Strategies for Treating the Other in the Methodological Focus of Intersubjectivity

Svitlana HANABA¹,
Valentyna MIROSHNICHENKO²,
Svitlana SHUMOVETSKA³,
Nataliia MAKOHONCHUK⁴,
Anatolii HALIMOV⁵,
Ihor BLOSHCHYNSKYI⁶

¹ Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, associate professor, Professor of Pedagogics and social-economic disciplines department, Faculty of foreign languages and humanities, National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, sveta_ganaba@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0002-4373-7075

² Doctor of pedagogical sciences, associate professor, Head of Pedagogics and social-economic disciplines department, Faculty of foreign languages and humanities, National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, mvi_2016@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0002-3931-0888

³ Candidate of pedagogical sciences, associate professor, Associate professor of Pedagogics and social-economic disciplines department, Faculty of foreign languages and humanities, National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, sv_shumovetska@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0001-5419-1576

⁴ Candidate of pedagogical sciences, Senior Instructor of Pedagogics and social-economic disciplines department, Faculty of foreign languages and humanities, National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, wysenka@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0001-7378-8917

⁵ Doctor of pedagogical sciences, professor, Senior Research Fellow, National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, galimov-a@ukr.net, orcid.org/0000-0002-4348-4995

⁶ Doctor of pedagogical sciences, professor, Head of the English translation department, Faculty of foreign languages and humanities, National Academy of the State Border Guard Service of Ukraine named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, i.bloshch@gmail.com, orcid.org/0000-0003-1925-9621

Abstract: In today's world, the “challenge” of cultural diversity turns out to be the basis for further social processes and necessitates the reorientation of conventional cultural institutions of social life to the recognition of the possibility of different cultures to develop fully within a particular social community. Another problem is the search for a person's ability and capability to “protect” “his/her own self” in the face of the threat of unification and depersonalization of the globalized world, to choose the most personal thing to him/her in society. Evolution towards a multicultural world predetermines the search of productive methodological approaches in explaining the integrative processes of the modern world and outlining strategies for the development of cultural diversity and multicultural co-existence. An intersubjective approach is relevant and productive in this perspective of consideration. In philosophical discourse, intersubjectivity is understood as intersubjectness and implies a connection between subjects, not identical, not universal Ego-Ego, but rather individual, autonomous, equal Ego-Other, emerging and understood as unique existence world by virtue of their nature.

The concept of dialogue is a kind of “solidarity” of the Otherness existences. The dialogue is seen as the goal and principal means of spiritual objective reality and renewal of modern social objective reality, demonstrating the ability to find common solutions, ways of understanding and harmony in resolving conflict situations, overcoming conformism and selfishness. A world deprived of cultural priorities in the development of certain cultures and the neglect of the opportunities and characteristics of others will deprive the human race of hostility and intransigence, will acquire the contours of a pluralistic, multicultural image, since it is “woven out” from the discourse of different value- worthy civilizational achievements.

Keywords: *intersubjectivity; pluralism; the Other; integration; dialogue; existence.*

How to cite: Hanaba, S., Miroshnichenko, V., Shumovetska, S., Makohonchuk, N., Halimov, A., & Bloshchynskyi, I. (2019). Strategies for Treating the Other in the Methodological Focus of Intersubjectivity. *Postmodern Openings*, 10(4), 168-181. doi:10.18662/po/101

Introduction. Topicality

Integration processes in the modern world significantly affect the further destiny of the human race. Nowadays, information exchange and communication media allow us to cover long distances and thus contribute to the “unification” of different lifestyles, worldviews and cultural values of the human race. The world becomes familiar and heard. Previously, experiences, achievements of other cultures seemed something exotic and distant, but now they appear quite close, within one’s own cultural environment. A dynamic changing world erases the boundaries, eliminates the barriers that divide the world of culture into “one’s own” and “the other”. The human race admires the same stars of art and cinema, wears the same jeans and sneakers, and listens to the same music, etc. Our commonness is marked by the signs of the Other. They penetrate our lives through ubiquitous advertising, international consumption system, the Internet. The space of everyday life encompasses the numerous territories of the Other, with the significant fact that these territories are universalized i.e. the same trademarks, chains of restaurants or supermarkets, etc. become the elements of everyday life in any country of the world. The mutual penetration of cultures, the levelling of the boundary between one’s own and the other is becoming increasingly intense, unpredictable and, according to researchers (Beck, 2000; Toffler, 2002), causes a kind of “shock” within the cultural environment and becomes a measure of the global problem of existence. The peculiarities of the perception of the Other having an ambivalent nature are revealed in this impossibility to hide beyond the limits of “one’s own”. On the one hand, the approaching of another, different culture causes fear of loss of traditions and heritage of one’s own culture, levelling of its cultural identity, and on the other hand, leads to overcoming the alienation of the culture, results in mutual enrichment and outlines new horizons of its development. Nowadays, the human race deals with the double challenge of “identity in the face of openness” (Castells, 2000). Approximation of “other worlds” influences the life practices, moral and ideological orientations, stereotypes of perception of the modern person. The person acquires new experiences, new knowledge, skills and habits and consequently develops the ability to overcome the boundaries of his/her own cultural environment and “stay” in other worlds, which lose the outlines of foreignness and hostility to him/her. The person’s way of life is not stability, but mobility, permanent stay within different, cultural communicative fields.

The urgency of the topic is enhanced by the fact that the process of "unity" of other cultural worlds is not devoid of contradictions, frequent undisguised hostility and confrontation. This leads to the search for effective ways of ideally tolerant attitude towards cultural diversity. The world outlines a situation that presents mosaic patterns, plurality of life forms and gives a new wave of new identities. Such a postmodern contemporaneity denies the existence of a unified image of reality for all participants, which cannot be clearly explained and concluded within a certain framework of understanding and perception. It manifests itself in spontaneity, a constant disruption of stability, a significant superiority of the emotional, the irrational over the established and rational. The consciousness of the modern person is oriented to constant "renewal", the search for personal freedoms; it is waging war with ideological ambitions of totality in the name of the game of differences, which never ends. Generally speaking, we can talk about the identity crisis. Such state of identity lies in distancing from understanding of identity as a constant, which is created once and for all throughout life and is supported by its holistic character in favor of a pluralistic, able to preserve freedom of choice and openness to new experiences. This crisis of identity in Ukrainian society tends to be more complicated: it includes acquisition of inferiority complexes rather than the acquisition of new outlines. This state of affairs is caused by a number of unresolved problems of socio-cultural, ethno-national, political, etc. nature, which show the ability to grow into militant, chauvinistic, Friend-or-Foe nationalist oppositions. Therefore, the development of a pluralistic type of self-identity, which involves free, creative, open personal search and choice; a change in the principle of interaction between groups of human communities, which was previously built on the opposition of "we" and "they" on the principles of coexistence, cooperation and understanding of different groups of society as a world and planetary community are timely.

The "challenge" of cultural diversity turns out to be the basis for further social processes and necessitates the reorientation of conventional cultural institutions of social life to the recognition of the possibility of different cultures to develop fully within a particular social community. Another problem is the search for a person's ability and capability to "protect" "his/her own self" in the face of the threat of unification and depersonalization of the globalized world, to choose the most personal thing to him/her in society. Evolution towards a multicultural world predetermines the search and analysis of methodological approaches effective in understanding and explaining the integrative processes of the modern world and outlining strategies for the development of cultural

diversity and multicultural co-existence. An intersubjective approach is relevant and productive in this perspective of consideration.

The purpose of the article is to examine the methodological baselines of an intersubjective approach that are productive for the modern world understanding as an “ensemble of cultural singularities and differences” that intersect, interact, interrelate and develop within the communicative and dialog space.

Methodology of Research

Review of researches on the topic.

In philosophical discourse, intersubjectivity is understood as intersubjectness and implies a connection between subjects, not identical, not universal Ego-Ego, but individual, autonomous, equal Ego-Other, emerging and understood as unique existence world by virtue of their nature. Otherness is another dimension of the world that is in the process of transcendence beyond the delineated Ego, remaining incomprehensible to the end, since the phenomenon of Otherness will be lost and it will be reduced to a certain modality averaged by It. The irreducibility of the Other to the common universal It or Ego does not mean contradistinctions or oppositions, but implies an understanding of the Otherness as one's own inherent value of the world, presenting other forms of thinking, world-view and value priorities and life practices. Researcher V. Tabachkovskyi (2004) analyses the phenomenon of Otherness as a real force capable of realizing itself in the “swift course of life” and constantly presenting new facets of its essence. “Every time we want something other, and this other, in each subsequent period of self-awareness of culture is in turn, also “other”, - says the scientist (Tabachkovskyi, 2004: 158).

Relevant is the study by Catalina Maria Georgescu, who revealed the problem of identity and realization of European values in the media using a postmodern methodology (Georgescu, 2018), namely the postmodernity of European integration (affirming EU core values, identities and principles in the Mass Media).

Noteworthy is the study on the transformation of values and the mentality of young people under the influence of cultural diversity (Pehoiu, 2018). An example of practical implementation of our theoretical considerations is a research conducted by the scholar ***Claudia Salceanu***. She conducted a comparative analysis of the value system in society between different generations of people (values in adolescents and emerging adults).

In this way, she showed the possibilities of building paths of a tolerant environment and coexistence of different generations (Sălceanu, 2019).

The followers of the postmodern R. Barthes (1989), J. Deleuze (1998), W. Welsh (2004), and others interpret the personality by giving it a number of new characteristics, with decentration being the most decisive among them (Barthes, 1989; Deleuze, 1998; Welsh, 2004).

A representative of phenomenology E. Husserl (1931) introduced the concept of intersubjectivity. He interprets this phenomenon as a product of ego consciousness in his work "Cartesian Reflections". "What is specific to me as an ego, my particular monadic being is purely in myself and for myself and, for me in a closed sphere of originality, encompasses any intentionality, including, aimed at something "other". However, this another ego is not just present, given to us as it is itself - it is constructed as an alter ego... In accordance with its constituted meaning, "the other" is my own reflection, and at the same time it is not, it is my own analogue, and again an analogue in the unusual sense of the word", - the philosopher writes (Husserl, 1931: 189-190). Cognition the Otherness phenomenon is, in his view, a complex and multifaceted task, since the Otherness is not regarded as a natural-physical object, but understood as a psychophysical subject, possessing the ability, through the lens of one's own experience, to cognize the world and my ego in the capacity of Otherness in this world. "I cognize the world through my own experience, not in the capacity of, so to speak, my own synthetic product, but as an alien to me intersubjective world that exists for everyone and accessible to everyone in their objects", - E. Husserl says (1931). This world is understood by the researcher as a personal multi-universe, as a community of unique and inherently valued Otherness, who, through an act of transcendence, are able to present their own authentic world and emerge as a difference and possibly opposition to my ego. Such property of my consciousness testifies that, besides my transcendental subject, there are other transcendental subjects whose community creates their own world of intersubjectivity. Non-recognition of the Otherness leads to a simplified understanding of the world as a one-dimensional layer-phenomenon of being that lacks a focus on personality.

It is worth noting that the problem of intersubjectivity was actively developed by the followers: E. Husserl (1998), J.-P. Sartre (1990), B. Waldenfels (1997) and others. They complemented E. Husserl's legacy with their original ideas. Philosophers viewed the phenomenon of Otherness as a concrete, authentic world, not as a derivative of ego-consciousness. Thus, the representative of the philosophy of existentialism J.-P. Sartre (1990) analysed the category of Otherness as a distinctive, personal being of

a human, capable of embodying psycho-emotional and spiritual uniqueness. "Any other person is another project", - the researcher accentuates. This project of Otherness is unfolded in the capacity of my Ego - objective reality in the other, because that Other is no stranger to me and has universal significance. "In this sense," he writes, "we can talk about the commonality of a human being, who, however, is not a given one in advance. Choosing myself, I make the commonality. I create it, understanding the project of any other person, no matter what era he/she belonged to" (Sartre, 1990: 337).

Statement of the main material and results of the research.

The creation of an intersubjective world is the product of meeting and interacting with equal Otherness. This world is devoid of objective and rational arrangement and is a reflection of a person's life experience and cultural phenomena, namely his/her interests, habits, attitudes, preferences, appraisals, etc. The core of the intersubjective universe is the specific subject's world artefacts. "Thus," E. Husserl emphasizes, "within myself, within the transcendently reduced pure life of my consciousness, I cognise the world in practice together with the "others" present in it, and, in the sense of this experience, not in the capacity, so to speak, of my own synthetic product, but also like an alien in my respect, the intersubjective world that exists for everyone and is accessible to everyone in their own objects (Husserl, 1931: 186). It is through intersubjectivity that a person's real life is different from other realities.

The life world of a person reflects the integrity of the human being, which in the plane of intersubjective interaction is deprived once and for all of a clearly constructed structure and has an open character. It is about the fact that in real life, the person is not able to exist without constant interaction and communication with other people. It is marked by the presence of each individual Other with his/her system of world-view values that form the basis of the world of great science, religion, culture, education. In this perspective, some thoughts of J. Deleuze (1980) are of particular interest. The philosopher used the concept of "folds" to understand the transcendental nature of Ego-Other co-activity. He defines the semantic versatility of the term as folding, bending, unfolding, as well as doubling, overlapping, and reflecting. The fold is interpreted by the scientist as an external doubling which is capable of maintaining the internal autonomous irreducibility: "bending-between-two", "inter-space", in the sense that it represents differences that differ" (Deleuze, 1980: 21). Exterior "unity", the completeness of the "image" of the fold maintains the autonomy, impermeability of the material from which it is formed. Interpreting his

reflections on the social dimension of being, J. Deleuze (1980) states: "Another is never a counterpart in the process of duplication, this is my sameness, which leaves me as a doubling of another, and not confronting myself in the external, I find the other in me (this always has to do with demonstrating that the Other, the Far, is also Close and Similar). This exactly resembles tissue invagination in embryology or the act of doubling in the process of sewing: a twist, a fold, etc." (Deleuze, 1980: 130).

The practical measurement of the above considerations makes it possible to view the realities of the modern globalized world as an "ensemble of cultural singularities and differences" that intersect, interact, interrelate and develop within the communicative and dialog space. In fact, another culture reveals its essential depths, presents a unique and distinctive face of its cultural progress only in the context of another cultural dimension that is able to attest to its uniqueness and equivalent difference. The delineation of the realm of the self as immanent transcendence presents the conjunction of Ego-Other as a dialectically complementary movement that expands in the epistemological and ethical-directional dimensions of sense, assures a constant process of Ego self-creation, crystallizing its new quality at all times. The situation when the phenomenon of the Other, different in culture disappears, poses a number of dangers, as the world is more and more capable of acquiring the outlines of "sameness", which is manifested in standardization, unification, totality and discourse of monoculture. Therefore, the "disappearance" of the Other is dramatic for one's own, sublime culture, since it deprives it of projections of further development.

Interesting thoughts in support of the above position are found in the works of the French researcher B. Waldenfels (1997). In his work "Non Self Topography: Studies in Non Self Phenomenology" he outlines a new humanistic mode of interaction with the Non Self (Other). The philosopher comes up with the idea of diplomatic sovereignty, the inviolability of the Non Self. In his opinion, the Self and the Non Self are not autonomous units that interact only in the external world, they also reveal an internal presence: the Self is not deprived of the Non Self, the Non Self contains the Self. Such complementarity between the Self and the Non Self leads to the creation of not a single universal unity, but presupposes inter-worlds, cultural inter-space, that is, universalisation in the plural: "The common world that emerges in universalisation can be defined as an expanding world, expanding its possibilities, but does not leave the game space of its possibilities. It happens differently between worlds that are and remain alien to one another. The Self arises here in response to the Non Self claims" (Waldenfels, 1997: 70). In fact, Non Selfness, as an Otherness to the Self

world, in conjunction with it, always affirms that my culture is able to crystallize its new facets and senses, to be perceived in an unfamiliar perspective, that is, to generate “Non Selfness to itself.” The Non Self acts as an elixir of life and development of the Self. “A pure own culture would be a culture that no longer gives any answers, but merely repeats and varies the available answers,” says (Waldenfels, 1997: 72). At the same time, according to the philosopher, the presence of the Non Self in the Self opens a “wild region” that is not involved in our culture and through which we are in connection with other cultures (Waldenfels, 1997: 70). The Non Self and Self are understood as correlates of the inter-subjective constitution of reality. Therefore, the process of interaction between different cultural worlds is truly valuable, where each participant does not lose his or her “individual face” but enriches each one due to this dialogue. Interaction with the Non Self (Other) world causes the “non selfness” of one’s own culture, which loses the outline of a static system, “dissolves” old meanings and acquires new meanings and senses. Such an understanding of the nature of the Other is valuable and in demand in the conditions of an integrative-global dimension of the modern world, which deprives itself of the features of a monolithic and monocultural objective reality and acquires the contours of a pluralistic, multicultural image. Conditions are created when there is a shift from the cognition of total and rational truth to the conversation and communication of “possible worlds”. This makes possible thinking (posibilism) in-demand. Possible thinking is not so much thinking about the real in terms of its possibilities, but about the possibilities of this object. It is thinking about the real in terms of its possibilities, that is, the possibilities of being different. The world is understood as the multiplicity of “possible” worlds and senses, the diversity of their interpretations. In such circumstances, human objective reality becomes a feature of cultural and conscious solidarity.

The cultural dimension of human being, having met and joined the world of the Other’s culture, starts a dialogue with it that overcomes the one-sidedness and seclusion of their cultural senses. K. Kantor (1996) believes that the cultural interaction of different types of cultures lies in the fact that having borrowed the values of another culture, the culture transforms them into its own without losing its individual identity. “The whole history of mankind is a history of interaction of different types of cultures, during which the originality of each of them was formed, and mankind as a whole made a movement to higher forms of existence,” - the researcher writes (Kantor, 1996: 5, 23). The researcher V. Tabachkovskiy (2004) qualifies the phenomenon when culture uninterruptedly, in

interaction with others, creates an “own world”, “seeking identity to the last breath” as the concept of “dance of cultures”. Losing the opportunity to produce new opportunities and perspectives for understanding human existence, cultural and historical worlds and practices of the past perish as they lose sense and productivity in understanding the problems of the present and projecting the future. Co-existence, co-activity, co-experience of the Ego and the Other is the condition of the development of the Ego, realized in the connection the Ego is the Other and in its reverse hypocrisy the Other is the Ego. The transcendental experience of the Otherness is understood in the role of a social mirror, seeing into which Ego receives information from it, perceiving the experiences and feelings, adjusting his/her own sphere.

Self-identification of the self takes place in the light of another cultural space. The identity of one’s own culture is highly dependent on dialogical relations with another, different world. Opening and developing one’s own identity of Ego do not occur in isolation, but it is realized through the dialogue, partly external, partly internal, with others. The dialogue highlights the complex intertwining, connections, influences of cultures of different peoples and their worldviews in a unified worldwide cultural space. It crystallizes a comprehensive understanding of human being, enriches it with new models of human “presence” in the world, overcomes the falsity of views and ideas about the unequal influence of cultures on the modern world image. Obviously, a dialogue of equal cultural Othernesses allows them to crystallize new facets of their original objective reality and in cultural synthesis with others to create new, corresponding to social realities, configurations of values, priorities, estimates that are important for humanity. The dialogue does not determine the correctness of one of the participants and the misconceptions of the others, but it is aimed at communication, co-creation, co-understanding of the parties giving birth to their own truth. It occurs under the law of “not identity” but as a complementarity of the “othernesses” that are self-worthy and valuable. It is a case of a dialogical pluralism that reflects the cultural-ontological hierarchy of senses and values.

The concept of dialogue is understood as a special form of human communication, as a co-creation that is able to open “the world for the first time”. Rather than anywhere else in the dialogue, and thanks to it, people’s coexistence is actualized and, for the first time, a fundamentally important phenomenon of full human communication emerges i.e. a meeting in which human destinies intersect and the interpenetration of human worlds occurs. The dialogue creates new possibilities for opening up a plurality of senses,

meanings, connotations that are not subordinated to a single conceptual dominance and are not limited to rational systemic totality.

This tendency for cultural interaction reflects the search for a multidimensional understanding of human life that cannot be reduced to the origins of a rational, hypertrophied in human civilization, which gave rise to scientism and technocratism. This approach outlines the ability of the modern person to understand himself/herself, to nurture the feelings and consciences of duty and responsibility for his/her own destiny, as well as the fate of all humanity. What is meant here is that the dialogue of equally valuable cultural Othernesses allows them to crystallize new facets of their original existence and in cultural synthesis with others to create new, adequate to social realities, configurations of values, priorities, estimates that are important for humanity. Cognition of the new, unusual world of the Other, elimination of anxiety towards the Otherness is possible provided that we find the ability to reincarnate, change, that is, to become Other in relation to our former self. The Other is not necessarily hostile, he has the right to exist, he has "his truth." The dialogue is a moral and ethical humanization of the social environment, the essence of which is reduced to the understanding of *the Other*, "incorporating it into one's own life", affirming the principle of tolerance instead of the situation: "he that is not with us is against us." Tolerance in the contemporary context is combined with affirmation of the value of the individual and his/her demands.

Culture will not be able to lose its "individual face" if its own cultural "core" is preserved. According to T. Skubashivska (2004) "... it is impossible to preserve a culture by "transcoding" it in the manner of another culture, abandoning its own code". The researcher presents her own version of the mechanism of cultural dialogue in which each culture appears in the form of a system consisting of several subsystems. In order to interact with another culture, a corresponding subsystem is created in which there is a complex process of adapting one's own cultural codes with those of another culture. Such processes occur in both cultures engaged in dialogue. Each of the cultures creates a special subsystem for dialogue with the other. In the event of cultural adaptation failure, this subsystem activity is curtailed, not the whole culture system as a whole. Successful promotion of cultural adaptation can lead to a broader impact of already modified external cultural influences upon the entire cultural system, already modified by the relevant subsystem (Skubashivska, 2004: 109-110).

The position of positive openness to another's cultural experience, the preparedness to keep it in strangeness and differences has hidden dangerous tendencies. It should be emphasized that dialogue of cultures

does not mean blind benevolence and trust, but an active and conscious interaction with other cultures. Such interactions may reveal cultural differences that no one expected. An alien, different culture, even when interacting with it, when we borrow its experience and share it, remains essentially unknown and alien to us.

Meeting a different, alien culture inevitably changes the horizons of one's own cultural progress, and the danger is that these changes to one's own culture are unpredictable and unexpected. Researcher O. Dovhopolova (2007) in this regard states: "... trying to look into the eyes of the Alien, we indulge in the chance, refuse the privileges of interpretation of the inhabited space. The randomness of a change of path is what is most frightening when meeting the Alien, which is confronted with a consciousness that seeks for a meaningful life, an attachment to some orderly integrity, where any change will finally have a positive explanation. But there will be no guarantee" (Dovhopolova, 2007: 276).

Summarizing the consideration of the problem of intercultural dialogue in the era of globalization it should be noted that the "challenge" of cultural diversity is the basis for further social processes, causes the reorientation of conventional cultural institutions of social life to recognize the possibility of different cultures to fully develop within some specific public community. The distinctive features of each individual culture become visible and valuable in the process of cultural dialogue and interaction. Another cultural dimension of being is deprived of the trait of hostility and rejection. There is a reorientation of cultural values in a multicultural society: from what was previously unacceptable, inadmissible and culturally forbidden, it has now become possible and culturally significant. We are able to build understanding and respect for other, dissimilar peoples and cultures through intercultural dialogue.

Conclusions

The authors of the article conclude that the relevance of intercultural dialogue in the modern era of postmodernity is relevant and productive in the foregoing thoughts, which are pertinent and productive in the context of the formation of a new universal spiritual community free from divisive patterns and stereotypes capable of producing new principles of world organization. The unity of cultures in the modern world space can occur under the condition of "unity in all diversity", which implies an equal vector orientation: both to the "unity" of cultures and to fostering the cultural diversity of the world at the same time. A world deprived of cultural

priorities in the development of certain cultures and the neglect of the opportunities and characteristics of others will deprive the human race of hostility and intransigence, will acquire the contours of a pluralistic, multicultural image, since it is “woven out” from the discourse of different value- worthy civilizational achievements. The idea of understanding the modern world as an “ensemble of cultural singularities and differences” that intersect, interact, interrelate and develop within the communicative and dialog space is at the heart of integration and integration processes.

The authors state that the methodological potential of the intersubjective approach is productive for understanding the modern world as a unique “ensemble of cultural values” that interacts and develops in the communicative-dialog space. Dialogue strategies, the researchers emphasize, allow one to hear and perceive the Other in its otherness, to perceive it as an equal participant in the world community, to overcome prejudices and stereotypes, to reduce the level of social and political tension in society, creating a tolerant space for cooperation and mutual interaction. The authors concluded that the self-sufficiency and openness of a productive, equal dialogue with other cultures, the dynamic synthesis of all its components within a multi-vector internal hierarchy will ensure the viability of a particular national culture, facilitate the search for coexistence in the one world where everyone has the right to his own constantly developing Ego. The socio-cultural progress of the human race is seen as a non-linear, probabilistic movement of diversity as opposed to unified, programmed unifying processes. Separately taken culture is not a static system that created and locked itself within its own world. It is a dynamic system that constantly “searches for places” of its own identity, getting into communication with other cultures. The integrative-global dimension of the modern world deprives itself of the features of a monolithic and monocultural objective reality and acquires the contours of a pluralistic, multicultural image, since it is “woven out” from the discourse of different value- worthy civilizational achievements.

The concept of dialogue is a kind of “solidarity” of the Otherness existences. The dialogue is seen as the goal and principal means of spiritual objective reality and renewal of modern social objective reality, demonstrating the ability to find common solutions, ways of understanding and harmony in resolving conflict situations, overcoming conformism and selfishness. Weighed and at the same time respectful attitude to the Other, to his/her world-viewpoints and outlooks on life, perception, inner interest and understanding of the significance of another presence, with its unusual thoughts, beliefs, behaviour implies the society deprivation of manifestations

of hostility, intolerability, inadmissibility of dominance and oppression of the Other objective reality by my Ego world.

References

- Bart, R. (1989). *Izbrannyye trudy: Semiotika. Poetika* [Selected works: Semiotics. Poetics]. (G. K. Kosikova, Trans.). Moscow, Russia: Progress.
- Beck, W. (2000). *Risk society: On the way to another Art Nouveau* (V. Sedelnik, & N. Fedorova, Trans.). Moscow, Russia: Progress-Tradition.
- Castells, M. (2000). *Information era: Economics, society and culture* (O. I. Shkaratan, Trans.). Moscow, Russia: GUVSE.
- Deleuze, J. (1998). *Skladka. Leybnits i barokko* [Leibniz and baroque] (B. M. Skuratova, Trans.). Moscow, Russia: Logos.
- Deleuze, J. (1980). *Logika smysla* [The logics of sense]. Moscow, Russia: Rarity.
- Dovhopolova, O. (2007). Stratehiyi stavlennya chuzhoho v epokhu hlobalizatsiyi [Strategies for the attitude of a stranger in the age of globalization], *Civil society in Ukraine in the age of globalization: Value-normative and institutional support for its development* (pp. 262-278), Kiev, Ukraine.
- Georgescu, C. M. (2018). The postmodernity of European integration: Affirming EU core values, identities and principles in the mass media. *Postmodern Openings*, 9(2), 196-209. doi:10.18662/po/28
- Husserl, E. (1998). *Kartezianskiye razmysleniye* [Cartesian reflections]. (D. V. Skliadneva, Trans.). Saint Petersburg, Russia: Science-Yuvesta.
- Kantor, K. (1996). Chetvertyi vitok istorii [Fourth round of history]. *Philosophical issues*, 1-2, 19- 42.
- Sartre, J. P. (1990). Ekzistentsializm – eto gumanizm [Existentialism is Humanism]. *Twilight of the Gods*. Moscow, Russia: Science.
- Skubashivska, T. (2004). Problema tolerantnosti u zrizi mizhkul'turnoho dialohu [The problem of tolerance in the context of intercultural dialogue]. *Practical philosophy*, 4, 108-113.
- Sălceanu, C. (2019). The evolution of human values – A comparative study of values in adolescents and emerging adults. *Postmodern Openings*, 10(2), 74-83. doi:10.18662/po/72
- Pehoiu, G. (2018). Education and culture. Cultural consumption among young people aged 18-35. *Postmodern Openings*, 9(1), 165-181. doi:10.18662/po/11
- Tabachkovskyi, V. (2004). Problema «YA-Inshyy» yak oserdya antropolohichnoyi refleksiyi [The Ego-Other problem as the heart of anthropological reflection]. *Philosophy. Human world: A lecture course* (pp. 157-178). Kiev, Ukraine: Lybid.
- Toffler, E. (2002). *Shock of the future* (E. Rudnev, Trans.). Moscow, Russia: AST.

- Waldenfels, B. (1997). *Topografiya Chuzhoho: studiyi do fenomenolohiyi* Chuzhoho [Non self-topography: Studies in non-self-phenomenology]. A handbook. of philosophical disciplines (V. I. Keluadze, Trans.), Kiev, Ukraine.
- Welsh, W. (2004). *Nash postmodernyy modern* [Our postmodern contemporaneity] (A. L. Bogachova, M. D. Kul'taeva, & L. A. Sitnichenko, Trans.). Kiev, Ukraine: Altepress.