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Abstract

A global world brings important global novations into the problem of a dialogue. A dialogue as a process of uniting traditions and novations is a dominating factor of a development of the society. In this dialogue social-cultural changes and novations mixing with a tradition generate a new specification of dialogue in the globalizing world. A dialogue turning takes place in the world and its main themes are the humanization of dialogue of cultures and the elimination of controversial potentials on the basis of principles of tolerance and humanism and also the principle of tolerant strategies of global dialoguing. Consequently, in this article a philosophical understanding of the approaches to the notion of globalization is given. These approaches on the one hand study the globalization as an establishment of the global communicative space and on the other hand, they reflect the modern world as a self-organized system where the processes of communication, generation of order from chaos, transformation and appearance of new bifurcation points as the new points of development take place.

Keywords: dialogue, globalization, dialogue turning, management.

1. Introduction

The terms “globalization”, “globalization era”, “globalizing world” are more and more strongly coming into the everyday and scientific language. “Globalization is a close rapprochement and interaction of different parts of the entire world which have different cultural sets and staying on different stages of development” (Nazarchuk, 2002, p. 281).

During the globalization era a qualitative change of world takes place. Its essence cannot be studied separately from the processes of mass media and communication development. Due to relevancy and importance of informational and communicational processes in the society the investigators’ attention to the phenomenon of communication and dialogue in conditions of globalization has increased. Despite the lively discussion of different globalization processes which takes place in literature, globalization as a problem has relatively recently arisen, that is why in publicism some independent and original globalization conceptions have appeared. Nevertheless their philosophical understanding in the context of communicational interactions and dialogue as their variety is not enough.

2. The Globalization Conceptual Analysis

Ulrich Beck in his work “What is globalization?” gives a definition to the globalization which in the most proper way reflects the essence of the world changes. First of all “the globality reflects the fact that henceforth all that takes place on our planet cannot lead to one locally limited event; that all inventions, victories and catastrophes concern the whole world and that we must put our life and our actions, our organizations and institutions to reorientation and reorganization according to the idea of “local-global” (Beck, 2001, c. 89).

Ulrich Beck distinguishes the notions of “globalism”, “globality”, and “globalization”. He writes: “Globalism is the understanding of the fact that the world market replaces or substitutes political activity, for me it’s the ideology of world market supremacy, the ideology of neoliberalism”. “Globality reflects the fact that that henceforth all that takes place on our planet cannot lead to one locally limited event; that all inventions, victories and catastrophes concern the whole world and that we must put our life and our actions, our organizations and institutions to reorientation and reorganization according to the idea of “local-global”. Globalization according to U. Beck is “a dialectical process which creates transnational social connections and spaces depreciates local cultures and promotes the appearance of third cultures”

The conception of globalization of the American thinker M. Castells characterizes the process of globalization by the expansion in space; stability in time; thickness of transnational networks of communication, connections and television flows and singles out the following reasons of globalization nonremovability: the global interweaving of the financial market, the increasing power of transnational concerns; information and communicational and technological revolution; the principle of democracy; the descriptive flows of industry of culture which enveloped the whole world; the polycentric world politics (concerns, nongovernmental organizations, United Nations Organization); the global poverty; the global destruction of environment; transcultural local conflicts.

The powerful globalization processes change the whole world. They cross the national and state borders which determines “the lack of attachment to a particular place” of the capital and communication’s labor; the power of transnational actors, institutions and agreements; the absence of a world state and world government. M. Castells sees in this situation the expansion of the global disorganized capitalism. It should be mentioned that in literature the most widespread tendencies of understanding the globalization are the tendencies of intensification of interaction and interdependence of the human societies’ life.

3. Defining the Problem of Dialogue

A great number of definitions and works on globalization doesn’t give us the relevant philosophical understanding of globalization, all its problems, aspects and contexts. On the one hand, globalization owes its appearance the formation of the global communicational space which took place by the beginning of the XXI century due to the development of the scientific and technological progress, which generated the latest technological opportunities of the implementation of communications and spreading the information.

On the other hand, the modern world acquires new features which find their reflection on the globalization processes. In such self-organizing systems as the modern society it produces the permanent processes of communication, transformation, the appearance of new bifurcation points in the social reality as a specific way of resolution of positive and negative globalization processes which produce the situation of communicational surpluses, conflicts, the situations of global risks, etc. A new communicative situation generates in the society; its key moment on the one hand is the increase of the role of communication and on the other hand is the appearance of new communication and dialogue problems and questions under the conditions of the modern world globalization.

The changing situation of the modern world is characterized by the globalization and renovation. At the turn of these historical moments the intellectual thought will have to seriously analyze a lot of topics, problem turnings; it will have to realize the nontraditional questions in order to understand the modern world panorama. All of them are essential and very relevant; one of these questions is a global dialogue. On the agenda is a paradigmatic “dialogue turning”. Having built a picture of the universe and fastened it by the supports which are the categories, the science unveiled a new global world where the dominant role belongs to the interaction, communication and dialogue.

4. The Problematics of Dialogue

The problematics of dialogue despite it becomes an urgent question of modernity in the context of a global dialogue of the mankind has its own traditions and novations. A tradition as a “transfer”, way and form of social inheritance which all are saved in the societies for a relatively long time has a rich history. The traditionalistic concepts of dialogue and the philosophy of dialogue are widely known. The classical scientific grounds and the cognitive tooling correspond to them. Such a traditional idea of a dialogue was an incitement for the revolutionary ideas in the modern natural science. It turned out to be that the historic forms of science development don’t destroy themselves but quietly coexist in the form of dialogue. A dialogue with nature and a dialogue between natural and liberal cultures are the characteristic topics of dialogue in science. The dialogical sense is represented in classical and postnonclassical interpretations as linear and nonlinear dialogues. Being armed with a novation synergetic approach and tooling, the modern science changes the idea of a dialogue.

Nevertheless the global world brings much more essential global novations into the problematics of dialogue. First of all, a dialogue has heretofore reflected about some separate questions and problems concerning the particular events which corresponded to the ontological aspect of understanding of our world and set aside no less important gnoseological aspect of approach to the world investigation problems.

Secondly, the review of the global problems through the prism of a dialogue requires the inclusiveness of scientific reflection. The world as a problem becomes a problematic field. Scientific reflection of such problem needs a new
understanding of dialogue, revealing novations in it which includes a combination of two aspects, scientific reflection of the modern world understanding and methods of handling in the defining of a problem.

It should be mentioned that such defining of a problem is a characteristic feature both of science and culture which was not limited by the traditional forms, but brought the external influence, nontraditional forms marked as novations and innovations. “A novation is a new, unknown and not characteristic item for the given tradition of culture. An innovation is a modified (changed, renovated), familiar or recognizable form” (Great Encyclopedic Dictionary, 2002).

The dominating factor of the society development is a dialogue as a process of combining tradition and novations. “The history of any culture demonstrates us the dynamics of social-cultural changes in which novations connecting with traditions generate the new cultural formations” (Great Encyclopedic Dictionary, 2002).

The civilizational approach of A. Toynbee conceives every historical challenge as a challenge to the traditionalism, motion to the innovation changes. In this case a global world opens a new novational page of dialogue, that is the dialogue of civilizations, dialogue of cultures, dialogue of states, etc.

Let us call the civilizations and cultures the world systems and then speak about the dialogue of world systems. The “world systemic” conception of L. Wallerstein is widely known in the historical science. This conception was developed in the 1980s. “The very appeal of a historian to the notion of “system” for defining the entire existence of the mankind, interconnection of all its national and state parts and then mastering the synergetic ideas of I. Progozhin by western and Russian philosophers and culture experts during the transfer from the analysis of construction and functioning of social and cultural systems to the explanation of their development processes” (Kagan, 2002).

5. The Dialogue of Systems

A phenomenon of globalization plays an important role in the dialogue of the world systems. The investigation of a globalization phenomenon is represented in works of foreign and Russian scientists. They note the fundamental transformation in the logic development of the world community at the end of the XX century. This transformation is connected with the globalization processes. The phenomenon of globalization is a complex and controversial process determining the appeal of philosophy to its understanding which in its turn is controversial and finds its reflection in the controversial conceptions. The understanding of the globalization phenomenon is represented by different points of view (Aron, Bauman, Delyagin, Giddens, Panarin, Dugin, Walzer and others). The process of globalization has seriously changed all the world phenomena and consequently brought up some specific problems which were not heretofore present in philosophy. The change of communication between the world systems brings up a problem of transformation, perception, reception of cultural and civilizational phenomena. It gets another global character and little depends on the previous intrasystemic communications. Here arises a problem of spontaneous dangers and conflicts towards such system forms which cannot be solved in the framework of the traditional communications.

Some new communicative practices of mankind appear in the era of globalization. A dialogue of the world systems is among them. It is known that the idea of understanding of “I and You” lies in a dialogue. In the capacity of “I and You” can be “Another and Another civilization”, “Another and Another culture”, East and West, religion and sciences, faith and sense. If during the interpersonal communication a human is realized as a person, then in the communication of the world systems the human nature is realized. The modern dialogue should be tended to establish the mutual understanding.

Consequently, our investigation focuses on the dialogue in the era of globalization as the most important problem which defines the future of the whole mankind. The globalization has not destroyed the historical problems of the world systems interconnections, such as the problem of war and peace, ecological problems, intercultural and international disagreements, interreligious conflicts and conflicts similar to them. “The globalization has not implemented the integration process of the mankind’s attempts to solve the global problems; vice versa it gave an unpredictable status to these problems” (Akhmetzhanov, 2010, p. 21).

And there is a question, whether the understanding of the necessity of dialogue in the modern world is enough and whether the mankind is in the mood to solve the fundamental problems of its inharmonious existence and development? Are there any reasons for the dialogue? Why does the dialogue seem a panacea for all disasters?

The answer is, the dialogue “unveiled” the critical situation in the world, it marked out the essence not only of the peaceful mutual understanding, but also the misunderstanding which leads to conflicts. It discovered “the motivation to dramatic changes: the danger crept over the most valuable things – over the human, his freedom, life, its principles, sense, stimulus and motivations, over its value foundations” (Akhmetzhanov, 2010).

A realization of the necessity of a fundamental turning in the understanding of dialogue in the globalization era takes place at the moment. The strategies of solving the civilizational, liberal and economical problems of the modern society are implemented through the dialogue, communication and understanding.

The following items became the central themes of searching for the answers to the dialogue turning challenges. The attempts to implement the projects of the global dialogue and the global integration led “the world community” to the problem of “incoordination”, contradictions that occur with the world systems, environment and human; such contradictions make it impossible to achieve the single understanding of aims and results of the dialogue projects. This is the central contradiction of the globalization era. The neglect of the abovementioned problems leads to the strengthening of tension, uncertainty, fear for the mankind’s future. How can we eliminate it?

The analysis shows that there are a lot of strategies of the dialogue of cultures which are represented in different models of “intercultural integration”, “alliance of civilizations”, “multicultural dialogue”, “communicative rationalities”, “mutual understanding philosophy”, “interfaith agreement”, “dialogue of civilizations”, “traditions and novations in the dialogue of cultures” and others, but such cultural pluralism does not promote the consensus and mutual understanding establishment. We need the humanization of the dialogue of cultures.

The world systems dialogue transforms fundamentally during the process of globalization, and the result of it is the appearance of potentials which correspond with the humanistic needs and ideas and also potentials which release not the order, but the chaos of the intersystem interaction. The elimination of such potential is possible on the basis of principles of tolerance, humanism and tolerant strategies of the global dialoging which is implemented in the polyethnic, multicultural space of the modern world.

Globalization on the one hand intensifies the intercultural integration, on the other hand it leads to a break of the historic traditional cultural connections; and the removal of value paradigms of the traditional culture leads to the neglect of historic successive connections, loss of moral guide and to the global mancurtism (historical unconsciousness). The ideas of patriotism, national mentality and the creation of the world outlook basis for the people’s consciousness can help to withstand the mancurtism (Toshchenko, 2012).

7. The Problem Field of the Modern Dialogue

Now it’s time for realizing the problem field of dialogue, time for the philosophical understanding of dialogue in comparison with traditionalistic and novational approaches. Dialogue is necessary as an “approach that is relevant to the communicative interaction of nations, civilizations, world system, world community and their institutes with a human” (Kochetov, http://www.allrus.info/main.php?id=652370&ar3=508). We need the latest world intellectual platforms of the intellectual level on the world problem field of dialogue.

From the point of view of globalization the problem field of the modern dialogue lies in the following. We need a working out of dialogical communicative strategies which do not criticize the world situations and do not overestimate the dominant paradigm, but develop the alternative approaches to the understanding of social and cultural facts, create theoretical conceptions which allow to see the essence of controversial sets which were formed in the scientific practice and investigating the modern world in different aspects and contexts. The pathos of the given thesis is proved by the words of Y. Habermas “…the truth is spread over the many universes of discourses, they are no longer fallen under the hierarchization, but in each of these discourses we are looking hard for the insights which could persuade everyone” (Habermas, 1995, p. 81).

The process of globalization eliminates the domination of the single “Logos”, it offers the set on the radical pluralism which leads to the loss of cultural identity and sovereign by nations. In this connection some strategies of the world systems dialogue become actual. They are the strategies that are aimed to save the identity both of the world system and the identity of an individual in it, and also to save in it the sovereigns of different levels, such as cultural, religious and individual.

It is necessary to consider a world systems dialog in the globalization era as an open process in the understanding of modern rationality, which is open, flexible and synergetic. The openness of dialogue aims the absence of the ideological rules and limits, procedurality of the common to all mankind values and also subordination of the fundamental world outlook paradigm. The dialogical paradigm acts as such fundamental world outlook paradigm.

A dialogue of cultures and dialogical thinking in the modern era are the only things that lead to the world systems mutual understanding and also to the understanding of a human in the culture of Another. “A dialogue of cultures is the only human’s opportunity to implement in himself the cognitive and creative possibilities, to overcome the stereotyped
prejudices which prevent from the fundamental communication in the world of cultural variety, to establish himself in the culture existence and to promote the understanding of Another and Another culture” (Akhmetzhanov, 2010, p. 23).

The abovementioned arguments about the “dialogue turning” in the modern philosophy allow to understand why in the XX century the idea of dialogue became a part of the problem field of the philosophical thinking and is steadily expanding its sphere of influence in the context of the world globalization. The history of the philosophy of dialogue begins in the 1920s with the understanding of a dialogue in the works of M. Buber and M.M. Bakhtin. M. Buber defined a human existence as a “dialogical life”, the strategies and comprehension of which we are studying in our investigation. The M.M. Bakhtin’s follower, V.S. Bibler, defined the laws of thinking as a “dialogics”. At the moment there are many interconnected notions: “an internal dialogue” as a process which happens in our consciousness and “a dialogical human nature”, a notion introduced by M.S. Kagan and considering a dialog as an optimum form of spiritual people’s communication in real life, in the imagination’s activity, in the perception of art, a “dialogical thinking”, etc. (Kagan, 2002).

8. Control as a Form of Communicative Practice

Today the problem of searching for the optimum ways of solving conflicts of the social and political shocks and the “overcoming the politics by morality” becomes very relevant. In this connection it is expedient to study a cultural and civilizational dialogue as a method of solving problems in the modern world.

At the heart of such study lies the idea of a global world as a system without control. The control like a dialogue is one of the forms of the communicative practices. The difference between them lies in the fact that control is a unidirectional process directed on the object of control and a dialogue is an equal two-directional process. Control is “a process of influence of a subjects towards an object which is aimed to the ordering, saving, destroying and changing the system of an object in accordance with the goal” (Globalistics, 2006, p. 769).

If in the separate states the social processes are controlled and regulated, then in the world community they are only regulated. The “regulation is a spontaneous process or the intentional actions aimed to provide the optimum functioning one or another system within the corresponding limits given by natural or artificial way” (Chumakov, 2013).

Nevertheless from the middle of the XX century the world communicative situation has been fundamentally changing in the connection with the world processes globalization and the whole world and mankind becomes a world system which has neither obvious, nor latent control. Regulation as a spontaneous process cannot be an effective regulator of the world system.

The process of controlling the world systems under the conditions of globalization is complex. It includes not only the question about the uncontrollability of this phenomenon, but also the opposition between the globalists and antiglobalists, between the phenomenon of the “global mancurtism” and even “global mancrutisation” of the mankind. Only a dialogue and a dialogical strategy of the modern culture can be put up against such understanding of the situation.

The development of the modern world can be studied from the pessimistic and optimistic points of view. Let us on the one hand study the pessimistic point of view towards the development of the modern world. Our global future seems as a united society with a homogeneous culture. The development of communications and communicative culture lies in the elimination of the diversity of cultures and creation of the cultural identity. In this case it’s necessary to choose the elimination of barriers which separate the cultures and the creation the cultural identity as a strategy of development. Some western sociologists see the cause of social conflicts between the world systems and the reason for the power which prevent the mankind from uniting right in the cultural diversity.

F. Fukuyama links the cultural leveling of the mankind with the formation of the unified mankind after which the “end” of the history comes. S. Huntington who in a realistic way estimates the impossibility of making the world culture and the system of values universal, points at its impossibility which creates a reason of the inevitable collapse of civilizations.

On the other hand, the optimistic point of view towards the fates of the world systems lies in the dialogue of the global world systems and primarily the cultures. Many politicians and philosophers think of it as of the “only possible and real communicative practice of the mankind. The idea of understanding of Another and Another culture, East and West, religion and sciences, faith and sense lies in the dialogue of cultures. A human actualizes himself in a dialogue, and in a dialogue of cultures the actualization of a human nature takes place. A modern dialogue of cultures is a dialogue out of dictate, a dialogue which has a presumption of the establishment of understanding” (Akhmetzhanov, 2010, p. 21).
9. Conclusion

Consequently, in this article a philosophical understanding of the approaches to the notion of globalization is given. These approaches on the one hand study the globalization as an establishment of the global communicative space and on the other hand, they reflect the modern world as a self-organized system where the processes of communication, generation of order from chaos, transformation and appearance of new bifurcation points as the new points of development take place.

It is revealed that the dominant factor of the society development is a dialogue as a process of combining traditions and novations, in which the social and cultural changes and novations combining with a tradition generate a new specification of dialogue in the globalizing world.

The central themes of searching for the answers to the dialogue turning challenges are determined. They are the humanization of the dialogue of cultures and the elimination of controversial potentials on the basis of principles of tolerance and humanism and also the principle of tolerant strategies of global dialoguing.

It is stated that the globalization on the one hand intensifies the intercultural integration, on the other hand it leads to a break of the historic traditional cultural connections and to the global mancurtism (historical unconsciousness). The ideas of patriotism, national mentality and the creation of the world outlook basis for the people’s consciousness can help to withstand the mancurtism.

It is understood that the development of the modern world can be studied from the pessimistic and optimistic points of view: the strategies of the elimination of the diversity of cultures as a cause of social conflicts between the world systems and the dialogue of cultures as the actualization of the human nature.
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