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CULTURAL INTERCOURSE PROCESS MODEL

Abstract. The main stages of the intercultural dialogue as a process are discussed in this paper. The question of the dialogue of cultures is updated according to the new culture and social situation in the world that has developed in the process of globalization. The steps in the process of cultural interaction, which in its turn leads to the logical conclusion of the interaction of cultures as a source of progress, are identified. Intercultural interaction cannot occur except through the interaction of individual worldviews. The problem of identification of an interaction mechanism in the analysis of cross-cultural interaction is considered. The problem of in what way a dialogue of cultures leads to a deepening of cultural self-development, to the mutual enrichment at the expense of other cultural experiences both within particular cultures, and across the world culture is studied. The need for dialogue between cultures is a prerequisite for survival of mankind. Interaction, dialogue of cultures in the modern world is a complex process. The need to ensure optimal interaction and dialogue of peoples and cultures in the interests of each side of this interaction is considered.
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The urgency of the research subject matter is determined by a new thinking paradigm of the XXI century – dialogic which is capable of elaborating a relevant to modern cultural processes model of the dialogue of cultures in the context of the fundamental principle of “unity in diversity”. In conditions of the global mankind disintegration the problem of intercultural dialogue development has become vitally important for mankind surviving and that is not why in the branch of culture the most modern mankind problems are observed and because as the culture is the most and communicative form of independence. That is the reason that the culture has the high-powered potential which makes it possible to overcome dangerous problems in the social mankind structure.
The development and enriching of the cultural tolerant interaction experience, the elaboration of strategic projects of the cultural dialogue and using their examples the development of practical decisions, creation of international institutes which aid in the dialogue of cultures, all the above are concrete methods of the dialogic cultural development. The paper urgency is caused by the necessity of the cultural and logical definition of trends, of the cultural transformation in conditions of the dialogue of cultures. It is conceivable that the problem of the cultural dialogue is the topical one in terms of the national culture protection and cultural achievements from tendencies to mankind culture homogeneity.

At present, process investigation of cultures and civilizations interaction in the context of modern global tendencies integration / disintegration is one of the hottest culturology directions, as to study of complicated and diverse-oriented processes going, on in the world. A new cultural and social situation which is established in the process of globalism makes more active the question about the dialogue of cultures.

The whole mankind history is the dialogue which runs through all life and it is a method of the execution of communication connections a condition of people mutual understanding. Interaction of cultures, their dialogue is the best basis for development of inter-ethnic, international relations. And vice versa when there are inter-ethnic tensions and all the more, inter-ethnic conflicts in the society, because of this, the dialogue between cultures is more sophisticated, interaction of cultures maybe limited through the interethnic tension of concrete carriers of these cultures.

Culture interaction processes are more complicated than simple «transference» of achievements of highly developed culture into less developed one and in its turn it logically determined conclusions about interaction of cultures as the contributor of progress.

The purpose of the paper. At present, the problem of the culture boundary, its kernel and the culture dialogue process model are actively studied. The dialogue is an active interaction of subjects equal in rights. The interaction of cultures and civilizations makes provision for the team-work of general culture values. The dialogue of cultures may be that pacificatory factor which averts conflict beginnings,
it can take away tension, to create the atmosphere of confidence and mutual respect. The dialogue conception is especially currently central for the modern culture. The process of interaction in itself is the dialogue and interaction forms are diverse types of dialogic relations. The dialogue idea comes into being in the profound past. According to Danilevskiy’s theory, cultures are developed in its own right and at the beginning they are hostile to each other. The foundation of all these distinctions to his opinion is «spirit of people».

«The dialogue is intercourse with the culture, realization and representation of its achievements, revealing and the understanding of values of other cultures, appropriation of the rest, a possibility of taking down political tension between states and its ethnic groups. It is the needed condition of a scientific search for the truth and the creation process in art. The dialogue is the understanding of «the ego» and intercourse with the rest. It is versatile and community of the dialogue is a matter of common knowledge.» [8, p.9]

Ancient India culture texts are filled with the unity idea of cultures and nations, macro and micro space, thoughts about that human health depends on, in many cases, quality of interrelation with environment, realizing, beauty force, understanding as world representation in out being.

The dialogue problems were studied by ancient Greek philosophers-sophists: Sokrat, Platon, Aristotel philosophers of the Hellenism epoch. The dialogic spaciousness was defined by them on the basis of the spirit culture, recognition of pluralistic thoughts, standpoints equal is rights principles which are common to all mankind, freedom and a value of a personality and the society in general. In the Middle Ages the dialogue was mainly used in moral aims. The Abelyars philosophic treatise «Yes and No» [11 22] is internally dialogic one. And in his other work «Dialogue between a philosopher, an Israelite and Christian» he foresaw the dialogue not only confessions but and cultures.

Although, the dialogue as the form of intercourse common to all mankind exists for a long time but in the right way problems of dialogic relations were studied by German philosophers: I. Kant, I. Phikhte, F. Shelling as well as problems of a subject and its cognized possibilities, subjective and inter-subjective relations.
Developing Phikhte’s ideas about difference and interconditionality of «I» and «other» L. Pheyberbakh began investigations of the dialogue in the early 20th century. I. Gerder considered interaction of cultures by a mode of preserving culture diversity. Culture reservation results in the culture death. However, to his mind, changes must be no contact with the culture «Kernel».

Modern cultures have been formed as the result of numerical and prolonged cultural interaction. In the historical sense the address to the dialogue is always scientific change evidence. The origination of the dialogue in the antiquity certified a fact that mythical knowledge changed into philosophical and discursive, critical.

Dialogues of Renaissance indicate that the new paradigm a new type of knowledge is formed. The modern culture also begins to turn to a new type of the human being in the culture. In XX century the culture moves the epicenter of the human being which is carried out in all spheres of life.

The dialogue of cultures is intercourse of unique and general personalities, the dominating idea of it is not cognition but inter-understanding. «In the profound text idea of the dialogue of cultures a new culture of intercourse is formed. Thinking and being of the other person are not only profound, in each of us it is the other thinking, knowledge which are internally vital for our being». [4, p. 80] In the modern world the dialogue of cultures is more complicated through the complex of circumstances.

Modern manifestations of fundamental problems are associated with the culture interaction of different nations.

The peculiarity of their determination is in the systematic dialogue of cultures, and not one even if this culture has attained success. «Determination of these problems foresees such globalism of interaction of cultures in space, and time, when the reality becomes self-realization of all and every culture via interaction of all with each and each with all the rest». Thus the mechanism of interaction of cultures itself is problematic.

In a process of intercourse in the contact situation of two cultures they exchange texts.

The model of this process of intercourse is as follows:

\[ A \rightarrow T \rightarrow P \rightarrow KP \]
In the scheme A – an author of a text, a participant of communication; P – text recipient, the second participant of communication, T – a culture text for its help the control is carried out; KP – cultural space, where intercultural intercourse is performed; the chain A – T – P denotes a process of intercourse.

A Gordienko justly thinks: «As a consequence of it that the globalism of intercultural interactions reason such completeness of the sense world up to taking part in it individuals, which has its origin only in a point of intersection of all cultural images, an individual goes out for individual private boundaries into the cultural space, infinite intercourse based on the principle, thus, in infinite re-comprehension of that, who he is himself. This process creates precisely that direct perspective of the human history». [5, p.76,78]

In as much as the spirit culture is intimately connected with religion, thus, the dialogue of cultures is not simply interaction of nations and their profound mystic connection, deep-rooted in religion. [7, p.20]

Thus, the dialogue of cultures is not feasible without the dialogues of religions and, the dialogue which occurs in the middle of religions. And purity of the dialogue is an affair of conscience. The real dialogue is always freedom of thought, judgments and intuition. The dialogue reminds the pendulum which if it walks away, the dialogue is carried on. The apostle Pavlo said: «It is incumbent to be with difference of opinions, to find out the most skilful from you» (1 kor.11:19).

The dry formal logic, linear, reasoning are sometimes alien and hostile to the spirit world. One-sided rationalism contains danger of simplified or erroneous conclusion. In connection with this in medieval monks there was the proverb: «devil-logic».

As the form of conversation the dialogue foresees corresponding community of space, and time, joint emotional experience with the purpose to understand an interlocutor, to find with him a common language. The dialogue can be a form of religion and philosophical thought (for example, Platon`s dialogues) and spirit revelation. In the ideal dialogue all interlocutors listen to a voice from a mountain, conscience, the truth of the whole. If the truth of the whole is not formed, this is
testimony to the dialogue of deafs-and-dumb, that is, it is a pseudo-dialogue, or its absence.

The complexity and significance of the dialogue give inexhaustible possibilities for its study. The classic of the dialogue theory is Martin Buber. The central idea of his philosophy-being is as the dialogue, between God and a man, a man and the world.

The dialogue with creator is life-saving when it is realized through the meditation of God, his commandments about morals and love. It is in this dialogue that vitality of God himself is revealed.

The foundation of the M. Buber’s conception is a dialogic principle. The man finds his own main point when he is used by all connected with humanity correlating himself with other people. Dialogue problems were studied in sociolinguistics (L. Shcherba, L. Iakubinskyi), literature and philosophical hermeneutics (Kh. Gadamer), phenomenology (Km. Gusserl, M. Mamaldashvili) fundamental ontology (M. Khaidegger), study of literature and semiotics (A. Averintsev, M.Bakhtin, M.Lakshin, Iu.Lotman), fundamentals of communication (A. Mol, V. Borev). Interaction of cultures was investigated by K. Levi-Stross, G. Khershkovets, S. Artanovskyi, S. Arutiunov, B. Jerasov, L. Ilonin, N. Ikonnikova. Inter-cultural intercourse makes up in a process of subject intersections which are built by language action. According to Kh. Gadamer the dialogue is original application of our own way and an alien way.

Inter-cultural interactions can’t go on differently than via interactions of individual ways of thinking. The most important problem during time of an analysis of the inter-cultural interaction is mechanism reveal of interactions.

There are two types of interactions:

1) cultural straight line, when cultures interact one with other owing to intercourse at the level of a language;

2) crooked line, when basic characteristics of interaction are its dialogizing, the dialogue, in so doing is carried out is the middle of the culture in the composition of its own structure.
The inocultural content has dual state and as «an alien part» and as for «a friendly part». Thus, interdependence and interpenetration of cultures is the result of out-of-straight interaction; the dialogue of the culture with himself, the dialogue with «a friendly part» and «an alien part» (it has a dual nature). The heart of dialogizing is in productive interaction of sovereign positions, elements of the united and versatile sense space and the general culture.

The first consideration what differentiates dialogizing from soliloquizing is the quest for the understanding of interrelations different views, ideas, phenomena, social forces. The philosophical dialogue is a possibility of various, as to quality, interpretations of philosophical paradigms. The dialogue is the whole complex of interactions with the help of it a joint of thinkers is formed. The philosopher, accumulating alien ideas, creates a real image. This sign was emphasized by Kh. Ortega-i-Gasset indicating that all philosophers are interpreted as an united philosopher who had been living allegedly two thousands and a half years.

The dialogue which bears in mind the idea of the culture and it is well to beat in mind the idea of the culture and it goes without saying it is in principle, inexhaustible. «The dialogue is only the dialogue in the special case when it can perform as infinite development and formation, all along new styles of everyone who takes part in the dialogue as the cultural phenomen. In a process of the complicated multi-layer dialogue of cultures the formation of values, which are common to all mankind is carried out». [6. p 141]

The concept of «unity» is important for the dialogue of cultures. S. Artanovskiy thinks that the concept of unity should not be considered metaphysically, as full homogeneity or indivisibility. «Historical unity of cultures doesn’t imply their identity that is full recurrence of phenomena. The unity means integrity, fundamental community, predominance of internal connections between elements of this structure over external ones. We speak, for example, about the unity of the Solar system which, however, must be aware of element plurality of its worlds. The world culture, from this point of view, forms the unity, which has a structure to be situated in two measurements – special (ethnographical) and temporary (ethno historical)». [1, p.43]
The interaction methodology of cultures, in addition, to the dialogue of cultures, was developed in M. Bakhtin’s works. The dialogue according to Bakhtin is mutual understanding those who takes part in this process and, at the same time, preservation of his thought, his in the others (confluence with him) and distance preservation (his place).[2,p.430] «The dialogue is always development, interaction, unification but not separation, it is an index of the general society culture. The dialogue is not a means and as an end it itself. To exist means to contact dialogically. When the dialogue is over, everything is over. Thus, the dialogue can’t properly be over as it must not be finished». [3,p.433]

According to M. Bakhtin, each culture exists only in intercourse with other culture and great phenomena in the culture occur only in the dialogue of different cultures in a point of intersection.

The ability of one culture masters achievements of the others is one of the contributor of vital functions. «The alien culture only in the other cultures eyes discovers itself in full measure and more profound. One sense reveals its profundities, meeting and coming across with the other side the alien contents..., between them the dialogue begins allegedly, which overcomes reticence and homogeneity of these senses these cultures... In such dialogic meeting of two cultures they are not combined and mixed up and they are mutually enriched». [2, p. 354]

The inheritance of the alien culture or complete unreceptiveness of it should give up the place to the dialogue. For both sides the dialogue of two cultures can be fruitful. «We raise new questions to the alien culture, which it didn’t raise itself, seek for answers our questions, and the alien culture answers us revealing before us new its sides, new sense profundities». [2, p. 355]

According to M. Bakhtin the dialogue can have definite heritages:

1. Synthesis combination of different points of views or positions into one common.

2. In a case of the dialogic meeting of two cultures, they are not combined, and mixed up, each preserves its unity and open integrity, but they are mutually enriched. [2, p. 360]
3. The dialogue enhances the understanding of the fundamental differences between participants of this process, when the more differentiation, the better but kind-hearted differentiation without fights and boundaries.

V. Sagatovskii singles out and the fourth possible heritage of the unsuccessful dialogue «to come to an agreement have not been possible, positions proved to be incompatible, important interests were violated, it is possible (and sometimes, a necessary condition) non-dialogic intercourse of parts». [9, p.22]

Dialogue obstacles can be different orientation of the value system which, commonly adds complexity, and some cultures don't alway contact with other cultures.

Conclusions. The interest is the beginning of the dialogue. The dialogue of cultures is the necessity of interaction, mutual aid, mutual enrichment. The dialogue of cultures is objective necessity and the development condition of cultures. In the dialogue of cultures the mutual understanding is provided and the understanding envisages unity, similarity, identity.

Thus, the dialogue of cultures is possible only on the basis of an understanding, but only on thee basis of individuality in each culture. In general agreement that combines an human cultures is their social status, that is, human and humane.

«The mutual understanding of centuries and milleniums, people nations and cultures provide complicated unity of all man kind, all human cultures, complicated unity of the human literature» (the same, p.390).

There is no single world culture but there is unity of all human cultures, which provides «complicated unity of all mankind» – humanistic beginning. The impact of one culture upon another one is realized only in that case, if there exist necessary conditions for such impact. The dialogue of two cultures is possible only in the case of definite approach of their cultural codes, availability or origin of general mentality.

The dialogue of cultures is the penetration into the system of values of this culture or another – one, respect for them overcoming, stereotypes, the synthesis of original and innovational, which is responsible for mutual enrichment and access to
the world cultural context. In the dialogue of culture it is important to perceive values of interacted cultures which are common to all mankind.

One of basic objective contradictions inherent to cultures of all nations of the world is the contradiction of development of national cultures and their approaches. Thus, the necessity of the dialogue of cultures is the condition of self – preservation of mankind and for motion of the spirit unity is a result of the dialogue of modern cultures.

The dialogue of cultures can be of assistance in upgrading of cultural self – development, mutual enrichment to another cultural experience as in the context of definite cultures as at the scales of the world culture. Interaction, the dialogue of cultures in the modern world is a complicated process and entirely possible, sometimes, painful. It is necessary to assure the optimal interaction between the dialogue of nations and cultures in the interests of each parts of this process.
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