



# REVISTA INCLUSIONES

CENCIA EN TIEMPOS DE CAMBIOS

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Volumen 7 . Número Especial

Julio / Septiembre

2020

ISSN 0719-4706

**CUERPO DIRECTIVO**

**Directores**

**Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda**

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

**Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras**

Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile

**Editor**

**Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda**

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

**Editor Científico**

**Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo**

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

**Editor Europa del Este**

**Dr. Aleksandar Ivanov Katrandzhiev**

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

**Cuerpo Asistente**

**Traductora: Inglés**

**Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero**

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

**Portada**

**Lic. Graciela Pantigoso de Los Santos**

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

**COMITÉ EDITORIAL**

**Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado**

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

**Dra. Heloísa Bellotto**

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

**Dra. Nidia Burgos**

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

**Mg. María Eugenia Campos**

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

**Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera**

Universidad de Valladolid, España

**Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González**

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

**Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy**

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

**Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes**

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

**Dr. Werner Mackenbach**

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

**Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín**

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

**Ph. D. Natalia Milanese**

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

**Ph. D. Maritza Montero**

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

**Dra. Eleonora Pencheva**

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

**Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira**

Universidad de La Coruña, España

**Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona**

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

**Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra**

Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

**Dra. Mirka Seitz**

Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

**Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov**

South West University, Bulgaria

**COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL**

**Comité Científico Internacional de Honor**

**Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía**

Universidad ICESI, Colombia

**Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas**

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

**Dr. Martino Contu**

Universidad de Sassari, Italia

**Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo**

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

**Dra. Patricia Brogna**

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

# REVISTA INCLUSIONES

REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES  
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

**Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez**

*Universidad de Barcelona, España*

**Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dr. Lancelot Cowie**

*Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago*

**Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar**

*Universidad de Los Andes, Chile*

**Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo**

*Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla,  
México*

**Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto**

*Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina*

**Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco**

*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo**

*Universidad de Chile, Chile*

**Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandía**

*Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España*

**Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar**

*Universidad de Sevilla, España*

**Dra. Patricia Galeana**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dra. Manuela Garau**

*Centro Studi Sea, Italia*

**Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg**

*Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia  
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos*

**Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez**

*Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia*

**José Manuel González Freire**

*Universidad de Colima, México*

**Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera**

*Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España*

**Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre**

*Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil*

## CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

**+ Dr. Miguel León-Portilla**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura**

*Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel",  
España*

**Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros**

*Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil*

**+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández**

*Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela*

**Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango**

*Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México*

**Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut**

*Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España*

**Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa**

*Dilemas Contemporáneos, México*

**Dra. Francesca Randazzo**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras,  
Honduras*

**Dra. Yolando Ricardo**

*Universidad de La Habana, Cuba*

**Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha**

*Universidade Católica de Angola Angola*

**Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza**

*Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica*

**Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix**

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades  
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

**Dr. Luis Alberto Romero**

*CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig**

*Dilemas Contemporáneos, México*

**Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández**

*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Dr. Juan Antonio Seda**

*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva**

*Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil*

**Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso**  
*Universidad de Salamanca, España*

**Dr. Josep Vives Rego**  
*Universidad de Barcelona, España*

**Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni**  
*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo**  
*Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*

**Comité Científico Internacional**

**Dra. Elian Araujo**  
*Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil*

**Mg. Romyana Atanasova Popova**  
*Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria*

**Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa**  
*Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal*  
*Centro de Estudios Africanos, Portugal*

**Dra. Noemí Brenta**  
*Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

**Ph. D. Juan R. Coca**  
*Universidad de Valladolid, España*

**Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel**  
*Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España*

**Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik**  
*Universidad de Colonia, Alemania*

**Dr. Eric de Léséulec**  
*INS HEA, Francia*

**Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti**  
*Universidad de Barcelona, España*

**Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant**  
*Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalem, Israel*

**Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro**  
*Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia*

**Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov**  
*Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria*

**Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez**  
*Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia*

**Dr. Gino Ríos Patio**  
*Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Perú*

**Dra. María Laura Salinas**  
*Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina*

**Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo**  
*Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina*

**Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec**  
*Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia*

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía  
Santiago – Chile  
Representante Legal  
Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

## Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad de Concepción



BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN

**CULTURAL DIALOG AS A FACTOR OF SOCIO-CULTURAL  
DYNAMICS IN MODERN CONDITIONS**

**Ph. D. Valentina E. Chernikova**

North-Caucasian Federal University, Russian Federation

ORCID 0000-0002-8352-359X

chervalen5@rambler.ru

**Fecha de Recepción:** 09 de abril de 2020 – **Fecha Revisión:** 06 de mayo de 2020

**Fecha de Aceptación:** 19 de junio de 2020 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 01 de julio de 2020

**Abstract**

The relevance of this study stems from the growing complexity of social relations, where dialog as a sociocultural phenomenon becomes an important means for understanding different levels of communication. The necessity of studying cultural dialog is a result of the contradictory crisis processes in modern society. In this society, the main condition of tolerant conflict resolution is dialog as a form of the interest alignment. Dialog increasingly often serves as an only possible way of the survival of mankind. In this regard, this paper studies the phenomenon of cultural dialog in the conditions of modern sociocultural reality. The intensity of sociocultural changes related to the processes of transculturation, integration and information, affects the ways of cultural interaction. It also concludes about the need to solve the following tasks: to analyze the subject matter of dialog as a form of intersubject interaction; to consider cross-cultural dialog as a priority strategy for cross-cultural interaction in modern conditions; to conclude about the place of Russia in modern cultural dialog; describe the consolidating role of political dialog; to identify the features of cultural dialog in the information and communication space. A leading approach to the study is a philosophical and cultural approach that allows revealing the nature, essence and ways of implementing cultural dialog in modern conditions. The paper substantiates the possibility and necessity of communication between the cultures, each of which carries its own meanings, traditions and norms.

**Keywords**

Socio-cultural reality – Cultural dialog – Cultural conflict – Information society – Political dialog

**Para Citar este Artículo:**

Chernikova, Valentina E. Cultural dialog as a factor of socio-cultural dynamics in modern conditions. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 7 num Especial (2020): 534-547.

Licencia Creative Commons Attribution Non-Comercial 3.0 Unported  
(CC BY-NC 3.0)

Licencia Internacional



## Introduction

Currently in the global community, dialog is not only the main way of solving global problems and overcoming confrontation between the countries, but is also a confirmation of the appropriate resolution of the issues of peaceful coexistence of different cultures and civilizations. At the early XXI century, the postmodern idea of the humanity consistently moving towards the consolidation of political, economic and cultural systems failed. Modern society begins to realize that the live activities of people belonging to different cultures cannot be performed on the basis of a single culture. In the modern world, full of contradictions and conflicts in the spiritual and cultural spheres, the dialog with its inherent emphasis on the equality and partnership is the only form of cross-cultural interaction. Based on the fact that dialog expects partnership and subject-subject relations, the question is: is the implementation of the dialog interaction possible in the setting of increasing communicative impact on society, individuals and culture? On the one hand, it is, since the involvement of a wider audience in the communication process opens up great prospects for increased cross-cultural interaction and the formation of a new transcultural space. On the other hand, information technology makes the transmission of cultural values a form of cultural expansion, and makes the common dialog interaction difficult. All this leads to the leveling of identity of a separate culture. This situation brings to the fore not only the problem of cross-cultural communication, but also the problem of the compatibility of the interacting cultures. Thus, the contradictory processes occurring in modern society, provide a basis for deep and comprehensive study of the role of cross-cultural dialog in the modern world. Taking into account the features of the modern cultural realities, the formation of new models of communication, information, and interaction, the author consider dialog as the primary means of preserving cultural integrity and as the most promising model of cross-cultural interaction.

It is clear that focus on cooperation, compromise and the need for the dialog in all spheres of social life is much more profitable and more useful than that of confrontation and ethnocentrism. Modernity dictates the rules for the states to interact with each other in cultural, economic and political relations. Political issues and culture mutually presuppose each other, international political dialog is a reliable way of prevention of a clash of civilizations. It is possible only between those able to overcome the "horizon" of their identity, to go beyond it, being engaged in communication in a political space. There are members who defend their individuality on the one hand, and awareness of their relationship with the rest of the world on the other hand. The dialog (especially the political one) exists for the sake of establishing this connection and for the sake of the mutual harmony between people, nations, states and civilizations. One type of cultural dialog that is able to settle the relations between different cultures is political dialog. It is aimed at consolidation of different political interests to shape the strategy and tactics of the coexistence of worlds.

Thus, political dialog as a cultural dialog becomes extremely important structural phenomenon in contemporary international politics.

A study of the cultural dialog is important in science. In Russian and foreign science the interest to this problem is increasing. The works of modern researchers indicated the need to consider dialog in the context of cultural globalization, dialog of civilizations, and cultural interaction between Russia and the West. Modern scientists are also concerned about the problems of dialog being a form of communication that reflects the characteristics of the transformation of post-industrial society and the information era. An important milestone in the solution of these problems is the VI Russian Congress of philosophy



“Philosophy in the modern world: the dialogue of worldviews”, which dealt with the study of different methods of cross-cultural and inter-civilizational interaction. It can be assumed that modern science offers a variety of approaches that expand the notion of cultural dialog and reflect the urgency of the problem.

## Materials and Methods

In order to achieve this objective, the author relied on a scope of research material. Basic scientific resource was fundamental research reflecting qualitative changes in society caused by modernization and informatization<sup>1</sup>, and studies of society and the risk of conflict<sup>2</sup>. Study of cultural determinants in different social processes has allowed scientists to draw the conclusion that in modern society, there is a clash of cultures in terms of values, norms, and traditions, resulting in the emergence of socio-cultural conflicts. According to Polish sociologist P. Shtompka, society is going through a transformative period experiencing “cultural trauma” due to the rapid introduction of alien cultural values<sup>3</sup>.

The most important method of conflict resolution is cultural dialog. In the history of philosophy, the problem of dialog, its relationship to spirituality, culture, creativity appealed to Socrates (who discovered the culture of dialogue), Plato, I. Kant, J. W. F. Schelling, L. Feuerbach, S. Kierkegaard. Since the XX century, this problem occupies a prominent place in the teachings of the Russian and foreign scientists. Many modern studies of dialog are based on the teachings of M. M. Bakhtin<sup>4</sup>, V. S. Bibler<sup>5</sup>, and M. Buber<sup>6</sup>. They consider the nature of dialog and the interpretation of cultural dialog as the exchange of cultural values, where culture not only retains its uniqueness, but also becomes enriched by the acquisition of the values of other cultures.

Considering culture as a “world of dialog”, where man not only penetrates the essence of “the Other”, but reveals himself<sup>7</sup>, M. M. Bakhtin laid the foundations of modern understanding of culture. The scientist believed that through dialog as the way of existence of culture, people form attitudes not only towards the historical heritage, but to the culture of modern nations. The problem of cultural becomes particularly relevant in the end of XX century, due to the need in understanding the features of cross-cultural and intercivilizational dialogs in the context of globalization. In modern science, the problems of studying the political dialog as a cultural dialog are very significant. Due to this fact, this study uses the works of U. Beck<sup>8</sup> and K.Kh. Delokarov<sup>9</sup>, in which globalization is presented as a complex, strategic problem. Such approach allowed to understand the essence of cultural dialog manifesting itself in the form of political dialog.

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990); U. Beck; A. Giddens and S. Lash, *Reflexive Modernization. Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994); K. K. Kolin, *Information civilization* (Moscow: Institut problem informatiki RAN, 2002); D. Bell, *The future postindustrial society* (2004).

<sup>2</sup> U. Beck, *Risc society. Towards a New Modernity* (London: SAGE Publications, 1992); V. I. Zubkov, *Sociological risk theory* (Moscow: RUDN, 2003).

<sup>3</sup> P. Shtompka, *Sociology of social changes* (Moscow: Aspekt Press, 1996).

<sup>4</sup> M. M. Bakhtin, *Aesthetics of verbal creativity* (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1986).

<sup>5</sup> V. S. Bibler, *From the epistemology to the logic of culture* (Moscow: Politizdat, 1991).

<sup>6</sup> M. Buber, *Dialog. Two images of faith* (Moscow: Respublika, 1995).

<sup>7</sup> U. Bek, *What is globalization? Mistakes of globalism - response to globalization* (Moscow, 2001).

<sup>8</sup> K. Kh. Delokarov, *Values of the globalizing world* (Moscow: Scientific Press Ltd, 2002).

<sup>9</sup> S. Benkhabib, *The claims of culture. Equality and diversity in the global era* (Moscow: Logos, 2005).

S. Benhabib studied cultural dialog in the setting of cultural pluralism<sup>10</sup>. T. Modood<sup>11</sup> and A. Phillips<sup>12</sup> studied the setting of multiculturalism, E.A. Pain<sup>13</sup>, N. Meer and T. Modood<sup>14</sup> dealt with cross-culturalism, while tolerance and compromise were studied by B.V. Shalin<sup>15</sup>, J.G. Janmaat and N. Mons<sup>16</sup>. An important component of theoretical consideration of the contemporary dialog is studying the communicative aspects of the information society. For example, the works of L.V. Skvortsov<sup>17</sup>, A.A. Chernov<sup>18</sup>, M. Fassler<sup>19</sup> present the features of the information culture, analyze the problems of the individual in the context of information and communication bonds. It should be noted that cultural dialog in the information society is generally viewed in the context of the analysis of the characteristics of the virtual space, the problems of on-screen communication, the specificity of interaction of mass-media, etc. Thus, despite the large number of works reflecting various aspects of cross-cultural communication, cultural dialog as a way of resolving and settlement of conflicts has not received sufficient development.

The author used the fundamental works of Russian and foreign scientists in the field of the philosophy of dialog, social and cross-cultural communications, and theories of the information society as a methodological basis. Considering dialog as the basis of cross-cultural interaction, the author relied on the theories of dialog of M.M. Bakhtin, V.S. Bibler, and M. Buber. The dialogical concept of M.M. Bakhtin is very significant in fulfilling the task of the study. Its main methodological provisions are the requirement to rely on a holistic understanding of culture, regarding its characteristic features and parameters, the use of an integrated approach to the culture and its internal content, and taking into account the value component in any cultural process.

A study of the cultural dialog in modern conditions involves the use of extensive methodological tools. Thus, when analyzing the phenomenon of dialog, the author applies the phenomenological and hermeneutic approaches. The comparative research method used in the study of different views on the problem of dialog evolution. Methodological beginning necessary to analyze the political dialog as a cultural dialog was the use of the principles of historicism and objectivity.

The study of dialog as the basis of socio-cultural interaction in modern conditions uses synergistic approach that considers cultural dialog as a dialog of open systems, taking into account the overcoming of destruction, entropy, and minimization of social and cultural conflicts.

---

<sup>10</sup> T. Modood, *Multiculturalism, a civic idea* (London: Polity Press, 2007).

<sup>11</sup> A. Phillips, *Multiculturalism without culture* (NY: Princeton University Press, 2007).

<sup>12</sup> E.A. Pain, "A difficult path from multiculturalism to cross-culturalism", *Vestnik Instituta Kennana v Rossii*, num 20 (2011): 78-85.

<sup>13</sup> N. Meer, and T. Modood, "How does interculturalism contrast with multiculturalism?", *Journal of intercultural studies*, (2011): 11-22.

<sup>14</sup> V.V. Shalin, *Tolerance: cultural norms and political necessity* (Rostov-on-Don, 2000).

<sup>15</sup> J. G. Janmaat and N. Mons, "Promoting ethnic tolerance and patriotism: the role of education system characteristics. *Comparative Education Review*". *British Journal of Educational Studies*, num 55 (1) (2011): 56-81.

<sup>16</sup> L.V. Skvortsov, *Information culture and integral knowledge* (Moscow: MBA, 2011).

<sup>17</sup> A. A. Chernov, *Formation of the global information society: problems and prospects* (Moscow: Dashkov i K, 2003).

<sup>18</sup> M. Fassler, *MedialeInteraktion* (Munche: 17, 2006).

<sup>19</sup> R. Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London: SAGE Publications, 1992).

## Discussion

### Dialog as a form of intersubject interaction and priority strategy of cross-cultural interaction in modern conditions

During the study of cultural dialog in historical and philosophical contexts, it was concluded that the problem originates from the antiquity, continues to evolve in the debates of the middle ages, in the dialogic texts of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment eras. The idea that dialog is the original form of European philosophy was widely spread in the literature of XIX - XX centuries. The sphere of dialogic interaction has grown so much that modern science proves the necessity of creating a special branch of knowledge – dialogics, as a general scientific theory of the interaction processes at various levels. By the end of the XX century, the study of the identity of each culture belonged to the framework of its interaction with other cultures (European, Asian, African, etc.). Modern world culture represents a scope of diverse cultures that are unique and needs to be in constant contact (dialog) with each other.

Note that cultural dialog is more of a metaphor than a rigorous scientific concept that acquires the status of a doctrine and should be followed in terms of enhancing cultural interaction. Dialog as a means of communication should be understood not only as a live talk, but as the absorption of the world's cultural values, understanding the uniqueness of other cultures, and special attitude to the cultural heritage and modern culture. Cross-cultural dialog contributes not only to cultural development, but also provides a positive scenario of interaction between nations and cultures as it is the interest of each party of the communication. In order to appreciate another culture, one needs cross-cultural literacy. It involves the ability to see differences in customs, traditions and beliefs of different cultures, as well as the ability to consider cultural unity and features. Currently, cultural dialog occurs against the background of rapid global changes, which affect all spheres of society and go beyond the separate countries and regions. R. Robertson called these changes the processes of “world compression” and strengthening the links between the different bearings<sup>20</sup>. One of the main problems of modern time is the clash of cultures, which is a cause of irreversible globalization processes. Different cultures are forced to exist in interaction with other cultures, and the clash of opposing values and attitudes often leads to conflicts. M.M. Dzhoshi, citing Professor P. Dutkevich (Carlstone University, Canada), writes that “humankind today lives in a world where dialog and conflict are opposed to each other”<sup>21</sup>. There is a growing confrontation between global and local cultures, which forms its own rules and regulations, introducing cultural values that are incomprehensible to other members of society. At the same time, the universalization of the modern world occurs. It aids the distribution of common cultural stereotypes within a culture. Thus, the modern socio-cultural space is a kind of duality: every culture experiences the confrontation between the universal and the local, national and international, high and low, elitist and marginal. It focuses the attention on studying interaction among cultures in the modern multicultural environment. Scientists are unanimous in the opinion that in the conditions of crises and risks, the most optimal way of cross-cultural communication is dialog, with its emphasis on equality, provision of the world order and cultural stability. Russian researcher of globalization processes in the field of culture, V.I. Tolstoy, believes that in modern conditions

<sup>20</sup> M. M. Dzhoshi, “Cultural dialog and civilizations in the era of world globalization”. Dialog kul'tur i tsivilizatsiy v global'nom mire: proceedings of the VII Int. Likhachov readings (2007): 49-51.

<sup>21</sup> V. I. Tolstoykh, The future of civilization in the context of cultural dialog. In collected works: Dialog kul'tur v globaliziruyushchemsya mire (Moscow: Nauka, 2005).

“there is a need in a new ideology of dialog that can be generated by crossover consensus of two dominant ideological orientations and types of thinking: anthropocentric (Western) and cosmocentric one (Eastern)”<sup>22</sup>. Today, the opposition of two socio-cultural spaces – East and West – is the modern reality of cultural dialog. Despite the fact that Western culture, with its focus on rationality, progress, anthropocentrism, and Eastern culture, focused on introversion, cyclicity, and conservatism, are presented as the two mutually exclusive integrities, the author believes that modernity justifies the relationship between these cultures. Cultural traditions and worldviews of East and West are taken into account while searching for a common understanding of the world, nature, and the future of the humankind. It just turned out that way that the dialog between East and West is a global phenomenon that involves different cultures that co-exist. Once M.M. Bakhtin noted that “the whole culture is located at the borders, the border is everywhere, through its every moment... the cultural life is reflected in every drop”<sup>23</sup>. The reality belies the myths about the incompatibility of East and West: the process of the “Great Synthesis” is gaining momentum in the world. The essence of this process is revealed at the example of Chinese development that leads the Chinese people to the connection of the material Western culture with the spiritual Eastern culture.

The place of Russia in the cultural dialog is determined not only by geographical location of the country between West and East, but also by the occurring changes. The humankind enters the development period when the role and prestige of any country depends not on the material and military powers, but on its ability to objectively evaluate the further historical development and the ability to offer alternative models for the future development of the civilization. Historically, Russia can be considered both European and Asian country. In other words, it tends to the West and to the East at the same time. Taking into account the fact that Russia historically brings together many ethnicities, cultures and faiths, it has inherent tendency to the dialog with other communities and cultures. In this the author sees its long-term civilizational lot. In a situation when the future of humankind is unpredictable, and the world is experiencing a crisis of humanism and the search for new spiritual paradigm, Russia strives to the understanding among countries and nations. Finding itself at the “civilizational crossroads”, Russia understands perfectly well what is the West and what is the East. The apt definition of N. Berdyaev says that Russia is “East-West” or Eurasia. One can be skeptical towards the “Eurasian idea”, but can’t deny the existence of such civilizational living arrangement). The author appreciates the idea that Russia is an independent civilization. Having its own historical lot, spiritual values, rich culture, centuries-old tradition of coexistence of all nations and ethnic groups, Russia is able to offer a special way to overcome inter-civilizational conflicts and contradictions. N.N. Moses once wrote: “The spiritual factor of the system of Russian traditions, which combine many of the features of the European West and the Pacific East, could serve a good purpose”. Reasonable use of these possibilities may open quite optimistic prospects for our country”<sup>24</sup>. The “Declaration of the rights of culture”, the project of the outstanding Russian scholar and humanist Dmitry Likhachov, states that “the cultural differences of nations and the inability...of the cultural dialog has become one of the causes of ethnic wars and international conflicts”<sup>25</sup>. Cultural dialog provides a unique opportunity for international

<sup>22</sup> M. M. Bakhtin, *Problems of the poetics of Dostoevsky* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literature, 1972).

<sup>23</sup> N. N. Moiseev, *The fate of civilization. The path of reason* (Moscow: Yazyki russkoy kul'tury, 2000).

<sup>24</sup> D. S. Likhachov, “Declaration of the rights of culture”. Retrieved from: <http://www.romance.ru/cgi-bin/index.cgi?page=d-6-3&item=1>.

<sup>25</sup> L. Moiseev, *SCO outgrows the regional framework*. Retrieved from: <http://www.infoshos.ru/ru/?idn=6050>.

dialog. That is why Russia recently conducts international meetings, conferences, forums, and symposia on cultural preservation and development, These activities optimize the dialog between cultures and contribute to the strengthening of relations among nations.

### **Implementation of political dialog as a type of cultural dialog**

An important aspect of dialogic form of communication is dialogic interaction in politics. In the modern world, dialog is not only the main way of existence of different cultures, but also an important factor in solving global and regional problems associated with non-confrontation, counter-terrorism and the consensus in the political, cultural and economic spheres of society. In addition, it is only dialog that is capable of developing strategies for harmonious coexistence of different political systems of the opposite political attitudes and interests on the level of consolidation. It explains the emergence of intergovernmental organizations which perform the function of establishing and strengthening strategic partnership in the context of preserving political and cultural interests at the international scene. In this regard, the author marks the activities of the Institute for global dialog (Africa), Center for world dialog (Cyprus) and Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (China). In the opinion of L. Moiseev, "the SCO is a dialog of cultures, civilizations, the unification of countries with different historical lots, different mentality and cultural values"<sup>26</sup>. Thus, change the direction of the dialog towards political cooperation actualizes the study of the practice-oriented political dialog, related to the implementation of the political interests of the states, on the one hand, and unification of different national cultures in a single sphere of communication, on the other hand.

The political dialog of cultures is possible only in democratic processes and relationships, since democracy implies equal interaction of diverse cultures, incompatible with the monopoly of a single one. It is important that in the lack of cultural diversity, democracy may not be formed at all, therefore, cultural pluralism may be considered as a determining factor of its functioning. A special part in the implementation of democratic principles is played by the cross-cultural political dialog, through which the democracy is born, evolves and develops.

The public sphere of politics not only transforms political dialogs, but also carries out their legitimation and proves their necessity. Refusal to carry on a dialog in a democratic society is regarded as a manifestation of authoritarianism and arrogance of governing bodies and elites. The strive for democracy or the setting the new democratic boundaries are always a result of cultural dialog, which are based on different cultural values, different development vectors, but at the same time they occur within a single historical era, and are designed to solve similar problems. It is no doubt that the form and the focus of the political dialog will largely depend not only on the nature of a particular culture, but on the specific social conditions, religious or cultural traditions prevailing in the society, social psychology, and ideology. Thus, it can be stated that political dialog and democracy are inextricably linked and determining each other components. Thus, avoiding confrontation carrying the threat of lawlessness actuation or other negative manifestations, is only possible through responsible and productive cultural dialog and positive interaction between different social and political structures. Unfortunately, in the XX century in Russia, it was possible to mention many examples of departure from political dialog to violent forms of relations

---

<sup>26</sup> A. I. Prigozhin, "Dialogue in science and society. Dialogic decisions", *Obshchestvennye nauki i sovremennost'*, num 3 (2004): 51-60.

between citizens of the country. The political life of Russian society for a long time was typical of the desire to demonstrate ideological opposition and political struggle of the parties and various associations.

Exploring the ways of dialogic interactions in modern societies including the Russian one, A.I. Prigozhin states that "the problem is the following: we diagnose an unacceptable conflict of modern history as the lack of dialogueness, strenuously proclaiming the need for dialog, but at the same time we do not know how to implement this idea in personal and social relationships"<sup>27</sup>.

We may partly agree with the scientist. It is not necessary to consider the lack of dialog to be the cause of conflicts in Russian society, because political and social conflicts in Russia have their own history and result from many factors. However, the author agrees with the fact that the lack of dialog in Russia entails the transformation of the conflict into a confrontational struggle of interests and values, thereby complicating the solution of social and political issues. The opportunities of dialogic communication are enormous, their use for finding compromise and the cooperation of subjects of social processes is an indicator of civilized society and the level of democratic development. A.I. Prigozhin writes: "The dialogic potential of the society is its ability to use various means and methods of dialog in the coordination of interests, goals and actions, whether it is the implementation of transactions, conflict resolution, disputes, etc. In other words, the dialogic potential can grow and be supported technically (if not technologically). We can assume that here we have not only the resource for the development of society, state, nation, organization, family, and other social institutions, but also the criterion of their civilizational maturity"<sup>28</sup>. Democratic dialog involves the joint search for the truth, the most efficient solution of the pressing issues, the achievement of a new level of intra-state relations through the exchange of cultural values.

As it came from the history, if the liberals and the socialists were engaged in a dialog, not uncompromising debates and discussions, the Russian society would have achieved great success at the political scene. However, the supporters of liberalism and socialism have constantly sought and still seek the disregard of each other's opinions, the demonstration of a monopoly on the truth. It comes to be a losing tactic for both parties. M. Foucault emphasized that "there is nothing more fragile than a political regime, indifferent to the truth; but nothing is more dangerous than a political system which claims to prescribe the truth. A function to say truly should not take the form of a law, in the same way it would be futile to believe that this function is lawfully living in spontaneous games of communication"<sup>29</sup>.

Recognizing the importance of dialog, yet the author notes that it cannot be considered as the only way of understanding the truth. However, one cannot deny its heuristic significance in the culture of polemics. Through dialogue, one can check the value-wise sense of ideas and proposed arguments for their optimality, the inputted and compliance with objectivity. It is quite a difficult task, particularly in case of conflict situations and political transformations taking place in society.

---

<sup>27</sup> M. Fuko, Concern for truth. Conversation with Francois Evald (Moscow: Kastal', 1996).

<sup>28</sup> M. Fuko, Concern for truth. Conversation with...

<sup>29</sup> V. E. Chernikova, "Manipulation of mass consciousness as a phenomenon of information society", *Teoriya i praktika obshchestvennogo razvitiya*, num 3 (2015): 141-144.

A necessary component of democratic dialog is the similarity of the positions of its participants, trust, interest in each other, and the expansion of the field of their interaction. The most productive and successful political dialog is social partnership, which is based on the interest of participants (partners) in the consolidated resolution of problems of mutual responsibility, and equal mutual obligations. Socially tolerant (or oppositional) kind of political dialog requires the existence of opposing parties and opposing views on different issues, the impossibility of the convergence of their positions. However, each subject of dialog recognizes the sufficiency and relevance of each other's positions, does not seek confrontation and destabilization of the society. Oppositionism of this type is that the participants of the dialog do not recognize the opposing positions but criticize it, thereby offering their own alternative. The presence of opposition in the political dialog is an essential aspect of democracy.

The desire to impose one's own position on the parties to the dialog by concealing the true purposes and intentions is a characteristic feature of a manipulative dialog. This case implies the active use of PR-technologies in order to complicate the position of the opponent and the inability to defend one's own views. Confrontational dialog is close to the above mentioned type. It should be viewed as a confrontation between the participants based on the failure of the mutual positions.

As the political practice shows, Russian society has all types of dialog, including confrontation in varying degrees. Despite the attenuation of confrontation in recent times, one should not ignore the intensity of the manipulative dialog. This type of dialog today is the most hazardous for the democracy, for it creates the surrogates of publicity. Continuous improvement (particularly at the level of governmental bodies) require social partnership, socially tolerant and oppositional types of dialog, because they are based on democratic principles of discourse ethics and are an important factor in the development of democracy.

Having analyzed the typical features of the political dialog, it is important to note that in modern Russia this type is possible and necessary. The problem is that there are conditions that make it difficult to conduct effective political dialogs in Russia. The main thing is totalitarian heritage associated with strain political relations that restrict the democratic interaction of political actors. Moreover, unformed culture of political dialog, which is today's reality, is a significant obstacle.

In developed democracies, political dialog as a way of overcoming political differences is an inherent part of political and social lives. The situation is different for the Russian society. First of all, the birth of democracy in modern Russia is due to irreconcilable struggle against the socialist political system, which essentially denied any dialogs. The modern politics try to resolve the most political contradictions by restructuring the environment or by changing political actors. This can be explained by the low level of awareness of Russian reality, a lack of critical consideration of one's activities, or vice versa, unjustified criticism towards not only politicians, but also towards the country and people in general. Copying Western cultural technologies also leads to difficulties in the implementation of productive political dialog.

Thus, the problem is, undoubtedly, very important and challenging for the young Russian democracy and requires a separate study. Note that while overcoming difficulties in the formation of democratic foundations, Russia has been steadily strengthening its political potential and considering political dialog as an important means of optimizing community and intergovernmental interaction.

## Features of dialog in the information society

One of the peculiarities of the modern time is global informatization. On the one hand, it positively affects all spheres of society by expanding communication boundaries, and on the other hand, it actuates “the negative trends related to the formation of stereotypes of mass consciousness, changing values and life-style...”<sup>30</sup>. Expansion often provokes social and cultural hostility and conflict. In this situation, it is important to harmonize relations between people by means of the dialog, which involves people with different worldviews and cultural values. The Polish philosopher A. Grzegorzczak writes: “Nonviolent actions are an ethically consistent conduct guided by a distinct moral ideal based on respect and love for the opponent”<sup>31</sup>. The emergence of new ways of communication and new understanding of social reality require a revision of the established ideas about dialog. Many researchers admit that dialog in its classical interpretation loses its relevance. For example, V. S. Bibler, the famous Russian researcher of contemporary culture, argues that modern reality is the instability and the “moving boundary” of culture find themselves on the verge of the ontological faults<sup>32</sup>. Multidimensionality of the modern world leads to the idea of pluralism, which is based on the recognition of the multiplicity of cultural forms and reflects the contradictions of modern reality. Modern science is in the search for variable patterns of dialogic interaction, which would reflect the contradictory nature of the modern world. Often, such models are: “universal, multidimensional dialog”, the dialog of cultural worlds, polylog as a principle of coexistence of cultures, etc. Activated search for new forms of dialog is explained by the fact that the means of communication like teleconferences, e-mail, the Internet, mobile phones, net-cinema, Skype, multimedia libraries, etc. are increasingly active implemented in modern practice. Thus, it is necessary to create “innovative trend-theories” which would be distinguished by versatility, reflect threats and challenges to society the “third wave” (E. Toffler) on the basis of the reconsideration of dialog. In author's opinion, the optimal model of a modern dialog is polylog. This statement has several reasons. First, polylog involves the interaction of a large number of equal subjects. It is of great importance against the background of cultural diversity. Second, polylog is able to establish communicative ties in terms of multi-vector network interaction of the infocommunicational space. Thirdly, the involvement of a range of subjects in the communicative process eliminates the misunderstanding between the participants of the dialog. Fourth, if dialog implies the presence of a common topic with common sense-orientation, the polylog takes into account the information coming from different and contradictory sources. Fifth, the idea of polylog is significant in terms of social and cultural transformation, when it is necessary to preserve the integrity of the culture. Here, polylog can be considered as a model of coexistence of communities and cultures in the era of information development of humankind.

Having considered the features of polylog as a modification of dialog, the author emphasizes that the thing that unites dialog and polylog is the axiological component. It provides for the principle of respect for different cultures, understanding and acceptance of the values of other cultures, and equality of the subjects of communication. The study of the Russian writer and philosopher L. N. Tolstoy concludes about a common spiritual basis for all cultures and justify this statement. The writer claimed that people belonging to different

---

<sup>30</sup> A. Gzhegorchik, “Spiritual communication in the light of the ideal of non-violence”, *Voprosy filosofii*, num 3 (1992): 54-63.

<sup>31</sup> V.S. Bibler, “Culture of the XX century and cultural dialog”, *Dialog kul'tur: proceedings of scientific conf. Moscow*, num XXV (1994): 3-11.

<sup>32</sup> E. Toffler, *The third wave* (Moscow: AST, 2004).



cultures have no reason for animosity or enmity, and that all philosophical doctrines from the point of view of their human purpose are the same. The philosopher-humanist, the great son of Indian nation, Mahatma Gandhi developed a similar idea. Gandhi believed that all religions, despite their external differences, are the same in their inner essence. There is a single true religion that is based on the idea of non-violence. The teachings of two great men defending the spiritual unity of all cultures are of great significance in solving the problem of cultural dialog in conditions of increasing risks and conflicts.

## Results

On the basis of the study of cultural dialog in the modern world and issues related to the implementation of dialogic interaction, the author gets the following results.

1. The problem of dialog is a philosophical problem that has raised interest in scientists since ancient times until today. Modern understanding of cultural dialog is based on the theories of the German philosopher M. Buber and the Russian philosopher M. Bakhtin, who spread the teaching about the dialog on the understanding of the essence of culture. Cultural dialog is considered as a process that involves not only the interchange of cultural values, but also the desire of the participants to understand the characteristics and identity of different cultures. Only openness to the cultures relative to each other allows realizing their own potential, to appreciate the uniqueness of their own culture, to search for universal values, which can be used for the good of humankind.

2. The modern cultural situation is typical of global changes that give rise to cultural conflicts due to the confrontation between global and local cultures. In conditions of cultural diversity and the aspirations of the cultures to the identity, it is namely the dialog that can become the main factor of preserving cultural integrity and cross-cultural understanding. A striking example is Russia, which due to its multicultural and geographical location is meant to provide successful interaction of cultures not only within the country itself, but also in the dialog between the East and the West.

3. Dialog as a means of solving social, cultural and political confrontation is, on the one hand, the openness of society (the desire for interaction, communicativeness, tolerance), and on the other hand, the subjective abilities of the members of the society to the interchange of cultural achievements, independent, and democratically oriented thinking. The basic rule of dialog is equality of opportunity of communicants based on rational discourse, which rejects the duality of the positions of the communicants and misinformation. It is namely the possession of information that allows the communicants to control the others. Thus, the exchange of information is the key to the successful communication process.

4. In the context of globalization, the dialog goes beyond a single culture and a single reality (cultural space), including the space of people with different religious, philosophical and political attitudes. It brings them to expediency and the need to address the issues that emerge from the boundaries of one nation or state and become general humanistic, thereby eliminating the political boundaries. Political dialog is possible only in the context of solving real practical problems, which occur in a particular state and become global in their nature, distribution and strength. This type of cultural dialog creates and expresses supranational interests.

5. Becoming one of the main values of modern society, information generates new patterns of interaction that reflect the multidimensionality, the dynamism and the multiculturalism of informational reality. The paper notes that in the information society, the most popular form of dialogic interaction is discussion, which takes into account the multi-vector nature of sociocultural reality. In the context of complex network information systems, the polylog is able to stabilize a sustainable communication and optimize collaboration

between the participants. All this will undoubtedly contribute to the socio-cultural development, implementation of cultural innovations on both the global and the local space of informational reality.

6. The study showed that the potential opportunities of cross-cultural dialog are great. Note the main one: the dialog of cultures in its updated version is an important factor of overcoming the crisis of humanism due to the aggressive impact of information. By recognizing the equivalence of certain culture, the dialog confirms humanistic principles focused on the formation of a new value system for further development of the civilization. Without claiming completeness of the study of social categories of cross-cultural dialog, the author says that it requires further consideration in the interdisciplinary research.

## Conclusion

The paper considers topical issues of cultural dialog against the background of the contradictory socio-cultural processes. Based on the study of the contemporary cultural situation, the author concludes that dialogue is the only possible way of interaction between cultures. The author uses Russia as an example, since this country has historically inherent desire to set the dialog with other communities and cultures. The study determined the nature and content of the cultural dialog in conditions of globalization expressed in the form of political dialog. This type is a way of coordinating the interests of countries with different cultures. Political dialog as a form of cultural dialog bases on the recognition of the cultural features of its participants and seeks to implement cultural dialog in a politically institutionalized form. The transformation of modern society towards the expansion of information exchange and virtualization of social space has led to the emergence of new ways of cultural dialog interpretation. According to the author, polylog as a modern version of dialog to the greatest extent reflects the communicative specificity of the information age and considers its polycommunicative and multi-vector nature. This understanding of cultural interaction is based on recognition of cultural diversity of cultures and the rejection of cultural confrontation.

## References

- Bakhtin, M. M. Problems of the poetics of Dostoevsky. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literature. 1972
- Bakhtin, M.M. Aesthetics of verbal creativity. Moscow: Iskusstvo. 1986.
- Beck, U. Risk society. Towards a New Modernity. London: SAGE Publications. 1992.
- Beck, U.; Giddens, A. & Lash, S. Reflexive Modernization. Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order. Cambridge: Polity Press. 1994.
- Bek, U. What is globalization? Mistakes of globalism - response to globalization. Moscow. 2001.
- Bell, D. The future postindustrial society. 2004.
- Benkhabib, S. The claims of culture. Equality and diversity in the global era. Moscow: Logos. 2005.
- Bibler, V. S. From the epistemology to the logic of culture. Moscow: Politizdat. 1991.

Bibler, V. S. "Culture of the XX century and cultural dialog". Dialog kul'tur: proceedings of scientific conf. Moscow, num XXV (1994): 3-11.

Buber, M. Dialog. Two images of faith. Moscow: Respublika. 1995.

Chernikova, V. E. "Manipulation of mass consciousness as a phenomenon of information society". Teoriya i praktika obshchestvennogo razvitiya, num 3 (2015): 141-144.

Chernov, A. A. Formation of the global information society: problems and prospects. Moscow: Dashkov i K. 2003.

Delokarov, K. Kh. Values of the globalizing world. Moscow: Scientific Press Ltd. 2002.

Dzhoshi, M. M. "Cultural dialog and civilizations in the era of world globalization". Dialog kul'tur i tsivilizatsiy v global'nom mire: proceedings of the VII Int. Likhachov readings (2007): 49-51.

Experience of social forecasting. Moscow: Academia.

Fassler, M. MedialeInteraktion. Munchen:17. 2006.

Fuko, M. Concern for truth. Conversation with Francois Ewald. Moscow: Kastal'. 1996.

Giddens, A. The Consequences of Modernity. Cambridge: Polity Press. 1990.

Gzhegorchik, A. "Spiritual communication in the light of the ideal of non-violence". Voprosy filosofii, num 3 (1992): 54-63.

Janmaat, J. G. & Mons, N. "Promoting ethnic tolerance and patriotism: the role of education system characteristics. Comparative Education Review". British Journal of Educational Studies, num 55 (1) (2011): 56-81.

Kolin, K. K. Information civilization. Moscow: Institut problem informatiki RAN. 2002.

Likhachov, D. S. "Declaration of the rights of culture". Retrieved from: <http://www.romance.ru/cgi-bin/index.cgi?page=d-6-3&item=1>.

Meer, N. & Modood, T. "How does interculturalism contrast with multiculturalism?". Journal of intercultural studies, (2011): 11-22.

Modood, T. Multiculturalism, a civic idea. London: Polity Press. 2007.

Moiseev, L. SCO outgrows the regional framework. Retrieved from: <http://www.infoshos.ru/ru/?idn=6050>.

Moiseev, N. N. The fate of civilization. The path of reason. Moscow: Yazyki russkoy kul'tury. 2000.

Pain, E. A. "A difficult path from multiculturalism to cross-culturalism". Vestnik Instituta Kennana v Rossii, num 20 (2011): 78-85.

- Phillips, A. Multiculturalism without culture. NY: Princeton University Press. 2007.
- Prigozhin, A. I. "Dialogue in science and society. Dialogic decisions". Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost', num 3 (2004): 51-60.
- Robertson, R. Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture. London: SAGE Publications. 1992.
- Shalin, V. V. Tolerance: cultural norms and political necessity. Rostov-on-Don. 2000.
- Shtompka, P. Sociology of social changes. Moscow: Aspekt Press. 1996.
- Skvortsov, L. V. Information culture and integral knowledge. Moscow: MBA. 2011.
- Toffler, E. The third wave. Moscow: AST. 2004.
- Tolstykh, V. I. The future of civilization in the context of cultural dialog. In collected works: Dialog kul'tur v globaliziruyushchemsya mire. Moscow: Nauka. 2005.
- Zubkov, V. I. Sociological risk theory. Moscow: RUDN. 2003.

## CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo  
Puede hacerse sin permiso de **Revista Inclusiones, citando la fuente**.