



Contents lists available at Canadian Scientific Journal

## Canadian Scientific Journal

journal homepage: [www.sccjournal.net](http://www.sccjournal.net)



# Philosophical fundamentals of polycultural dialogue re-semantization: methodologeme and sense search

Troitskaya Tamara<sup>1,\*</sup>, Troitskaya Olena<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Melitopol State Pedagogical University named after Bohdan Khmelnytsky, Melitopol, Ukraine

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Philosophy Education and Science, National Pedagogical Dragomanova University, Kyiv, Ukraine

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 6 October 2014

Received in revised form 5 November 2014

Accepted 11 November 2014

#### Keywords:

Discourse

Dialectics

Dialogue

Human dimension

Culture level

Maieutics, polycultural dialogue

Dialogue sense

### ABSTRACT

Among all scientific tasks of modern poly-functional, harmony developed person development the founding of dialoguiness implementation by a personality as nature feature has to be considered the most important one and the organization of polycultural dialogue has to be considered as the theoretical-methodological and practical purpose. Determining the role of the dialogue and dialoguiness it is very difficult to overestimate their role as well as underestimate the necessity of these phenomena essence clarification. In great experience of dialogue comprehension there are a lot of interpretations of its essence and content with reference to phenomenon polysemy instead of the exact definition.

For dialogue re-semantization, in particular polycultural one, and its return into the area of senses it is necessary for contemporary humanistics to address to dialogue reflexion by prominent philosophers of the past and today, in particular to the methodologemes of dialogue purposes, content and organization. We outline these guidelines as the search of cognitive process gradual development mechanisms, enrichment of subject dialogue interaction with new (proper and other) ideas as correction of view points (disputable and opposite ones), as means of personality maxims implementation and their conformation with social imperatives and also dialogue raising to sense comprehension of people co-existence, consensual ethics of co-world.

© 2014 Canadian Scientific Journal. All Rights reserved

## 1. Introduction

Nowadays the contemporary humanistics is facing two principal tasks: the first one is to unite the huge experimental material accumulated for centuries into one theory which allows understanding the human behavior; the second one is to implement the concepts of innovative, full-featured, dialogue human development into scientific view about the world.

\* Corresponding author at: Melitopol State Pedagogical University named after Bohdan Khmelnytsky

Lenyna st., 20, Melitopol, 72312, Ukraine

E-mail addresses: [troizka@ukr.net](mailto:troizka@ukr.net) (T. Troitskaya)

That is a person who is able to live and be happy in rapidly changed events, civilization challenges, complicated, multi-optional, amphiboles and controversial natural and social-spiritual environment. These tasks have to be based on the new methodology of new knowledge obtaining and also exploring new (proper) assessments of projects, mechanisms of life activity in the polycultural world by a human.

Thus, contemporary humanistics addressing to the problem of human dialogueness is not excessive; with the help of dialogue Homo scientis (knowledgeable) will grow into Homo sapiens (wise); a human will enter the area of the mankind's huge experience interpretations, the area of diversification thinking and the world of authentic ideas and approaches; the mystery of "Other" for a man is revealed in dialogue communication which will enrich the inter-subjectivity of a man; in the dialogue the actualization of people co-existence and the fundamentally important phenomenon of full people co-existence – a meeting - due to which people's destinies cross and inter-perception of the people world micro-spaces takes place. According to E. Andros, the most important mechanism of civilized arrangement of modern human existence is being worked out through the dialogue. Namely alienation minimization is carried out in practice in the today society which often atomizes the human existence and makes a man alone and withdrawn (Andros 2004).

At the same time as polycultural dialogue, intercultural dialogue, area dialogization, polycultural education, discourse and others are used as notions, terms and even categories which likely reflect one phenomenon. So there is an urgent necessity to determine at least the meanings of these notions and free them from connotations, falsifications and non-intellectual layers.

## **2. Objectives.**

In extremely limited volume of the article on the basis of encyclopedia editions widely used by humanistics representatives we will try to clarify some moments of both essential and existential content of reflexion of the dialogue in the polycultural society. The discovery of phenomenon essence will enable its interpretation as a phenomenon and an activity and ensure the true orientation to the constructive action.

## **3. Methods.**

On the basis of reconstruction of the most important concepts of past philosophical thought concerning the polycultural dialogue the complex of research analytical methods and techniques as well as methodological tools of phenomena study (convention, conceptualization etc.) was used.

## **4. Results.**

Starting the analysis of the dialogue essence it is necessary to mention that almost all dictionaries uncover it as a conversation, a talk, problem telling, an utterance exchange etc., indicating the Greek origin of the notion "dialogue" (dialogos). In this comprehension there is the necessity to tell about some terminological interpretations that the notions acquire in concrete-scientific thesauruses as a separate genre in literature including philosophical one, or as one form of art to conduct a talk (Contemporary Philosophy 1957). It also interpreted as a way of the progressive development of cognitive process when the movement to the desired result is carried out by the way of interaction, points of view that are different to some extent (Rapatsevich 2005), or forms of communication between people when the sense is changed depending on

the purpose of communication (Bulatov 2009) and other. Namely this reduction and fragmentation allow almost all talks that are non-constructive in consensus search to be as a dialogue.

Emphasizing the functional mission of a dialogue, in particular its defining as the purpose-ideal (a consciously chosen image of the anticipated result) and as a mechanism of the environment changing, as a mechanism of endless process of new purposes creating (purpose-laying) it is the time to turn to the thoughts of dialogue founders – Socrates and his followers.

Socrates and pupils (primarily Plato) evolved the dialogue to its high degree of perfection on the basis of clearing the essence of one or other notions with help of questions and answers where the most important thing was not only knowledge itself but wisdom as lifestyle, as its sense (how to live, according to which notions).

The essence of Socrates' dialogue can be presented in comparison with philosophizing of thinkers of that time and the next epochs:

- as opposed to dogmatic presenting of the philosophical teaching Socrates searched the truth;
- he considered a man and his morale as the only interesting subject of a dialogue, while the majority of philosophers had interest in natural philosophy;
- Socrates determined the consideration and disproof of many answers on the essence of the good, evil, fairness etc. as the main purpose of a dialogue; this process had to go on until "the correct answer" was found from the point of view of the dialogue leader; the other philosophers, in particular sophists, were satisfied by the rhetorical effect;
- according to Socrates, the definition of the discussed subject denied the relativist comprehension of the truth; according to sophists, the truth was almost always relative.

Not taking into account the rhetorical (only rhetorical) effect, Socrates constructed answers as a logical operation where the dialectics plays the main role – the art of the anthropological content which continues maieutics (from Greek) – literally the midwife art. Socrates compared his method of philosophizing with this one and thought that helping the truth birth in other people he continued the work of his mother, the midwife Fenarete, in morale sphere (Bulatov 2009).

Since those times the dialogue has been changed terminologically and conceptually according to many scholars (M. Bulatov, V. Tancher, V. Andruschenko and others) and it was developed by M. Buber, M. Bakhtin, K. Apel, Ju. Habermas. The last ones comprehended the dialogues as the discourse within communication ethics, as the theoretical-analytical procedure, as the way of scientific analysis of problem complex emphasizing the sober, logical, notional elements; and the analysis means upon the condition of adding with different approaches, interpretation penetration, value correlation and rhetorical strength. But to our point of view, its primary (essential) purposes-eidos and the dialogue content as a dialectics form, the definition of notions as a method of the truth finding out are beyond the phenomena comprehension and they were transformed into the analysis of many existentialists.

The comprehension of the dialogue was greatly enriched by L. Feuerbach, "in formulation of development tendencies of new time philosophy he focused on the necessity of theology transforming to anthropology, in particular the God transforming to the Mind and the Mind transforming to the Man. At the same time he was trying to create new religion the principle of which is "a man to a man is the God", and their main connection is love. Moreover, he "presented the principle of dialogue dialectics – the dialogue "I - You" – opposed to monologue dialectics of Hegel" (Feuerbach 1955).

Nevertheless, remembering Socrates who considered human problems worth of dialectics attention, it should be mentioned that he was the first who laid the praxeological foundations of the dialogue as a logical operation and the way of philosophizing and even "midwife" art of the truth birth in other people (maieutics).

That is exactly why taking into account requirements, in the basis of the analysis of today researches, according to A. Maydanov, E. Andros, V. Boychenko, M. Bulatov, it is necessary to mark the dialogue essence in the modern polycultural world:

- a dialogue is the form of gradual development of cognitive process when the movement to the desired result is fulfilled by the way of interaction of various viewpoints, approaches, trends which do not contradict each other. At the same time the interaction is having the character of advancing mobile movement which ensures the progress of cognitive process in certain way. So each act of interaction gives the birth to more optimal results or more considerable and direct pre-conditions to correlate the desired one for the future similar acts. Besides, in the dialogue interaction the understanding of one's dialogue viewpoint by another one takes place and that involves clarification, correction, improvement, development and enrichment with proper ideas;

- as the means of scientific creativity a dialogue performs several functions simultaneously: function of search optimization (its variety encouragement); correction function which is reflected in mutual detailing and interacting viewpoint correction; synthesize function which plays the role of the consolidation means of obtained interaction results ( Rapatsevich 2005);

- since a dialogue is changed depending on the communication purpose, the polycultural dialogue is becoming increasingly important one directed towards peaceful and productive development of the mankind and represented in the modern conditions as the communication of various unique cultures. It should be acknowledged that without the "dialectic dialogue" it is impossible to prevent the destruction of cultures as a whole, the acquisition of some cultures by more technically developed ones and, moreover, - the encouragement of culture keeping, the augmentation of cultural heritage and the creation of a "cultural circle";

- a dialogue on the basis of responsibility ethics confirmation is worth attention; it has replaced the educational ethics – the ethics of abstract duty – which discredited itself during the last century and which "was unable to help under the conditions of endless wars (inter-state, civil, world), terrible practice of totalitarian regimes, ethnic cleansing etc., under the conditions of catastrophic value loss of human dignity and proper life, personal people existence" (Andros 2004).

This dialogue can be considered as the ethics of community discourse, its fundamental principles and norms are not external for a man, but they are maxims and the result of inter-subjective, mutually coordinated expression of the will.

The principally important in this context is the understanding of proper notion "culture" (Latin culture – processing, education, development, mastering), from its literally comprehension to the combination of ways and means of arrangement, the implementation and search of people life activity senses as well as the combination of material and spiritual acquisitions and time and space localized social-historical formations (by B. Boychenko) (Andruschenko, Gorlach 1997).

## **5. Conclusions.**

Realizing the many-sidedness of all kinds of a dialogue and the actuality and the significance of the polycultural dialogue undoubtedly, it is necessary to know that their context expansion (even with the help of discourse suggested by Ju. Habermas, F. Grebner, V. Schmidt, Y. Henkel and others; which has to be fulfilled on the basis of rational impartiality, without giving preferences to one or other values) is impossible without turning to Socrates understanding of a dialogue. It means that into the basis of polycultureness it is necessary to lay the principle of pluralism, recognition of parity and equal rights of all ethnical, social, political,

age, religious, confessional groups, to our mind, in the case if they do not allow elements of discrimination by signs of one or another belonging. Moreover, a dialogue cannot be opened around the truth search unless we “address” to Socrates, his morality, human philosophy or we recognize the human dimension and the human measurability of the intercultural dialogue in the modern context as criteria of the culture level; hence the self-perfection of man’s will, his faithfulness to cultural values (Socrates dreamt about this). For the sense comprehension we suggest to add the operational organization and the consideration of the culture level of the dialogue subjects and the definition level in science, practice of dialogue theme and also the direct contemporary humanistic researches for recognition of transgressiveness, contextuality, reflexiveness as the methodological foundations of scientific search and the organization of the dialogue interaction.

## **References**

1. Andros E. (2004). Communicative nature of human existence. Philosophy: Man’s World. Kyiv. p. 225-245.
2. Andruschenko V., Gorlach M. (1997). Social Philosophy: Brief Encyclopedic Dictionary. Kyiv-Kharkiv. 400p.
3. Bulatov M. (2009). Philosophical Dictionary. Kyiv. 515p.
4. Contemporary Philosophy: Dictionary and Reading book (1957). Rostov-na-Donu. 511p.
5. Feuerbach L. (1955). Main fundamentals of Philosophy of future. Vol.1. Moscow. 136p.
6. Rapatsevich E. (2005). Pedagogy: Big modern encyclopedia. Minsk. 720p.