates' elenctic dialogue is entirely different, it is based on the negation of original non-reflective and unproblematized certainties, partners met to discuss matters and issues and the importance of the dialogue was the dialogue itself. Elenxis allows different opinions to meet together, it does not contest differences but considers the reasons for the differences, it does not accept uncritical outlandish opinion but remains open to different possibilities.

In 20th century thinking we encounter these two aspects of dialogue in the phenomenologically oriented philosophy of upbringing of B. Waldenfels, who differentiates between **responsive rationality** emerging from a creative, imaginative search for answers to unset questions (similar to Socrates' elenctic dialogue) and **communicative rationality**, supporting the objectives and rules transcending all that is the self and the other, rational arrangement, changing the different to the same, requires the expected answers and eliminates everything different.¹⁴ Similar to Waldenfeld's responsive rationality, W. Welsch speaks of **transversal understanding** – thinking which does seek a superior or inferior but a meeting and discussion.

It is a dialogue where the self encounters the other (we are most aware of what home means for us when we are far away from it), the self and the other carry on together, they are both original, like a native and foreign language they develop together, the other becomes the self (by learning a foreign language we appreciate our own language more). Both come from original separation, the self is created and evolves from the other and vice versa.

Multiculturality has a permanent place in this intellectual concept and we can nurture it for the needs of multicultural dialogue in upbringing and education. We do not set the rules of multiculturalism and we are often confronted by questions for which we have no prepared answers.

For Plato philosophy began as a dialogue, questions and answers; this tradition was continued by Husserl and Heidegger with their philosophy of intersubjectivity

¹⁴ WALDENFELS, B. *Znepokojivá zkušenost cizího*. OIKOYMENH : Praha 1998, page 16.

and mutual existence, by Buber with his concept of man being born from the I – thou relationship, by Gadamer with his response to the call of tradition and by Habermas when he speaks of verifying the claims of validity. All of these alternatives of modern philosophy express one basic feeling: once a specific logos, an understanding, loses its implicitness as a principle and space for community, the dia – in dialogue, the detachment between the partners in the dialogue wins. The part of the word inter–in intersubjectivity, joint – in joint existence and dis – in discourse indicate a certain detachment. The fact that we have highlighted this does not mean that we can control it.

The basic assumption of the capacity and restoration of a dialogue in which we do not place the unknown below the known, the different below our own is experience of the other. In reference to the previously mentioned work of Waldenfels *Znepokojivá zkušenost cizlho*, otherness is not something which is beyond us, it does not come from variation but the self and the other develop together, they are both original like a native and foreign language originating at the same time, both stem from primary distribution (Urscheidung). This endless process assumes that the other is found in the self and the self in the other. There is a mutual linkage (entrelacs), chiasmus between them. This radically other seems menacing and dangerous, it threatens our certainty and awakens a deeply embedded fear of aliens, which belongs to our individual and collective history. We also encounter the other as temptation, incitement, provocation.”¹⁵

The other is not only dangerous but as philosophers and anthropologists know all too well it is a chance for survival. It was Claude Lévi-Strauss who showed western culture has formed based on pure pragmatism which is threatened by unilateral pragmatism and advocates only the cultivation and nurturing of that which carries immediate benefits. In 19th century England a potato disease killed off a whole harvest and this ended in a famine among the poor inhabitants of the world’s most industrialized country comparable to medieval times. Cultures that are thought of as being less developed, wild and barbaric from the point of view of eurocentrism and logocentrism have strongly rooted procedures of self-preservation. Western humanity treads a wild path of experiment, misconduct and mistakes to arrive at these observations which are a central part of “backward cultures”. In recent times we invest a great amount of money into building genetic databanks which irrevocably destroy many biological genotypes. This is also true for culture.

What assumptions are needed to open a dialogue with cultures where there was once only a monologue?

If we seek these assumptions in western thinking then one of the possibilities is so-called productive thinking. In his book *Produktivní myšlení* Max Wertheimer states this classic example: two boys are playing badminton. The older one, a young Boris Becker, is playing so well that his partner cannot possibly be his opponent and all pleasure from the game soon disappears. Boris Becker of course does not

¹⁵ Ibid, page 15.

feel the pleasure of victory for very long because beating a weaker opponent brings him no satisfaction. There is only one solution: Boris suggests changing the rules, the aim of the new game is not to win but to pass the shuttlecock i.e. he changes the battle into a game (or better still into a passing game), he changes agon into elenxis. The sense of the game is not to defeat the opponent but solidarity, cooperation, and collaboration. Just as in elenctic dialogue there is a transformation in the participants, it is process of restructuring a social activity. Originally, those who were more skilled would only concentrate on their own plans and the opponent was only a means to their victory. Transformation means to look at an activity from the perspective of the loser, so in the end both cooperate to the best of their ability. The task, game, or dialogue is ambivalent – we play and work with people who oppose us, to win at all cost can mean to lose. (Wertheimer mentions in this text the habit of chess players to warn their opponent of schoolboy mistakes so that they both enjoy the game’).¹⁶ The social background of such a strategy is plain enough and it is not only about game theory.

Strategic multicultural upbringing can be established on the basis of productive thinking and conduct as an encounter with collaboration. It is known that in an environment of common interests and collaboration we do not encounter racism, xenophobia, ethnic ill feeling or intolerance of any kind. As my teacher once said to me at art school, a multicultural upbringing is not a problem. Otherness is an inspiration for everyone involved.

A similar encounter, however, expresses the fulfillment of assumptions vital for a multicultural upbringing and is without doubt the encounter with **reverence and respect**. Without these attributes it would not be possible to have a “productive type” of encounter. Reverence and respect are not based merely on a hierarchy e.g. weaker – stronger, winner – loser, team mate – opponent. The difference between reverence and respect is that reverence cannot be enforced whereas respect can, and because it cannot be enforced we are less interested in those who show reverence, who are worthy of reverence, who are capable of reverence. Jan Sokol wrote quite beautifully of this in his work *Filosofické antropologii*, where he states that a relationship with reverence must begin with man perceiving in what way someone else can excel; it may be quite an inconspicuous, normal person whose preeminence can only be seen by me. The preeminence or prominence of another in me must not arouse the shadow of envy or malevolence. This is especially difficult: whatever excels also provokes. In a person who I think highly of I also have to reveal something which I would like to resemble – reverence implies the fact that I know how far away I am from it. ... Only in this way is it possible to understand a seemingly paradoxical phenomenon: the better someone is (for example a pianist) the more they are able to appreciate people who are even better, whereas someone who knows nothing values nothing at all.”¹⁷ Reverence is always an expression of

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ SOKOL, J. *Philosophical anthropology. Man as an individual*. Portal : Prague 2002, page 182.

personal character. Even if ability belongs to the social character of man, we learn it through living with others and also we learn to appreciate ourselves. Through the personal character of the relationship of reverence there is a typical respectful and conscious detachment – the relationship of reverence leaves, in contrast to fanaticism, blind admiration or unreachd and untouched worship of e.g. personal or intimate realms. In the linguistic sphere there is a specific type of speech which values reverence but is without any familiarity and struggles to express nearness and distance, affection and detachment.

Summary

The most important realization resulting from the many different concepts of multiculturalism for us as educators is that we should not apply concepts of multiculturalism from previous historical, political or cultural assumptions.

The basic assumption for multiculturalism is culture itself (in the most original epistemological sense as *colo, colere* – cultivate, care for, educate), from the point of view of the philosophy of culture it is something which needs to be worked on, to be learnt. Multicultural upbringing in this sense is cultural upbringing, value upbringing. It builds a system of values in children which forms their identity (personal, moral, cultural, national) but avoids enclosing them within it and permits them to understand everything that affects their behavior and the behavior of others towards them. If I have to define someone, I have to understand who I am, what are my possibilities, e.g. if I want to live in Europe surrounded by an impoverished and inhospitable world knocking on my door which I am afraid to open. In this sense a multicultural upbringing is not a choice but to use Fink's definition of upbringing, i.e. *Notwendigkeit*, it is a necessity.

Multicultural upbringing as value upbringing provides understanding based on tolerance, respect, and reverence, which, as I have tried to illustrate, are fundamentally different. One of the assumptions of a multicultural upbringing is a dialogue where we pose questions and find answers together in good faith.

LITERATURE

BARŠOVÁ, A., BARŠA, P. Goodbye multiculturalism. Islamic revival causing a reversal in European integration policies. In *Lidové noviny* (People's News) from the 3rd of Sept 2005.

BĚLOHRADSKÝ, V. Twilight of multiculturalism. In *Salón. Literature periodical Práva* from the 15th of June 2006.

ERIKSON E. H. *Dětství a společnost*. ARGO : Praha 2002.

GADAMER, H.-G. *Problém dějinného vědomí*. Praha : NFÚ AV ČR, 1994. *Kam kráčíš Ameriko? Krize americké identity*. Rybka Publishers: Praha 2005.

KING, AHUNTINGTON, S. P., SCHNEIDER, B. *První globální revoluce. Svět na prahu nového tisíciletí*. Bradlo : Bratislava 1991.

- 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».