

PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH TO INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Alibayeva Ainur

aika.alik@gmail.com

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University

(Almaty, Kazakhstan)

Алибаева Айнур Назаровна

aika.alik@gmail.com

Казахский национальный университет им. аль-Фараби

(Алматы, Казахстан)

Abstract. The article explores the causes and implications of the «cultural turn» in modern international relations theory, with an emphasis on the role of culture in shaping global dynamics. Although «culture» is a broad and often ambiguous term, it plays a vital role in understanding interactions between international actors. This study investigates how the concept of culture can be applied to analyze international processes, using a logical and philosophical approach. Such an approach helps interpret social communities as distinct systems of meaning-making, where ideal objects and values are described through specific languages and reflected in the material practices of their members. By reconstructing these semantic frameworks, the study compares different cultures and examines the importance of intercultural interaction in communication. While previous research provides valuable empirical insights, there is a notable lack of theoretical generalizations regarding intercultural dialogue. The present study aims to fill this gap by developing a theoretical model for intercultural communication, focusing on dialogue as a key component. The findings underscore the role of culture as a universal integrator in cross-cultural communication and international relations, offering new perspectives on how cultural factors influence modern global interactions.

Keywords: Cross-cultural communication, semantic dominants, international relations, «new meaning-setting», culture as a universal integrator.

Introduction

The exploration of international processes inevitably necessitates addressing theoretical and methodological issues regarding the role of culture and intercultural communication within these processes. This study aims to develop a new theoretical model that considers the influence of cultural factors on international interactions and the identity of subjects in international relations.

On the one hand, this arises from the tendency among experts to expansively define the concept of «culture», which in contemporary terms often aligns closely with the concept of a «political entity». When culture is understood in this manner, it is not merely seen as another synonym for «nation» or «state». Instead, its use implies a dynamic approach to assessing developments in the political sphere, as it functions as a comprehensive integrator within a «complex society». This integration involves combining various methods of structuring a society on a macro-level, both in its origins and orientation [1].

Additionally, the associated meanings linked with the concept of culture» in the realm of international relations naturally give rise to the notion of embracing positive scenarios for global interactions. Presently, the approach to negotiating processes, referred to as the «cultural» approach, can also be viewed from a different perspective – one that emphasizes the deficiencies in the negotiation culture [2]. This culture represents the epitome of a diplomat’s expertise, where they can engage in a well-structured and positive dialogue while ensuring respect for all participants and the utmost propriety in selecting methods to address the defined objectives.

In contemporary international affairs, cultural diplomacy (as an element of public diplomacy) holds a distinctive position, alongside a phenomenon aligned with the more specific notion of «cultural diplomacy» [3]. Scholars frequently link these concepts to the concept of «soft power». However, a distinction exists between them: cultural diplomacy encompasses more than just the active dissemination of one’s values abroad, which includes practices like cultural exchanges. It also entails an ongoing focus on engaging with value partners to foster an «interactive dialogue» that involves the synthesis of these values [4].

Despite the extensive research literature covering valuable empirical material in detail, there is a shortage of working generalizations. A precise theoretical examination, combined with a practical and responsible analysis of the unique nature of interactions characterizing these pivotal aspects of international relations, serves to enhance the efficiency of research initiatives and practical endeavors, particularly in the realm of education [5].

Methodology

The methodology of this article focuses on analyzing intercultural communication as a key resource for optimizing the contractual process in international relations, employing categories and approaches from the philosophy of culture. This study discusses the development of generalizing models that enable a comparative analysis of heterogeneous materials while also addressing the methodological limitations inherent in such comparisons.

To achieve the overarching goal of this research, several specific tasks are outlined:

– Clarification of Intercultural Communication: The first task involves a thorough clarification of the interpretation of intercultural communication from

logical and philosophical perspectives. This step is crucial for establishing a solid theoretical foundation.

– **Synthesis of Values:** The second task is to determine the formal conditions necessary for the «synthesis of values» that leads to the optimization of the contractual process. This involves identifying the key elements that facilitate value integration among diverse cultural contexts.

– **Connection of Cultural Codes:** The third task seeks to substantiate the relationship between «cultural codes» and linguistic-cultural frameworks, using value and behavioral models that characterize representatives from various cultures. This analysis will highlight how cultural frameworks influence communication and negotiation processes.

The novelty of the proposed approach lies in the advancement of a contemporary version of the theory of understanding. This version aims to identify mutually acceptable interpretations while maintaining the essential ability to form a common field of argumentation. Ultimately, this study advocates for the establishment of a new theoretical model within the scientific community that accurately describes the dynamics of international processes, grounded in a robust logical and philosophical framework.

Analysis and Results

The philosophical examination of intercultural communication encompasses an exploration of the related phenomena and strives to uncover its fundamental nature. Despite the diversity of philosophical doctrines and methods, a central theme remains the exploration of the principles that underpin specific phenomena. In certain contexts, culture serves as a «communication universe» [6]. A simplified definition of the boundaries of the process referred to as «naming to address challenging situations» [7] represents the historical point from which philosophy originates and finds its foundation. Language breathes life into understanding as a parallel process, existing within and actively impacting the real world. The boundary that distinguishes objects from the «common understanding» resembles glass: at times, it can be ambiguous, and at other times, evident; it neither permits immediate entry into the «mirror» nor discourages the pursuit of doing so.

The process of aligning (or perhaps more accurately termed as identification) various levels of comprehending meaning ultimately shapes the reality emerging from obscurity, brought into clarity through language. Therefore, philosophy is inherently an exploration of enigmas. It is no coincidence that Aristotle asserts that the inception of philosophy is marked by astonishment [8]. Time provides a framework for potential interpretations of this enigma, assigning a weight that corresponds to duration. However, the «specific significance» of a word does not solely stem from time. If a word endures, if someone can grasp its meaning, it arises not only from its historical context. There exists an alternative source of significance, possessing a timeless essence, which only becomes apparent within the confines of time. Current discourse often emphasizes traditional values,

serving as a prominent method for individuals engaged in international matters to demonstrate their connection to a realm of lasting importance. Philosophical rationalism, aptly characterized as bitter, insists on the equally essential and simultaneously unreliable nature of human consciousness in approaching these principles. From this perspective, everyone possesses the means, yet not all have the opportunity to utilize them.

The enigma of intercultural communication emerges when we pose a basic question about the resemblance (or contrast) between cultures as complete social entities and their potential to connect through a shared semantic realm, often referred to as the «third reality». What's notable is that the level of arbitrariness in its establishment holds less significance - any agreement inherently implies the establishment of a reasonably sturdy communication foundation, entailing the quest for a common means of expression [9]. The issue at hand concerns the sustainability of the «cultural content» acquired through this process. Nevertheless, one of the principal objectives of the thesis is to optimize its effectiveness with ongoing dedication, or at the very least, to uphold its operational state.

Positivism, as conceived by its founder Auguste Comte, focuses on strict descriptions of observed phenomena as the only valid form of knowledge in the philosophy of science. This contrasts with the philosophy of life, which posits the idea of an infinite and purposeless creation of the world. In the original teachings of N.Y. Danilevsky in his era, these two philosophies coexisted, revealing as much as one's self-culture allowed. However, they remained somewhat impenetrable to each other [10]. Does this suggest that their communication is mere fiction? Following the strict principles of contemporary comparativism, people from different cultures can never achieve full mutual understanding as if they belong to the same culture. This situation raises the question of how they can establish any form of agreement [11]. Moreover, how is the challenge of cultural communication distinct from that encountered by individuals who, within the same language, culture, and even a single family, sometimes fail to comprehend each other? This leads us to the subsequent philosophical development from the twentieth century: in the absence of complete understanding, what remains are interpretations and the conflicts that stem from them [12], which challenge the inconsistency inherent in the concept of «exchange of complementary values» [13]. The clash of interpretations represents a standpoint that allows for a more detailed examination of mutual inconsistencies through the comparison of mirrored images of each other.

This implies a departure from acknowledging the «ontology of meaning» and rejects the notion that it is universally accessible, including the possibility of translating it into languages of various cultures. This viewpoint conveys a sense of refined skepticism, not merely relativizing the truth in a sophisticated manner but rooted in the nihilistic acknowledgment of its demise. However, even within the realm of post-metaphysical nihilism, the notion of truth persists in one specific context. As it is still permissible to discuss this concept, individuals engaged in communication are encouraged to shift from their speculative, localized truth constructions – which tend to not only touch upon ontology but also engage in the act

of ontologizing their ideas and presenting them as values – towards acknowledging the inherent inadequacy of these constructions in capturing the whole essence of existence. Truth manifests by stepping away from reflective conceptualization, favoring a more profound examination of discursive practices. This approach aligns with the cultural turn in epistemology, a concept distinctly delineated in the works of L.S. Vygotsky [14]. Therefore, by relinquishing epistemological optimism that claims the potential for a positive model of knowledge within the realm of «beginnings» (an area where metaphysics has been «refined» by science), it becomes justified to adopt a new, epistemologically balanced approach. This approach guides consciousness towards exploring existential-cognitive endeavors that do not aim to grasp the ultimate meaning but rather stimulate the process of establishing meaning [15].

In the XX century, the field of science took a cautious approach toward gaining a positive understanding of cultural interactions [16]. This approach does not attempt to delve into discussing ultimate truths, especially those of a metaphysical nature, as if they could serve as subjects for scientific analysis. As a result, it has simplified the perspective on the issue of intercultural communication. When communication is seen not so much as pure communication but instead as interaction or transaction, its true significance lies not solely in comprehension or interpretation, but in practical actions. Therefore, any collaborative effort undertaken signifies effective communication. As a result, communicators must accurately encode and decode information, and both the sender and receiver must effectively manage, receive, and process the information necessary for addressing practical issues, this underpinning of the cross-cultural interaction topic ensures that assessments within this sphere are empirically confirmable. This approach excludes considerations of values, the meaning of life, and other concepts beyond empirical validation from the realm of scientific knowledge. Despite the intimate connection between «information and communication», the grounding of information in relevant social-philosophical theories lacks empirical substantiation [17]. Technologies built upon this theoretical communication model reached unprecedented levels of development in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, ushering in new modes of interaction and profoundly reshaping existing ones, from radio and television to aviation. These advancements reshaped daily life, altered human consciousness, social structures, and had a notable impact on psychophysiology and ethics, as discussed by Luhmann [18].

In light of the transformative events in communication driven by the scientific, technical, and information revolution, there have been substantial global shifts in public consciousness [19]. Drawing from O. Spengler's perspective, the fabric of culture, including its temporal and spatial dimensions, is undergoing dynamic alterations. This has led contemporary philosophers of culture to explore the realms of mathematics and linguistics [20]. They seek to understand and examine how culture encapsulates the most crucial methods of understanding space-time relationships inherent to its distinctive mode of thinking, particularly when this mode of thinking is regarded as an intellectual quest of the world. Simultaneously,

numerous contemporary transformations are associated with a return to strategies that were previously discarded by culture or were not at the forefront of cultural discourse, such as archaization [21]. Due to the developments in communication spurred by the scientific, technical, and information revolution, profound global shifts have occurred in the collective consciousness [22]. In line with O. Spengler's perspective, the temporal and spatial dimensions of culture, constituting its dynamically evolving fabric, are undergoing transformation. Consequently, contemporary philosophers of culture are increasingly turning to disciplines like mathematics, exemplified by Knezevi and linguistics. They are exploring how culture encodes the most significant methods of interpreting space-time relations intrinsic to its unique mode of thought, especially when this mode is seen as an intellectual exploration of the world. Simultaneously, there is a resurgence of certain strategies, once discarded by culture or no longer in the mainstream, like archaization [23].

Luhmann's communication theory asserts the necessity of regarding communication as an autonomous entity, a self-contained cycle of reproduction (autopoiesis) within a social system, where «information,» «message,» and «understanding» are interconnected components [24]. Within this context, the current era is characterized as a period in which «comprehensive knowledge about mental and social systems is no longer attainable» [25]. In contrast, Russian scholars emphasize that 20th-century philosophy sought, through communication, to reintroduce the notion of subjectivity. Simultaneously, the philosophy of communication reverts to a hermeneutical approach [26]. Furthermore, the broad applicability of concepts inherent to communication theory and their depersonalization forms the basis for the potential for agreement. In essence, this transition signifies a shift from the «individual» (subject) to the «universal» (intersubjectivity) once more [27]. Linear thinking, which was once the prevailing norm in the Eurocentric civilization, was grounded in the Abrahamic meta-narrative. This overarching narrative was built upon the redefinition of space influenced by ancient Greek mathematics and the Late Hellenistic perspective on time, as elucidated by Augustine. Presently, these cultural reference frames are being replaced by alternative interpretations of space and time, introducing a sense of relative perspectives. The new methods of establishing meaning draw inspiration from models such as the dynamics of neural connections, rhizomatic structures (a non-systemic complexity akin to a «tuber»-rhizome), and the deconstruction of binary thinking, leading to the recognition of the principle of plurality. In international relations theory, this shift in perspective is illustrated by the emergence of the concept of multipolarity, which recognizes the necessity for such a shift [28]. This concept is currently widely acknowledged as one of the most promising and practical approaches. Another untested domain is the study of processes within the field of education, a traditional vehicle for transmitting cultural heritage. The international stature demanded from leading universities in our country necessitates alignment with some of the fundamental values rooted in our national culture while accommodating new educational standards. This alignment need not be absolute and definitive, but in its absence,

educational institutions would either need to undergo a profound transformation of the entire country's mindset (an improbable feat) or adapt their academic standards to align with existing socio-cultural conditions. Failure to do so when delivering educational services abroad could result in producing compliant conformists rather than capable professionals who are prepared to act in the best interests of themselves and their country. Hence, the role of philosophy in modern education primarily focuses on nurturing competencies in knowledge, skills, and goal-setting abilities, while considering the intricacies of understanding the «Other» within the context of partnership relations. It's worth noting that in rapidly advancing countries like China, philosophy occupies a prominent place within higher education structures. It not only provides a framework for ideologically sound methodologies but also offers meaningful approaches to processing knowledge that steer consciousness toward methodologically relevant solutions to practical challenges. Philosophy serves as a secondary language level, essentially functioning as a meta-language. In this sense, it can be perceived as universal since it reinterprets meanings rather than how they are represented within a particular linguistic and cultural context. This reconstruction includes reflection on such matters, of course. On the other hand, philosophy must retain the core meaning of language words and expressions that are unique to the language in which the philosopher communicates. It is contrary to the essence of philosophy when it is described, as M. Heidegger labeled it, as «chatter» When Russian literary critics draw parallels to «bird language» they are emphasizing that philosophy is a meta-language primarily designed to approach the very essence itself [29]. Looking at it from this standpoint, philosophical abstractions embody the essence, highlighting not just the meaning but the profound depth of understanding. These philosophical abstractions are far from empty; they are all-encompassing. In this context, philosophy can manifest itself in any language, yet its purpose is not so much about articulation but rather about maintaining silence. This silence arises from the intrinsic inability to fully convey the pure essence using anything other than the precise language it strives to transcend. Therefore, philosophy, much like diplomacy and medicine, straddles the realms of both art and science. Throughout its history, philosophy has consistently sought to transcend the «black hole of egocentrism» [30] inherent in individual consciousness, accomplishing this by bridging the essence of phenomena into the domain of communication. Language plays a vital role in enabling this shift due to its inherently interpersonal nature. Furthermore, communication inherently presupposes interaction among individuals, people, and sentient beings. While objects, devices, or even water in containers can connect in various ways, only humans possess the unique ability to truly share. Hence, the exploration of philosophical anthropology, the reinforcement of the biographical method, and other qualitative approaches within the realm of «non-classical» science take on a pivotal role in cultural-relational epistemology, given the paramount importance of human beings in this context.

The transformative developments in the field of communication that have transpired in the last fifty years have exhibited a range of expressions within

various cultural environments. When overlaid with local strategies, communication technologies induce distinct reconfigurations within individuals themselves. Contrary to predictions, our posthuman future is not solely characterized by a trend of homogenization; instead, there is a layering effect that maintains a delicate balance between global trends and local conceptions of their national culture's place, time, and destiny. This preservation is achieved through language, traditions, customs, and religious beliefs [31]. Simultaneously, there is a rather unexpected and often overlooked aspect of this external unification's role in intercultural communication. While it can sometimes serve as a force that erodes national and cultural identities, including language and thought, the unification tendency also fosters the creation of a socio-cultural community. This shared experience of navigating the intersection between culture and technology, particularly digital technologies and the devices built upon them, brings together people who represent unique cultural positions. Besides the essential human emotions of happiness, suffering, affection, and empathy, modern culture introduces the experience of its involvement with technology and digital devices. These everyday features, which draw numerous countries and peoples closer in terms of their sensory acceptance or rejection of new communicative phenomena, establish new points of contact in intercultural communication. These points of contact have the potential to influence international processes predictably.

A comprehensive examination of this domain, viewed from various angles, also necessitates a philosophical analysis of the ongoing developments. Such analysis helps uncover the most fundamental trends in the creation of new meanings at their core. In this context, the initial question posed in this article finds the following solution: enhancing the effectiveness of a professional international expert in the realm of intercultural communication involves systematically monitoring the evolution of the semantic and value frameworks of cultures engaged in interactive dialogues. At the very least, this entails continually expanding one's knowledge and perspectives. There is no way around the ongoing exploration of new phenomena in everyday culture, the systematic exploration of economic, political, legal, and artistic aspects of culture, ranging from folklore to high art, is crucial. This exploration includes a thorough examination of how these aspects are expressed through language. To accomplish this, individuals need to develop these skills, drawing from their own cultural background and heritage. Furthermore, it necessitates the timely development of competence in analyzing cultural axioms, primarily employing the methods of cultural philosophy that focus on a comparative analysis of processes in their full depth, breadth, and uniqueness.

The application of the theory of nonlinear connections in socio-humanitarian fields of knowledge is not solely linked to a reevaluation of our understanding of culture's structure and functions. One of its fundamental aspects is related to the process of change, a concept traditionally akin to the philosophical notion of «movement.» It's akin to the idea that rapid movement approaches a state of rest [32]. This concept bears a resemblance to artworks created by A. Labas, depicting passengers in high-speed transportation. In these works, the apparent

«trajectory» of the passenger's experience is almost indistinguishable from a fixed point in space. This visual shift, which revealed the potential of hieroglyphic cultures, aligns with the same transformative direction. It redirects the flow of thought from a linear to a nonlinear format. The processes described are beyond the reach of scientific statistics for measurement and control. They exist within the realm of language, evading precise quantification. Without such language or carefully articulated clarifications, any attempt at exact calculation is susceptible to inaccuracies stemming from improperly operationalized concepts or paradoxes that emerge when confronting ideas that cannot be directly operationalized. It is not always feasible to exclude these ideas from calculations since neglecting such metaphysical aspects often erodes the essence of culture. Immanuel Kant provided significant justification for the unscientific nature of concepts such as «God», «world» and «soul». He illustrated the adverse consequences that even a partial loss of these concepts could have on science. This situation becomes even more evident in the realm of ethics, as Kant argued that «ideas of pure reason» play dual roles in regulation and construction. These ideas hold a non-empirical significance in culture, contributing to an individual's sense of life's purpose. Their absence, even if it leads to more accurate calculations, can be detrimental to the human way of life or culture. Thus, the philosophy of communication retains its relevance, even when existentialism is not in the foreground.

Culture is intrinsically linked to the process of creating meaning. The term «logos,» which translates to a «rational word,» also embodies the concept of «meaning» in ancient Greek. Etymologically, «logos» traces back to the notion of counting and calculation. Its meanings encompass «report,» «reason,» and «law.» It is not a coincidence that many European languages associate «thinking» and «counting» [33]. You can engage in calculation (and thus responsibly believe) when you comprehend the need for trust. Otherwise, you may end up with fantastical outcomes that are unsuitable even for high-quality simulation. The crisis of the scientific model of knowledge, a topic extensively discussed by philosophers in the twentieth century, has brought the question of values back into the realm of analysis. Today, it is the moment to replace the inquiry about meaning at the forefront, of course, approached with the utmost correctness and responsibility. One promising approach to tackle this subject is A.V. Smirnov's theory of the collective cognitive unconscious, which focuses on the capacity for thought embedded in the language specific to a particular culture [34]. Hence, delving into the study of international relations processes necessitates addressing the nature of language and the cognitive patterns it conveys. A.V. Smirnov's statement remains valid: when viewed from the perspective of intercultural communication, a culture possesses less self-awareness than an external viewpoint engaged in translation. This observation resonates with R. Kipling's remark «Oh, the West is the West, the East is the East and they will not leave their places.» It prompts us to consider the fundamental principles of translation. Translation is seldom straightforward, as cultural and historical context often plays a pivotal role. Unless a «semantic primitive» directly represents a simple action, such naming provides minimal

information. Therefore, it can be argued that the accuracy of translation should be assessed based on the correspondence between the translated content and the third party involved – reality. However, philosophy has long demonstrated that the alignment of knowledge with factual reality is an analogy, and it is not always straightforward to verify this alignment through action, which remains an extra-cognitive phenomenon.

Another aspect to consider is how to verify this alignment with reality in situations where experimentation is not feasible, especially in cases requiring analytical predictions of potential future outcomes, particularly in the context of its applicability to international processes. For instance, the study of trends in migration legislation necessitates an exploration of the semantic core of both the host society and the migrant communities. These meanings, or rather, their compatibility or lack thereof, establish a field of negotiation, legitimizing certain forms of behavior while marginalizing or even criminalizing others. Additionally, this domain is not solely about meaning; it encompasses meaningful actions and practices. It's important to note that the Kipling ballad mentioned earlier is not just about words; it embodies common values – such as courage, honor and love (or more specifically, actions stemming from these values) – which bring together people from various origins and cultures.

Conclusion

To explore the renewed interest in the question of meaning within the examination of international processes, which complements and further delves into the rekindling of the question of values in this domain, it is crucial to utilize the methodology of cultural philosophy. This involves conducting novel investigations into the linguistic and practical aspects of these processes occurring within the sociocultural space. Equally crucial is the systematic comparison of the findings derived from corporate analyses of international intercultural communication activities. This comparison not only enables the scientific reconstruction of the semantic core that defines the distinct content of a given culture but also reveals the universal underpinnings within it.

Furthermore, introducing a significant number of philosophical terms into the educational process, along with the development of their corresponding content, to capture various facets of intercultural communication is pivotal in the context of the problem addressed in this article. Some of these terms include philosophical, comparative studies, sense-setting, and the axiological foundation of culture. Examining their practical significance through the lens of communication strategies elevates the skill set of international experts to a higher level.

The analytical approach outlined above is not arbitrary but rather a necessity. In the current landscape of global processes, any analyst must adopt a similar framework. However, this does not imply that contemplation on this subject is a matter of choice. Just as people inherently think logically, it does not render logic as a science redundant. Similarly, active participation in intercultural

communication, which presupposes the mastery of relevant competencies, does not eliminate the need for reflection on how to engage in international relations consciously. This analytical process forms the bedrock of a well-founded resolution of promising challenges, which, in turn, underpins intercultural interaction and simultaneously renders it complex in terms of the potential ramifications of particular decisions.

List of references

- 1 Белозеров В.К. Методы анализа стратегических культур // Очерки глобальных трансформаций: Политика, экономика, право. – 2022. – No 5 (15). – С. 29–49.
- 2 Tevdoy-Burmuli A. Populist discourse in mainstream parties: From crisis of modern polity to crisis of concept // SSRN Journal. – 2022.
- 3 Пайтинка Е. Культурная дипломатия в теории и практике современных международных отношений // Политические науки. – 2014. – No 17. – С. 95–108.
- 4 Robillard J. Philosophy of communication: What does it have to do with the philosophy of social sciences // *Cosmos and History: The journal of natural and social philosophy*. – 2006. – Vol. 2 (1) . – P. 245–260.
- 5 Padgett D.A. Teaching Race, class and cultural issues in Earth sciences to enhance multicultural education initiatives // *Journal of geoscience education*. – 2001. – No 4 (49). – P. 364–369.
- 6 Meyer E. The Culture map: Breaking through the invisible boundaries of Global Business // New York: PublicAffairs. – 2014. – P. 277
- 7 Luckmann T. Aspects of the theory of social communication // *The Russian sociological review*. – 2007. – No 3(6). – P. 3–20.
- 8 Aristotle's metaphysics / Translated from the Greek by P.D. Pervov and V.V. Rozanov. – Theology and history of St. Thomas. – 2006.
- 9 Глаголев В.С. Вербальные и концептуальные аспекты методологического дискурса VII съезда РИСА // *Вестник МГИМО Университета*. – 2012. – No 6 (27). – С. 216–219.
- 10 Gold J.R., Gold M.M. Ancient and Modern // Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge. – 2021. – Series: Planning, History and Environment. – P. 35–70.
- 11 Силантева М. Межкультурный диалог как основа плодотворного сотрудничества в системе международного партнерства // *Современные исследования коммуникаций*. – 2013. – No 5 (2). – С. 14–17.
- 12 Ricœur P. The Conflict of Interpretations // Paris: Éd. du Seuil. – 2010. – P. 500.
- 13 Ricœur P. The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics // Ed. D. Ihde. Nachdr Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press. – 2010. – P. 512.
14. Arnett R., Mancino S. Hermeneutics and Semiotics // Bloomsbury Publishing. – No 1. – 2022. – P. 52-55.
- 15 Пружинин Б. Концепция А.В. Смирнова о логике смысла и философии сознания // *Вопросы философии*. – 2022. – С. 5–44.
- 16 Geertz C. The Interpretation of cultures: Selected essays // New York: Basic Books. –1973. – P. 470
- 17 Fornas J., Bolin J.F.G., Bolin P.G. Youth culture in late modernity // Sage Publications (CA). – 1994. –P. 56-60.
- 18 Luhmann N. What is communication? // *Communication Theory*. – 2006. – No 2. – P. 251–259.

- 19 Auwalu A., Yunusa M., Garga F. The Meaning and Theories of intercultural communication // Cambridge University Press & Assessment. – 2015. – No 125
- 20 Гончарова О. Социофонетическое направление в зарубежной лингвистике // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. – 2018. – С. 119–122.
- 21 Martin J.N., Nakayama T.K. Intercultural communication in contexts // New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education. – 2010. – P. 12.
- 22 Buriak N.Yu. The problems of linguistic personality in intercultural communication // NA. – 2014. – No 2. – P. 288–291.
- 23 Гуревич Т.М., Изотова Н.Н. Энтимологический код японской культуры // Японские исследования. – 2019. – С. 158.
- 24 Глаголев В.С. Модальность в праве: различия культурных контекстов // Право и управление, XXI век. – 2019. – No 3. – С. 21–28.
- 25 Tsui M. Social work supervision: Contexts and Concepts // Thousand Oaks, California. – SAGE Publications Inc. – 2005.
- 26 Navickas J.L. Hegel's Prefatory Notion of Subjectivity // Consciousness and Reality: Hegel's Philosophy of Subjectivity. – Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands – 1976. – P. 13–22.
- 27 Kerby A.P. The Adequacy of Self-Narration: A Hermeneutical approach // Philosophy and Literature. – 1988. – No 2 (12). – P. 232–244.
- 28 Morley D., Chen K.H. Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in Cultural studies. – London: Routledge. – 2011.
- 29 Wieting S.G., Polunbaum J. Epilogue: The future of exchange between local culture and global trends // Culture, Sport, Society. – 2001. – No 4 (2). – P. 237–254.
- 30 Charlton W. Society and God: Culture and Creed from a Philosophical Standpoint // The Lutterworth Press – 2020.
- 31 Sprock A.S., Gallegos J.P., Arteaga J.M. Generator of ethnocultural learning objects for the preservation of the languages, customs and traditions indigenous // 2014 XL Latin American Computing Conference (CLEI). – Montevideo, Uruguay: IEEE. – 2014. – P. 1–11.
- 32 Нопиянен О.А., Филимонова Н.В., Андреева Л.А. Cultural interaction and cultural conservatism. – 2019. – P. 350–358.
- 33 Могилевич Б.П. Структура межкультурной коммуникации: методологические аспекты // СП. – 2013. – No 2 (13). – С. 7–11.
- 34 Furnham A. Culture Shock: A review of the literature for practitioners // PSYCH. – 2019. – No 13 (10). – P. 1832–1855.

Transliteration

- 1 Belozero V.K. Metody analiza strategicheskikh kul'tur [Methods of Analysis of Strategic Cultures]. // Ocherki global'nyh transformacij: Politika, jekonomika, pravo. – 2022. – No 5 (15). – S. 29–49.
- 2 Tevdoy-Burmuli A. Populist discourse in mainstream parties: From crisis of modern polity to crisis of concept // SSRN Journal. – 2022.
- 3 Pajtinka E. Kul'turnaja diplomatija v teorii i praktike sovremennyh mezhdunarodnyh otnoshenij [Cultural Diplomacy in Theory and Practice of Contemporary International Relations]. // Politicheskie nauki. – 2014. – No 17. – S. 95–108.
- 4 Robillard J. Philosophy of communication: What does it have to do with the philosophy of social sciences // Cosmos and History: The journal of natural and social philosophy. – 2006. – Vol. 2 (1) . – P. 245–260.

5 Padgett D.A. Teaching Race, class and cultural issues in Earth sciences to enhance multicultural education initiatives // *Journal of geoscience education*. – 2001. – No 4 (49). – P. 364–369.

6 Meyer E. The Culture map: Breaking through the invisible boundaries of Global Business // *New York: PublicAffairs*. – 2014. – P. 277

7 Luckmann T. Aspects of the theory of social communication // *The Russian sociological review*. – 2007. – No 3(6). – P. 3–20.

8 Aristotle's metaphysics / Translated from the Greek by P.D. Pervov and V.V. Rozanov. – Theology and history of St. Thomas. – 2006.

9 Glagolev V.S. Verbal'nye i konceptual'nye aspekty metodologicheskogo diskursa VII sezda RISA [Verbal and Conceptual Aspects of the Methodological Discourse VII Convent RISA]. // *Vestnik MGIMO Universiteta*. – 2012. – No 6 (27). – S. 216–219.

10 Gold J.R., Gold M.M. Ancient and Modern // *Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge*. – 2021. – Series: Planning, History and Environment. – P. 35–70.

11 Silanteva M. Mezhekul'turnyj dialog kak osnova plodotvornogo sotrudnichestva v sisteme mezhdunarodnogo partnerstva [Intercultural Dialogue as Basis of Fruitful Cooperation in the System of International Partnership]. // *Sovremennye issledovanija kommunikacij*. – 2013. – No 5 (2). – S. 14–17.

12 Ricœur P. The Conflict of Interpretations // *Paris: Éd. du Seuil*. – 2010. – P. 500.

13 Ricœur P. The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics // *Ed. D. Ihde. Nachdr Evanston: Northwestern Univ. Press*. – 2010. – P. 512.

14 Arnett R., Mancino S. Hermeneutics and Semiotics // *Bloomsbury Publishing*. – No 1. – 2022. – P. 52-55.

15 Pruzhinin B. Konceptcija A.V. Smirnova o logike smysla i filosofii soznaniya [The A.V. Smirnov's Concept of Logic of Sense and Philosophy of Consciousness]. // *Voprosy filosofii*. – 2022. – S. 5–44.

16 Geertz C. The Interpretation of cultures: Selected essays // *New York: Basic Books*. – 1973. – P. 470

17 Fornas J., Bolin J.F.G., Bolin P.G. Youth culture in late modernity // *Sage Publications (CA)*. – 1994. –P. 56-60.

18 Luhmann N. What is communication? // *Communication Theory*. – 2006. – No 2. – P. 251–259.

19 Auwalu A., Yunusa M., Garga F. The Meaning and Theories of intercultural communication // *Cambridge University Press & Assessment*. – 2015. – No 125.

20 Goncharova O. Sociofoneticheskoe napravlenie v zarubezhnoj lingvistike [Sociophonetic Direction in Foreign Linguistics]. // *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*. – 2018. – S. 119–122.

21 Martin J.N., Nakayama T.K. Intercultural communication in contexts // *New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education*. – 2010. – P. 12.

22 Buriak N.Yu. The problems of linguistic personality in intercultural communication // *NA*. – 2014. – No 2. – P. 288–291.

23 Gurevich T.M., Izotova N.N. Jentomologicheskij kod japonskoj kul'tury [The Entomological Code of Japanese Culture]. // *Japonskie issledovanija*. – 2019. – S. 158.

24 Glagolev V.S. Modal'nost' v prave: razlichija kul'turnyh kontekstov [Modality in Law: Cultural Contexts Differences]. // *Pravo i upravlenie, XXI vek*. – 2019. – No 3. – S. 21–28.

25 Tsui M. Social work supervision: Contexts and Concepts // *Thousand Oaks, California. – SAGE Publications Ins.* – 2005.

26 Navickas J.L. Hegel's Prefatory Notion of Subjectivity // Consciousness and Reality: Hegel's Philosophy of Subjectivity. – Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands – 1976. – P. 13–22.

27 Kerby A.P. The Adequacy of Self-Narration: A Hermeneutical approach // Philosophy and Literature. – 1988. – No 2 (12). – P. 232–244.

28 Morley D., Chen K.H. Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in Cultural studies. – London: Routledge. – 2011.

29 Wieting S.G., Polumbaum J. Epilogue: The future of exchange between local culture and global trends // Culture, Sport, Society. – 2001. – No 4 (2). – P. 237–254.

30 Charlton W. Society and God: Culture and Creed from a Philosophical Standpoint // The Lutterworth Press – 2020.

31 Sprock A.S., Gallegos J.P., Arteaga J.M. Generator of ethnocultural learning objects for the preservation of the languages, customs and traditions indigenous // 2014 XL Latin American Computing Conference (CLEI). – Montevideo, Uruguay: IEEE. – 2014. – P. 1–11.

32 Hopiaynen O.A., Filimonova N.V., Andreeva L.A. Cultural interaction and cultural conservatism. – 2019. – P. 350–358.

33 Mogilevich B.R. Struktura mezhkul'turnoj kommunikacii: metodologicheskie aspekty [The Structure of Cross-Cultural Communication: Methodological Aspect]. // SP. – 2013. – No 2 (13). – S. 7–11.

34 Furnham A. Culture Shock: A review of the literature for practitioners // PSYCH. – 2019. – No 13 (10). – P. 1832–1855.

Әлібаева А.Н.

Мәдениетаралық коммуникация философиясы

Аңдатпа. Мақалада қазіргі халықаралық қатынастар теориясындағы «мәдени бетбұрыстың» себептері мен салдары, сондай-ақ мәдениеттің жаһандық динамиканы қалыптастырудағы рөлі қарастырылады. «Мәдениет» ұғымы кең және жиі екіұшты болғанымен, ол халықаралық субъектілер арасындағы өзара әрекеттесулерді түсінуде маңызды рөл атқарады. Бұл зерттеуде мәдениет ұғымын халықаралық процестерді талдауда қолдану логикалық және философиялық тұрғыдан қарастырылады. Мұндай тәсіл әлеуметтік қауымдастықтарды белгілі бір тілдер арқылы идеалдық объектілер мен құндылықтарды сипаттайтын және олардың өкілдерінің материалдық тәжірибесінде көрініс табатын түрлі мағыналық жүйелер ретінде түсінуге көмектеседі. Осы семантикалық жүйелерді қайта құру арқылы зерттеуде әртүрлі мәдениеттер салыстырылады және коммуникация процесіндегі мәдениетаралық өзара әрекеттестіктің маңыздылығы атап өтіледі. Бұрынғы зерттеулерде құнды эмпирикалық материалдар ұсынылғанымен, мәдениетаралық диалогқа қатысты теориялық қорытындылардың жетіспеушілігі байқалады. Бұл зерттеу диалогты негізгі компонент ретінде қарастыра отырып, мәдениетаралық коммуникацияның теориялық моделін әзірлеу арқылы осы олқылықты толтыруды көздейді. Зерттеу нәтижелері мәдениетті мәдениетаралық коммуникация мен халықаралық қатынастардағы әмбебап интегратор ретінде көрсетеді, сондай-ақ қазіргі жаһандық өзара әрекеттестіктерге мәдени факторлардың қалай әсер ететіндігі туралы жаңа көзқарас ұсынады.

Түйін сөздер: Мәдениетаралық қарым-қатынас, семантикалық доминанттар, халықаралық қатынастар, «жаңа семантикалық болжам», мәдениет әмбебап интегратор ретінде.

Алибаева А.Н.

Философия межкультурной коммуникации

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются причины и последствия «культурного поворота» в современной теории международных отношений с акцентом на роль культуры в формировании глобальной динамики. Хотя «культура» — это широкое и часто неоднозначное понятие, она играет важную роль в понимании взаимодействий между международными акторами. В данном исследовании анализируется, как концепция культуры может быть применена для изучения международных процессов с использованием логического и философского подхода. Такой подход помогает интерпретировать социальные сообщества как различные системы смыслообразования, где идеальные объекты и ценности описываются через определённые языки и отражаются в материальных практиках их представителей. Путём реконструкции этих семантических рамок в исследовании проводится сравнение различных культур и подчеркивается важность межкультурного взаимодействия в процессе коммуникации. Несмотря на значительные эмпирические данные, представленные в предыдущих исследованиях, существует заметный дефицит теоретических обобщений, касающихся межкультурного диалога. Настоящее исследование направлено на восполнение этого пробела путём разработки теоретической модели межкультурной коммуникации, с акцентом на диалог как ключевой компонент. Полученные результаты подчеркивают роль культуры как универсального интегратора в межкультурной коммуникации и международных отношениях, предлагая новые перспективы на то, как культурные факторы влияют на современные глобальные взаимодействия.

Ключевые слова: Межкультурная коммуникация, смысловые доминанты, международные отношения, «новое смыслополагание», культура как универсальный интегратор.