

~~~

УДК +130.2+7.01

## Principles of Humanitarian Paradigm of Intercultural Communication Development

Valeria E. Budenkova\* and Elena N. Savelieva

*Tomsk State University  
36 Lenin, Tomsk, 634050, Russia*

Received 22.11.2012, received in revised form 21.01.2014, accepted 12.04.2014

*A serious problem of the present-day globalizing world is the inability of “unrelated” cultures to have a dialogue, which leads to many local and global conflicts, escalating tension in inter-ethnic and inter-religious relationships. The contradictions of sociocultural reality can be studied from the humanitarian perspective which will help to reveal the specificity of globalization processes within cultural space. The article’s authors sharing this idea analyze the theoretical basics for development of a new humanitarian paradigm. Its relevance is determined by the need to form attitudes of a “globalization era human” whose system of values is able to assure progressive interaction of sociocultural systems. The article describes such important factors of intercultural relationships development as the acknowledgment of cultural uniqueness and increase of culture communicative potential. The results of the analysis make it possible to substantiate the significance of communicative competence and tolerance as the key principles of a new type of thinking helping to create favorable conditions for the dialogue of cultures under the conditions of objective integration of the mankind.*

*Keywords: globalization, humanitarian paradigm, national and cultural identity, local culture, tolerance, communicative potential of cultures, communicative competence, intercultural communication, communicative behavior.*

\*\*\*

The contradictions of the sociocultural reality of the 21st century require thorough analysis and working out of mechanisms making it possible to minimize the risks caused by globalization processes. The “effects” of globalization include, on the one hand, increasing of the mutual dependence and mutual influence of states; on the other hand, localization and determination to preserve cultural identity at any costs. Under such conditions the ability of cultures to conduct a dialogue is especially important. Just as the dynamics and nature of culture communicative

“behavior” are determined by its subject, so the stability and balance of the global world are driven by the world outlook of a modern man. The present-day social and political reality, despite the endeavors of governments in different countries and regions, demonstrates escalation of inter-ethnic conflicts, which, in its turn, leads to the appearance of a new type of thinking that changes the paradigm of intercultural communication. A long-simmering problem is the need of the “globalization era man” concept aimed at a constructive dialogue between countries and communities. The absence of

such concept, as well as the lack of attention to the analysis of qualities characterizing global thinking negates the effectiveness of relationships between cultures.

The described problematic context determines the objective of this article dedicated to the analysis of theoretical basics for working out of a new humanitarian paradigm and its key principles. The authors concentrate on such characteristics of thinking of a new type personality living under the conditions of global integration as communicative competence and tolerance. The authors believe in the special role of the humanities both in understanding of globalization and in formation of the world outlook of the 21st century man. The conceptual framework of this attitude is based on the studies in which the effect of globalization on culture is analyzed (J. Derrida, S. Huntington, M.T. Stepanyants, M.A. Muntyan, M.A. Cheshkov), as well as the works studying the communicative nature of sociocultural reality (A.Y. Antonovskiy, A.V. Nazarchuk, G.I. Petrova) and the problems of intercultural relationships in a global society (R. Baumeister, P. Bourdieu, N.N. Fedotova etc.).

It is known that technological and economic approach overshadows the cultural components of the world homogenization which can be conceptualized primarily within the framework of humanitarian discourse. It is the humanities that act as a theoretical and methodological basis in studying such “effects” of globalization as unification of sociocultural development, increasing localization of national and cultural identity, tension in national relationships, non-productiveness of communication. We believe that understatement of such problems considerably narrows the area of search for effective mechanisms of intercultural dialogue. Favorable conditions for solving these problems can provide world outlook attitudes meeting the challenges of the modern world. It is time a new

type personality appeared able to adapt to fast-changing conditions, as much as possible sensitive to the expansion of information environment, and – which is especially important – able to build relationships based on the principles of respect, openness, tolerance and readiness for a dialogue. In this connection it is appropriate to discuss the formation of a new humanitarian paradigm integrating the knowledge and experience of different disciplines in understanding the realia of the global world and destined not only to explain changes occurring in the world system, but also to determine the world outlook of the 21st century man.

Before specifying the key principles of the said paradigm, we are going to describe the specific character of studying globalization from the humanitarian perspective.

#### **Globalization in the context of humanitarian thought**

The variety of ideas about globalization explains the wideness of the conceptual spectrum in which this notion is used acquiring its meaning in the context of this or that subject area, scientific school or national tradition. The situation is also complicated by the lack of coordination in understanding of the object or process of this action in different languages requiring justification of conceptual apparatus [5]. A considerable amount of works dedicated to the essence of globalization as a process changing the structural and functional organization of the modern world concentrates on the understanding of its political and economic aspects. This basis allows them to suggest definitions contextualized by the researchers’ interest to the establishment of global economy and formation of a new world order under the conditions of economic integration. In this context, globalization is viewed as increasing interconnection and interdependence of national states and regions forming the world

community, their gradual integration into the unified system with common rules and standards of economic, political and cultural behavior. An important point completing the characteristic of present-day globalization processes is their scientific and technological component. The basis of globalization is considered to be a new scientific paradigm of world development leading to universalization of post-industrial and information-oriented society and influencing the development of the world economy, finance, telecommunication systems and science.

As opposed to the approach described above, culturological interest does not fit into the framework of understanding globalization as a process that is driven *primarily* by economic and technological progress of the last decades. Due to culturology, studies of other (not only commercial) forms of human activity contribute to the analysis of formation of a unified financial and economical space. The view of “globalization effects” in this case is not limited «the circulation of persons, commodities, modes of production, and socio-political models on a market that is being opened in a more-or-less regulated way» [4, p. 371]. The cultural components of the assumed world homogenization are particularly important. The ideology of culturological approach is based on the idea that globalization has a multi-level composition forming an integral financial-legal-political-informational framework within which all activity, including cultural, takes place. In this connection, it is no coincidence that the notion of “culture globalization” appeared reflecting the theoreticians’ concern about the integrity of culture in its value aspects under the conditions of planetary integration and homogenization. Culturology understands “culture globalization” as: i) formation of unified integrated frameworks manifested in morals, art, communication, way of life, behavior stereotypes; ii) cultural and historical process of development and coming

together of national cultures on the basis of universal human values; iii) establishment of local identities under the conditions of global community formation.

Today, no one disputes the complex nature of the problem itself and the necessity of interdisciplinary approach in studying globalization processes. In fact, many disciplines contribute to the understanding of globalization: economy, social science, political science, philosophy, culturology etc. Not only every such discipline suggests its own interpretation of globalization, but many new, “hybrid”, disciplines appear [8]. However, the mission of the humanities lies in the adequate analysis, estimation and interpretation of globalization processes taking place in the cultural domain which are radically different from their economic and political topology. The cultural components of homogenization of the modern world conceptualized, primarily, within the framework of humanitarian discourse are of particular importance [6].

For example, the readiness to acknowledge the uniqueness of cultures can be considered a characteristic of global thinking manifested in culture. This important point emphasizing the significance of all world processes for individual human living makes it possible to solve the issue of cultural identification from the perspective of cultural difference as priority, and not of global unification aggravating the problems of identity on a national, confessional and language levels.

Such position is especially important in view of the contradictory trends: formation of new integrity of the world and heterogenization processes. The increase of human systematic interrelatedness in economy, politics, culture and art at the turn of the 20th- 21st centuries is unmistakable both for supporters and opponents of globalization. As important is the fact that convergence is accompanied by a reverse process:

the more there are factors promoting unification and universalization in economy, politics and social sphere, the stronger are the fragmentation and separation trends, the more evident is the urge to preserve uniqueness in the ethnocultural context of human existence. "The general movement of globalization towards integrative transboundary space activates the opposite movement for preservation and strengthening of local area borders, determination to form a united center, dedication to multiplicity and diversity of local centers. Such struggle of opposites is typical for the state of culture under the conditions of increasing globalization in the sphere of civilization" [7, p. 32].

In most cases researchers do not overstate the ambiguity of the globalization "effects" viewing them as two sides of one and the same process, as complementary and mutually supporting phenomena. But perhaps they are making a mistake just passively looking at the struggle the result of which can not be predicted. Humanitarian thought warns that just as opposite processes are the ontological characteristic of the globalizing world, so it is necessary that their development should be balanced, which will provide for the stability of modern culture. Without acknowledgment and support of the value of uniqueness the stability and sustainability of cultural identity in the situation of world homogenization is not so obvious. For example, the importance of local cultures is put into question in the world where the relationships between the center and periphery are the relationships between those who act and those who only react. Such is the logic of the predatory "new globalization" (so-called "westernization") from the point of view of researchers fearing the expansion of the "western" society model and adjustment of the world to the needs of this model [3]. Jacques Derrida, in his turn, seeing in globalization the cultural strategy of the West

aimed at subjugation and enslavement of "other", non-Western, non-civilized, non-human cultures, disputes its "ideal image" as opening of the borders and making the world more integral and homogeneous.

Anyhow, humanitarian thought asserts the importance of the unique in the global space and the meaning of the whole variety of cultural phenomena for the world community. From the point of view of humanitarian discourse, globalization within cultural space has a special character and can not be reduced to the trends of unification, loss of culture national uniqueness, and leveling of artistic and aesthetical world outlook processes. On the contrary, traditional forms of culture and ethnonational values arouse intense interest, and there is a pronounced tendency of preserving national and cultural specificity. Moreover, as the sociocultural reality becomes more complicated, the possibility of its "probability structures" increases, which leads, in its turn, to the multiplicity of identities [7]. Cultural identification acquires a variative character the reason for which is the necessity to interpret the cultural development models of other communities and to match up to them. A concept is formed that allows for coexistence of multiple identities as a possible form of new world model structuring that is acceptable for cultural framework. Based on this concept, it is possible to predict the actualization and growth of the number of local cultures. At the same time, such diversity of national and cultural identities requires new communicative conditions and behavior models. Along with emerging opportunities, there appears the problem of intercultural communication.

**Communicative competence  
as a principle  
of the new humanitarian paradigm**

Understanding the role of local cultures is necessary, but not enough – reality forces to

take into account the different degrees of their readiness for a dialogue. Based on this, the present-day humanitarian thought, apart from acknowledging the uniqueness of cultures, pays special attention to their communicative potential. Those local cultures that are ready to adapt to modern conditions must have a necessary communicative potential, i.e. ability to engage in a dialogue, to establish connections and relationships with other cultures and to develop under their influence while preserving its own identity.

The authors of this article believe that the communicative potential of any culture is characterized by the presence and correlation of two necessary qualities: stability (sustainability) and variability (adaptiveness) [2]. Communicative stability means that a culture has a high communicative potential if it retains its core (basic values, meanings, traditions) in a dialogue with other cultures. Communicative variability demonstrates the ability of a culture to adapt and to develop in constantly changing conditions. The more flexible, “responsive” and dynamic a culture is, the higher is its communicative potential. Thus, the communicative potential of a culture depends on the degree of manifestation of both mentioned qualities (stability and variability).

However, it should be noted that it applies only to an ideal culture model. In reality certain cultures (national, local, regional) are often characterized by one dominating quality or trend: striving for stability which is achieved by limitation of communication and communicative space, or variability which can lead to the loss of identity. Limitation of dialogue and attempts to control communicative processes are characteristic of closed-type cultures and subcultures having their own ideology or aimed at completing a certain “mission”. As a rule, it is the ritual and ritual behavior that are important in such cultures (subcultures) based on the

hierarchical principle with a clearly determined place, role and function of people. The specificity of communicative processes in such structures is driven by the objectives of self-preservation in “unfavorable” conditions such as the absence of acceptance by the society and other cultures (outcasts of different kinds), or existence in the environment of another culture leading to segregation. Moreover, the system of basic values and meanings in such cultures is different from the generally accepted or dominating one in the culture in which they exist. The core values and sustainability of the whole cultural system are maintained not due to the tradition, but due to special measures aimed at stabilization, though eventually these measures might become a tradition. The absence of limitations in communication and information exchange can lead to destruction (core deformation) and assimilation of a local culture. Sticking to rituals and regulating behavior it is possible to preserve the cultural core constantly updating basic values.

The “reverse side” of communication limitation is communicative aggression when one participant tries to impose their own dialogue strategy on their partner and control the process according to their own scenario. In this case the final objective of communication is not important: it may be both transmission of the participant’s own values and meanings (cultural expansion) and borrowing of values and meanings from other cultures. Aggressive behavior strategies are typical of young cultures and cultures with an unstable core that were formed as a result of the eclectic interaction of different traditions. In such cultures aggression acts as a defense mechanism.

Increased communicative variability characterizes cultures that have an unstable base or that undergo a paradigm change. Being affected by other cultures, they not only expand

their communicative space, but often lose their own “face” falling under the influence of various external factors. Trying to avoid marginalization, such cultures have to “adjust” themselves to their partners that are stronger and more experienced in terms of communication. In view of globalization processes and transition to information society, the problem of communicative variability is especially relevant. In general, it is the communicative potential that determines the place of this or that culture in the modern world and affects the nature of intercultural relationships.

In view of the foregoing, communicative competence has a special meaning in the “globalization era human” system of notions. This quality formed by the new humanitarian paradigm is seen by us as a key property. This statement is based, firstly, on the acknowledgment of cultural diversity; secondly, on the accentuation of the meaning and specificity of such processes as the external and internal development of culture communicative potential. A competent judgment is necessary that will provide analysis of multiple national and cultural identities in the context of potential opportunities and intercultural dialogue issues.

Among the components of communicative competence we would like to mention, first of all, the adequacy of estimation of culture communicative “behavior”. Such opportunity is provided by studying cultural and historical epochs, national cultures, countries and regions based on the acknowledgment of the unique. The authors believe that it is the ideology of importance of everything for everybody and of everybody for everything that is able to help in working out the effective models of intercultural interactions and prediction of their results on the basis of adequate estimation of communicative stability/variability, aggression/dependence etc. Besides, estimating communicative potential, we are able to assert ourselves in the communicative space and better

understand not only other cultures, but also our own.

The second component of communicative competence to be considered is the orientation towards the increase of communicative potential. The search for its mechanisms is an important condition for communication management taking into account both development and possible risks connected with self-preservation of the core of cultural systems.

The experience in studying this problem shows that high communicative potential guarantees more opportunities of culture development and influence [2]. These opportunities are available for those cultures the basic values and meanings of which allow them to communicate and to expand their communicative space without damage to itself and other dialogue participants. Many factors can be revealed that increase (and decrease) communicative potential. They include, for example, such external (civilizational) factors as globalization, consumption growth, development of technologies and computerization dynamization of cultural processes etc. Internal factors characterizing a certain culture or region include political and economic, social, religious and ethnical, ideological conditions, as well as ethnical and social composition, contacts between different categories of population etc.

Thus, we would like to emphasize once again that communicative competence, which implies understanding of the nature of culture communicative “behavior” and readiness to increase its potential, creates favorable conditions for intercultural relationships in the context of the objective integration of the mankind.

### **Tolerance as a principle of the new humanitarian paradigm**

The second important principle of the new humanitarian paradigm forming a system of values in a global society is tolerance. We believe

that, together with communicative competence, this characteristic of a man as a social and cultural being plays a special role today. It is tolerance that enables development of the communicative potential of national cultures and preservation of cultural diversity. The spheres where tolerance can turn from an abstract idea to a real regulator of human relationships are communication and communicative space. Tolerance is formed together with communicative space and is revealed within it. Before outlining this interrelation it is necessary to clarify the definition of tolerance in the context of this work.

Today it is generally accepted that tolerance means a permissive attitude and respect towards other cultural traditions, values and relevant culture-bearers even if they are quite different from our own. Such interpretation of tolerance is simplified and does not disclose the essence of the phenomena. It should be noted that respect and permissiveness are not the same, and respect does not guarantee tolerance in relationships. In the context of our study, tolerance is considered to be a search for the common in the different, respect of the other's position, allowing for critical dialogue. As "tolerance is not transcendent and absolute, it requires conscious efforts and has certain limits" [1, p. 227], which are determined by the form of rationality dominating in the given culture. The rational basis of tolerance is supported by the fact that addressing to the other implies that a communication participant acts consciously and realizes his or her tasks, objectives and interests. On the other hand, it is the objectives and interests that determine the participants' readiness to make mutual allowances which, in their turn, affect the productiveness of the dialogue.

Tolerance is only possible if there is a common "coordinate system", common ground. Such a ground is found in communicative space where common meanings, values and

responsibilities are formed. It is this sphere where each communication participant, abandoning some of their interests, acquires new objectives, meanings and perspectives which are the products of common efforts and common activity. Thus, the range of development opportunities considerably expands for each communication participant while allowing for preservation of their identity. Communication as an effective dialogue with mutual understanding as its aim is impossible without tolerant attitude of its participants to each other and without their readiness to make allowances to each other. Thus, the practical "dimension" of tolerance is directly connected not only with preservation of the uniqueness of separate cultures and social groups, but with the survival of the mankind on the whole. The keystone idea of tolerance is unity as commonality of interests, meanings and objectives.

The connection between tolerance and communicative potential, in its turn, can be described as follows. Societies with high communicative potential have a higher tolerance level and, vice versa, "closed cultures" (with low communicative potential) are less tolerant and aggression-prone. But in real life everything can be more complicated. We believe that communicative potential and tolerance (as concepts and as certain sociocultural characteristics) complement each other. The communicative potential of culture is a quality that characterizes, first of all, culture and society, and tolerance is a characteristic of a man as a social and cultural being. That is why formation of tolerance provides support and development of the culture communicative potential. Realization of national and cultural differences and specificity is necessary for an effective dialogue. If we acknowledge that tolerance is the obligatory principle of the new humanitarian paradigm, we will have an important regulator of human relationships and society life. Otherwise globalization processes

might dissociate the world community instead of uniting it.

Thus, in the face of continuous conflicts in the present-day sociocultural reality, one has to agree that a new humanitarian paradigm is necessary. It can be worked out by the humanities that defined their own area of scientific interest in the problematic range of globalization. Pointing at the importance of national and cultural identities and the role of culture communicative potential,

they are able to determine qualities that must characterize global thinking of a modern man.

We have included communicative competence and tolerance in this list of qualities, but it is not limited by them. As a conclusion, it should be noted that it would be very risky to rely upon the spontaneous development of these qualities. Their formation must be guaranteed by targeted efforts that can be based on the concept of the 21st century man.

### References

1. Budenkova V. E. *Kommunikatsiya i ratsional'nost' kak osnovaniya tolerantnosti* [Communication and Rationality as Grounds for Tolerance]. *Izvestiya Tomskogo politekhnicheskogo universiteta*, 2006, Vol. 309, No 1, p. 225–229.
2. Budenkova V.E., Zaitseva T.A., Savelieva T.N. *Kommunikativnyy potentsial regional'nykh kul'tur: opyt analiza i razvitiya* [Communicative Potential of Regional Cultures: Analysis and Development]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 2011, No 346, p. 40–45.
3. *Vesternizatsiya kak globalizatsiya i "globalizatsiya" kak amerikanizatsiya* [Westernization as Globalization and "Globalization" as Americanization]. *Voprosy filosofii*, 2004, No 4, p. 58–69.
4. Derrida, Jacques, *Negotiations: Interventions and Interviews, 1971-2001*, ed. by Elizabeth N. Rottenberg (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002) 424 pp.
5. Muntyan M. A. *Globalizatsiya: chto eto takoe?* [Globalization: What Is It?] <http://www.perspektivy.info>
6. Tishunina N. V. *Sovremennye globalizatsionnye protsessy: vyzov, refleksii, strategii* [Modern Globalization Processes: Challenge, Reflections and Strategies]. *Globalizatsiya i kul'tura: analiticheskiy podkhod* [Globalization and Culture: Analytical Approach]. Saint-Petersburg, "Yanus" Publishing House, 2003, p. 5–24.
7. Ustyugova E.N. *Globalizatsiya i kul'tura* [Globalization and Culture]. *Globalizatsiya i kul'tura analiticheskiy podkhod* [Globalization and Culture: Analytical Approach]. Saint-Petersburg, "Yanus" Publishing House, 2003, p. 25–46.
8. Cheshkov M. A. *Globalizatsiya: sushchnost', nyneshnyaya faza, perspektivy* [Globalization: Essence, Current Stage and Perspectives]. *Vek globalizatsii* [Globalization Era], No 2, 2008 <http://www.uisrussia.msu.ru>



## **Принципы гуманитарной парадигмы развития межкультурных коммуникаций**

**В.Е. Буденкова, Е.Н. Савельева**

*Томский государственный университет*

*Россия, 634050, Томск, пр. Ленина 36*

---

*Серьезной проблемой современного глобализирующегося мира является неспособность к диалогу «неродственных» культур, что приводит к многочисленным локальным и глобальным конфликтам, росту напряженности в межэтнических и межконфессиональных отношениях. Это инициирует подключение к исследованию противоречий социокультурной реальности гуманитарного знания, раскрывающего специфику глобализационных процессов в пространстве культуры. Солидарные с подобной установкой авторы статьи нацелены на анализ теоретических оснований, способствующих разработке новой гуманитарной парадигмы. Ее актуальность обуславливает потребность в формировании мышления «человека эпохи глобализации», система ценностей которого способна обеспечить прогрессивное взаимодействие социокультурных систем.*

*Рассматриваются такие важные факторы развития межкультурных взаимоотношений, как признание культурной уникальности и повышение коммуникативного потенциала культур. Результаты анализа позволяют обосновать значение коммуникативной компетентности и толерантности как ключевых принципов нового типа мышления, способствующих созданию благоприятных условий для диалога культур в условиях объективной интеграции человечества.*

*Ключевые слова: глобализация, гуманитарная парадигма, национально-культурная идентичность, локальная культура, толерантность, коммуникативный потенциал культур, коммуникативная компетентность, межкультурные коммуникации, коммуникативное поведение.*

---