International Conference on Research Paradigms Transformation in Social Sciences 2014

Model of Tolerance of Intercultural Communication

Kokarevich M.N. [a,b] *, Sizova N.Z. [b]

[a] National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Lenin St 30, Tomsk, 634050, Russia
[b] Tomsk State University of Architecture and Building, Solyanaya St. 2, Tomsk, 634003, Russia

Abstract

In this paper a model of tolerance of intercultural communication as a methodology of solving sharp confessional, ethnic and natural conflicts of modernity is built. It's shown that the culture is a system of mental dominants at the level of being; the systems of mental dominants are qualitatively original because the cultures are unique and must be equal; the system of mental dominants and mental nucleus of culture determines intensity to maintenance of own identity; perception of cultural and civilizational phenomena of the other culture is limited by this intensity. So, the space of cultural tolerance opening the possibilities for prosperity and development of each culture and complementary interaction of cultures are possible on condition that each of them awares their own mental originality, status of mental nucleus as a limit of intercultural mutual influence and realizes own individuality and equality of all cultures.

Key words: tolerance, intercultural communication, mental dominants of the culture

1. Introduction

Nowadays the problem of tolerance of intercultural communication is one of the global problems as a result of the problem of surviving of Earth civilization. Really the modern epoch should be considered not only as the epoch of states' interaction, economics, but as an epoch of communication of separate cultures.

Cultural ethnic factors become good reasons of war conflicts, (e.g. in the region of Persian Gulf), that have an aim to defend not only state interests, but own culture, and own way of life also. Religious terrorism and terrorism (in all its manifestations) becomes the fact of cultural and historical reality, e.g. the destruction of Buddha's Statue by Taliban in Afghanistan in Bamyan province, the destruction of the twin towers in New York in 2001. Global project of Westernization and Americanization of the world community turns out to be unable to exist. European democratic

*Kokarevich M.N. Tel.: +7-913-817-0256
E-mail address: kokarevich@mail.ru

values, Western liberalism and individualism are not generally accepted to the Russian citizens, to people of other cultures. This is confirmed by the confrontational realities of modern cultural and historical picture of the world.

So the deficit of cultural, religious, ethnic tolerance is present in relations among peoples, religious confessions that actualize the problem of turning out ontological, existing foundations of realization of the tolerance model of intercultural communications. Detection of such reasons supposes firstly understanding of the existence of intercultural influence limits. Secondly it supposes forming of the principles of tolerant, complementary coexistence of cultures.

2. Methods of the study

Multidisciplinary approach, method of historical and philosophical analysis, hermeneutical method, comparative methodology, methodology of reconstruction of cultural and historical reality, based on the picture of culture as coexistence of unified cultural and historical types, where every element is determinate by the system of mental dominants.

3. Results and Discussion

Culture is a system of mental dominants at the level of being; the systems of mental dominants are qualitatively original because the cultures are unique and must be equal; the system of mental dominants and mental nucleus of culture determines intensity to maintenance of own identity; perception of cultural and civilizational phenomena of the other culture is limited by this intensity.

In fact modern cultural space is the space of interaction of separate cultures, cultural and historical types. Moreover each separate culture is the whole sphere with its mental nucleus. Mental nucleus of culture is a system of mental dominants that has property of fullness that means the system of mental dominants that is embodied in all forms of culture, defining their qualitative uniqueness (Kokarevich, 2011). This system has also property of effectiveness as an ability to self-development, preservation of cultural identity when interaction with other cultures; and ability to modification as at the level phenomena as at the level of essence, that is the level of change of separate mental dominants while maintaining of their contents and structural invariance as a whole, i.e. while maintaining of its own identity.

Thereby the system of mental dominants provides the will to life as ability to self-development, self-preservation at interaction with other cultural and historical types. Will to life, on the one hand, is directed to preservation of identity and to interaction with other cultures with the purpose of finding and extracting funds, forms, providing the creative potential of its own culture on the other hand. In this case there are limits of perception of different social and cultural phenomena.

Mental nucleus of the culture is a combination of civilization (directed to people, their strong and prosperous existence in the "nature-society" system) and cultural components (expressing a person's ability to transcendence, his aspiration to creativity, service to the idea of beauty and so on). The selection of civilization and cultural components of the mental nucleus of culture allows to watch the limits of interaction and to see that the mentality of culture specifies the border of interaction and interpenetration of cultural forms, tendencies.

The processes of interaction are the most naturally in civilization sphere. This or that phenomenon of culture is called civilization cause of its focus on people. Focus on people, their use supposes adequate correspondence to the reality (technology) and structures of human mind (mathematical knowledge). These properties are ontological and epistemological conditions obstacle related phenomena and their free perception by any culture. So their support on civilization values such as family for "McDonalds", responsibility for "Nike" and so on becomes the base of success of leading trademarks.

Civilization is immanently inherent to Japanese culture. It is an aspect of such mental dominant that Ruth Benedict named the need for self-esteem, the need to take a worthy place in the world (Benedict, 2007). It wasn't successful in getting this by force of arms that is why it should be possible with the help of economic growth to get well-deserved

place in hierarchy of countries. Strong economics arouses respect and admiration in modern world. That is why the naturalness of the reorganization of Japanese awareness to development of economics, the improvement of living standards, improving the quality of life.

Accordingly the unity of opinions and acceptance of the document such as Athenian charter is possible only in the sphere of housing building oriented to people, mostly embodying the values of civilization, cause to supply the population of industrially developed countries with high quality mass housing. Analogously the processes of exchange in the sphere of technology and its consumers' forms flow freely. So obviously evident usefulness and functionality makes perception of mostly civilization forms of one cultural and historical type natural by other cultural and historical type, i.e. it makes civilization interaction natural.

However the apparent naturalness of mutual perception of civilization forms is limited. Limitation is confirmed by the fact of modification and transformation of interacting phenomena. As a whole the possibility of perception turns out to be conditioned by cultural and mental dominants of perceiving culture (principles of management by economic structures, brought by the Americans into Japanese economics, had transformed according to Japanese collectivism, need in self-esteem and other mental dominants). At the same time the fact of perception of European technologies, civilization values of comfort by Japanese culture is conditioned by brightly expressed civilization component of this and that culture.

Perception of cultural phenomena, ideas, values is more strictly limited by the system of mental values of interacting cultures. Imposition of foreign, i.e. incompatible with own base system of values of any culture (e.g. Western ideas about freedom of personality in Islam world) is perceived by this culture as the threat of its own identity. In this case the will to life of this culture reveals itself especially strongly. The rise of national consciousness begins, manifested even in acts of terrorism, in open rejection of Western liberal values. It becomes obvious that mentality of this or that culture specifies the boundaries of perception of different cultural forms, e.g. standards of behavior and so on.

Moreover the limits of intercultural communication are conditioned by confirmation thirst of own cultural identity, own mentality, own cultural consciousness, "cultural "I am", so typical to each culture. In fact modern cultural space becomes more and more homogeneous, unified in the aspect of the uniform distribution of living standards of welfare, the standards for success in life, career and so on. Analogously, ordinary society appears from an ordinary man, the problem of personal consciousness, national identity sharply occurs in the situation of ordinary man and the threat of dissolution of personality. F. Nietzsche had defined and formulated this problem as the most tragic. Later this problem had been determined as a problem of finding its existence, meaning of life by each individual. In the world of culture as coexistence of separate cultural and historical types the problem of keeping of own identity, own consciousness, "cultural "I am" is rising also nowadays with its own special mentality. In the depths of cultural consciousness "will to life", "will to power" of every culture, every cultural and historical type awakes as a necessity of affirmation of its own mental, paradigm values and as the thirst of building of own world.

M. Heidegger remodeling Nietzsche's image of will to power noted such its peculiarity as it can't stand any aim out of itself (Heidegger, 1993). If it's true, it's obviously, that there is deep base of "eternal return" to its mental values, dominant sources, immanently inherent to each culture and eternal becoming of new cultural and civilization forms, claiming their own cultural identity by the act of their emergence. This phenomenon of constant interaction of cultures at the level of individuals, groups, states allows seeing the reaction of cultures, directed against cultural unification, against dissemination of standards of any culture. It also allows seeing the reaction at consolidation of cultural consciousness.

So the possibility of tolerant intercultural interactions is caused by understanding of that circumstance, that the system of mental dominants of each culture has the will to permanent confirmation of its own identity and that is why it defines the possibility and sets the limits of perception of cultural and civilization phenomena. Modern cultural space is the space of interaction of cultures. In this case the interaction can be as tolerant and complementary as not complementary also. Let's define the principles, when their realization can help to overcome cultural rejection, confirmation of tolerance of intercultural relations. Let's show that such principles can be the regulations on equality

in value of cultures along with understanding of limits existence of cultural forms perception and presence the desire for approval of its own identity by each culture.

If the recognition of qualitative originality of each culture and wish of cultural self-assertion is typical to modern consciousness, but principle of cultural equality in value hasn't status of axiom yet, even in the limits of modern cultural cognition nowadays and moreover in the modern public consciousness. The methodology of cultural cognition overcomes A. Toynbee's thesis with difficulties about the existence of primitive societies resistant to civilization without mutation, transforming primitive societies into cultures; and F. Braudel's idea about existence of the worlds-civilizations and the worlds-windows. Nevertheless the methodological foundations of admission of the cultural equality in value have roots in the 19th century also. They are introduced by E. Durkheim's researches, who had criticized the supposition that all primitive societies belong to one cultural type. Later the researches of British and American cultural and anthropological schools argue absolutely enough the principle of cultural equality in value, but there are some R. Rorty's comparisons of cultures as Antipodes and Earth inhabitants that have underlying message of inequality of cultures.

Legitimacy of this thesis about cultural equality in value rises to a common position about relativity of value basis of this or that culture. Relativity of the system of values composing mental, paradigm nucleus of any culture, makes impossible the comparisons of cultures from certain positions e.g. from European principles of development as the development of economics and science. It's impossible to build the hierarchy of cultures according to any other foundation because the existence of the single criterion of development means its construction to the rang of "absolute", but it contradicts to the basic position about relativity of value foundation of any culture.

The principle of cultural equality in value becomes the foundation of understanding consciousness and tolerant relation the other culture. It becomes the condition of dialogue relations among cultures and such interactions that suppose mutual self-opening of each of participating cultures in the interaction. It is for further deepening in understanding of consciousness that implicitly proceeds to the dialogue of own and other value equality and sovereignty. It should be noted that there is a raw of cultures, which have "cultural snobbery" dominant in their mental nucleus. Such dominant characterizes the American culture. Consciousness of its exclusivity is embodied in the formula: God blessed America three times – in the present, past and future. These blessings are as follows: it is prosperity in the present, freedom – in the past, equality – in the future. That is why the USA is the world-power hegemon. Consequence and source of hegemony is prosperity. The symbol of prosperity is Excellency. Although I. Wallerstein says that such conception was typical for Americans until 1990 (Wallerstein, 2001), but at present the USA have a tendency to consider itself as real "indispensable global state" (Brzezinsky, 2010), responsible for distribution of democratic, liberal values and inclusion different countries into the created world of economics.

However the merits of American cultural anthropology in the statement of the thesis about the cultural equality in value, knowledge necessity of the other culture for better intercommunication with this culture and influence on it are obvious. Completed research of Japanese culture on demand of the USA by Ruth Benedict is an example of it. This research showed the need to take into account the uniqueness of each culture. That is why when the military mission failed the regret was expressed because George Bush had not such adviser as Ruth Benedict and had not special knowledge of this Islam region and this culture. However theoretically well-grounded position about cultural equality in value wasn't included into the practice of the USA cultural interaction with other countries because of no correlation of this position with mental dominants of American culture having "cultural snobbery" and it won't be included also in the future. No doubt the features of cultural snobbery are typical to Islam cultures. That is why the space of tolerance is not realized at present.

Realization of tolerance principle supposes the overcome of cultural exclusiveness at the theoretical and practical levels at temporary perspective. Cross-cultural researches prove it. Cross-cultural approach emerges from the necessity of the statement of the principles of equality in value in social and cultural life in the XXI century and as a consequence of understanding relationship also. Undoubtedly the statement of space of understanding consciousness supposes identification of barriers and mechanisms if intercultural communications overcome cultural centrism, understanding of each culture as a whole formation with its mental nucleus.

4. Conclusion

So, the space of the cultural tolerance opening the possibilities for prosperity and development of each culture, complementary interaction of cultures is possible on condition that realization own mental originality, status of mental nucleus as a limit of intercultural mutual influence, realization of own individuality and equality of all cultures by each culture.

Acknowledgements

References

Kokarevich M.N. (2011). Mentality and forms of the culture: types of determination. Tomsk: Bulletin of Tomsk State Pedagogical University. 113, 203-208.
Benedict R. (2007). The Chrysanthemum and the Sword: Patterns of Japanese culture. St. Petersburg.: Nauka.
Heidegger M. (1993). Time and Existence: articles and speeches. Moscow.: Respublika.
Wallerstein I. (2001). Analysis of the world systems and the situation in the modern world. St. Petersburg.: Universitetskaya kniga.
Brzezinsky Zb. (2010). Second Chance / Three Presidents and the Crisis of American Superpower. Moscow: Mezdunarodniye otnosheniya.