INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE AS THE BASIS OF EDUCATIONAL SPACE

Olena Garmash, PhD[1], Irina Barantsova, PhD [2*], Maxim Rutkovsky[3]

[1]Associate Professor, Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University, Ukraine
[2*]Associate Professor, Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University, Ukraine
[3]Postgraduate Student, Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University, Ukraine

Electronic reference *(Cite this article):*

Garmash, O., Barantsova, I., & Rutkovsky, M. (2022). INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE AS THE BASIS OF EDUCATIONAL SPACE. Sprin Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, 1(07), 367–377. https://doi.org/10.55559/sjahss.v1i07.39

ABSTRACT

The article is based on the idea that all the various external manifestations of the spiritual essence of a person are complicated by the lack of development of target objects, principles, and potential of cultural-educational and pedagogical means of harmonizing the interaction of people. The first place in it is asserting the dialogic style of life of the subjects involved in the cultural and educational space. The analysis of intercultural education as a social institution and sociocultural space for an individual's socialization has made it possible to suggest that it has the potential to ensure the spiritual security of Ukrainian society, particularly regarding intercultural relations. The authors conclude that dialogue cooperation, as a certain humanitarian technology, should direct all educational discourses into the development of a dialogue of cultures and its orientation towards philosophical reflection in the educational process. Philosophical reflection approximates the notion of "intercultural dialogue" and other terms and even categories that function in scientific and academic life. The article stresses that communication space is often contradictory to determine at least the meaning of these concepts and release them from stereotyped connotations, falsifications and quasi-intellectual layers.

Keywords: education, culture, dialogue, discourse

Introduction

Definition of the earlier nature of dialogue, from a philosophical point of view, as an element of the theoretical, methodological, spiritual and ethical principles, in particular, as a fundamental principle that is subjectively a fundamental requirement and a prerequisite for thinking and behavior of the individual, makes it possible to conclude that such a methodological guideline is not leading in existing cultural and educational practices that remain beyond the scope of dialogue in the cultural and educational process.

In this way, its essential characteristics are not disclosed; therefore, the possibilities of influence on the cultural and educational situation largely are not unfolded. Moreover, suppose the dialogue remains beyond the actual problems of modernizing modern education and the "knowledge society." In that case, the general feature of which, according to S. Proletov, is "... a profound transformation of knowledge into various information constellations and the primacy of flexibility and speed of operation from information on conventional intellectual procedures and practices [19, c.7-24], then it cannot be considered a complete process of human spiritual development. Since the philosophers' postulate about the cultivation of a cultural person remains unchanged, the theoretical justification of the anthropological movement of a man from knowledge (in its broad substantive content) to the intellectual-ethical and spiritual interaction of the subjects of the world is needed.

Analysis of recent research and publications

In modern conditions, all the various external manifestations of the spiritual essence of a person are complicated by the lack of development of target objects, principles, and potential of cultural-educational and pedagogical means of harmonizing the interaction of people, in which the first place is asserting the dialogic style of life of the subjects involved in cultural and educational space. Extremely important theoretical foundations for overcoming the contradictions in this process are studies in which the methodological ideas of dialogue as a way of being and dialogical understanding are substantiated (M. Bakhtin, V. Bibler, H. G. Gadamer, G. Dilthey, P. Rickor, F. Schleiermacher, etc.), which explore the problem of understanding in detail. The problem of dialogical understanding as a way of being, which leads to a man's spiritual growth and the question of dialogical ontology, is disclosed in the writings of M. Buber, F. Rosenzweig, et al. The concept of "dialogical situation" and its essential characteristics were outlined by Y. Bogachinska, the implementation of the principles of dialogue in cultural and educational practices - by V. Bieberer, N. Bourbules, P. Kendzor and others.

The dialogue, in our opinion, as a construct of understanding, is within the limits of constructivism to be the basis of the theoretical and methodological support of the spiritual development of a man.

Materials and methods

Based on the analysis of encyclopedic editions most commonly used by the representatives of humanities, it was possible to highlight some significant moments of both the essential and existential content of the dialogue. Almost all dictionaries, indicating the Greek origin of the concept "dialogue," literally reveal it as a conversation, presentation of the problem, the exchange of replicas, etc. In this sense, there is a need to speak about terminological interpretations, which this concept acquires in specific scientific theses: as a separate genre of literature, including philosophical one; as the disclosure of a topic in a conversation of two or more persons; as one of the forms of art to conduct a conversation (V.Kokhanovsky); as a form of the progressive development of the cognitive process, when the movement to the desired result is carried out through interaction, different points of view (E. Rapatsevich); as a form of communication between people, when the meaning varies depending on the purpose of communication (M. Bulatov), etc.

However, as noted above, its original goals are the content of dialogue as a form of dialectics, a means for defining concepts as a method of finding the truth, which often remains beyond the comprehension of phenomena and is replaced by the analysis of many existential, practical actuals, etc. Therefore, remembering Socrates, who considered the dialectic to be worthy of the only human problem, its morals, and unlike the Sophists, who first laid the basis

for the dialogue as a logical operation and a way of philosophizing and even the "middle" art of the birth of truth in human consciousness (Mayevics), his positions should be considered imperative.

It should be noted that in present conditions of the communication of different cultures, each of which is unique, without a "dialectical dialogue," as the prevention of the destruction of cultures in general, the absorption of certain cultures more technologically developed and, moreover, the promotion of the preservation of cultures and the enhancement of cultural heritage and the creation of a "cultural circle" is not possible. This has particular significance regarding the dialogue that addresses spiritual values, which, in our opinion, have not yet been fully involved in a large-scale social dialogue and cultural and educational process.

In this sense, the fundamental question is the use of various discourses that have a certain social significance and specificity in dialogue, since "discourse" in scientific literature is defined as "linguistic activity regulated by socio-cultural codes (rules, traditions and values) of a particular social practice (science, justice, medicine, religion, politics, education, etc.), through which people - within the limits of this practice - produce, use and broadcast socio-cultural meanings, models of social experience, realize their own objective and / or communication needs" [16, c.37].

The study of the works on intercultural dialogue, referred to above, made it possible to provide that scientific discourse is focused on the rational organization of communication and its social effectiveness, on the disclosure of ideological contradictions, based on the following principles:

- the principle of cognition, according to which the modality of discourse is realized in the space of subject-object relations and evaluated in terms of the classical concept of truth ("true" or "false"), which differs from the communicative modality of the pragmatic theory of truth ("effective" or " ineffective");

- the principle of reflexivity and objectivity of discussion, which manifests itself in the rational conceptual nature of the process and the result of communication, in the transition from ordinary consciousness to rational one during the dialogue;

- the principle of systematic and organized dialogue, which organically combines all levels of human consciousness (public, personal);

- the principle of a high logical culture of dialogue, which involves knowledge of the laws of formal logic and rules of reasoning, the opposition to manipulative techniques in communication, as well as the criterion of seriousness, the inadmissibility of irony in relation to the sphere of sacred view;

- the principle of objective unity and functional complementarity of the positions of the parties in the dialogue, based on the idea that all social institutions in society (religion inclusive) form the functional integrity of society, mutually reinforcing each other, solving common problems and have a common goal - a stable civil democratic society with high morality;

- the principle of scientific and historical ways in the conduct of dialogue, the inadmissibility of non-scientific, non-historical arguments in the dialogue of religions, taken from questionable sources both to the religious audience and to the scientific community;

- the principle of deideologization, when the model of dialogue is based on ideological practice, on non-political engagement and on the avoidance of manipulative schemes and techniques by different ideologies of politicized consciousness (the concept of state religion, world domination of religion);

- the principle of demythologization, the overcoming of value-emotional representations (mythologeme), which are manifested at the level of social psychology, mass

consciousness, for example, the existing belief that in Islam, the spirit of aggression and evil prevails, that the woman is enslaved there, that Christianity has degenerated, there is polytheism and paganism, etc.);

- the principle of emotional and psychological support of the parties in the dialogue, support of psychological comfort and empathy.

In a somewhat different aspect, these authors traditionally present the tradition of philosophical discourse in a dialogue that dates back to antiquity - from the mayevtics of Socrates, and is now represented by the works of F. Rosenzweig, O. Rosenschtock Hussy, F. Ebner, M. Buber, M. Bakhtin, et al. In contrast to the scientific and religious discourse involved in the dialogue, philosophical discourse is fundamentally polyphonic, pluralistic, subjected to various epistemological, methodological, and value-setting approaches that fundamentally different, but keep "definitive correctness and logical coherence" [16, c.37].

In general, the specifics of philosophical discourse are summarized by the authors to the following principles:

- the principle of philosophical pluralism, the plurality of different approaches to understanding problems with the condition of respect for religion and the different views of subjects of dialogue;

- the principle of the interdependence of the parties to the dialogue in relation to the ideological completeness of views, which implies the emergence of commonality of the semantic space of the parties ("I and the Other"), during which both participants of the dialogue recognize "Another as a neighbor" or within the limits of the religious concept when they are "in God," or in the personal concept when a person can become a personality only among other persons and the integrity of the identity of a person depends on the integrity of the consciousness of society and other personalities [2].

- the principle of humanism, respect for human rights in all his individual identities, the assertion of the right to self-determination, freedom of thought, the realization of their abilities and their religious identity;

- the principle of the aspiration of human harmony with nature and with society, progress, understanding of the value of all persons, the ideology of non-violence, and self-restraint instead of consumption [22].

- the principle of tolerance, behavior, customs, feelings, beliefs, thoughts and ideas, which allows the parties to accept and understand each other (this principle is based on the following axioms: the presence of socially significant differences in the parties of the dialogue; overcoming the feeling of hostility to others (the axiom of overcoming negativity); the refusal of violent, manipulative methods of rejection and suppression of others (the axiom of non-violence); overcoming alienation and conflict (the axiom of compromise); awareness of a common living and a common identity (the axiom of value identity); the general rejection by the parties of the dialogue of the violation of morality, human rights and freedoms (the axiom of evaluation), the deduction of tolerant consciousness from the rules of socio-economic and legal behavior of citizens (the axiom of social relativism) [2].

- the principle of "extravagance" (M. Bakhtin), which makes it possible to use the life world of another person, with a subsequent return to his worldview that allows the subject to complete the perception of another person in a holistic manner, as a result of which this cognitively enriches and ethically determines the attitude to this person, creating the preconditions for interaction with him [15, c.67-72].

- the principle of categorical philosophical language (in dialogue, and philosophical discourse it has an advantage over other discourses, having the greatest degree of reflection, penetration into the essence of the problem of dialogue on the basis of categories as extremely abstract concepts (essence and phenomenon, general, special, individual, content and form, abstract and concrete, etc.).

Results

Thus, only the most general dialogical principles of philosophical discourse are listed. In each particular case of philosophic schools of dialogue (M. Heidegger, F. Rosenzweig, A. Rosenscht Hussy, F. Ebner, M. Buber), it is possible to take on the methods used by them. In general, one can conclude that not only interreligious dialogue but also any socio-cultural dialogue can only effectively be realized on the basis of philosophical discourse, which removes denotations and connotations of other discourses participating in the dialogue due to its most abstract and reflexive nature.

That is why the problem of discourse should be translated into a plane of cultural and educational space in which the educational discourse prevails, the essence of which is not defined by E. Dobrenkov as a formalized system of transfer of knowledge but as a problem field for the development of subjects of the discourse of educational and scientific knowledge, which testifies about their temporary status as agents of cognitive dialogue or the information process of knowledge exchange [8, c.14].

The content of educational discourse is manifested in the search and implementation of cognitive and communicative means that represent the professional, cultural, and social ideals of education and construct professional, socio-cultural, and personal identities. The analysis of numerous literature makes it possible to name the following principles of such discourse:

- the principle of creative learning (if the purpose of scientific discourse consists in the production and systematization of objectively true knowledge about the world, their practical use, and also in the invention of research methods, the purpose of educational discourse is to transform and translate the received scientific knowledge to the younger generation in creative formation interest in its inclusion in intellectual and social activities, in orientation not only on the completeness of the translated knowledge but also on its accessibility to the addressees);

- the principle of socialization, the inclusion of the individual in an integral system of social relations, including through the mastery of various kinds of discursive practices in order to create a more general discourse field in which targeted socialization and inculturation of individuals are carried out;

- the principle of personal development, based on the postulate of the incompleteness of the ideal project, which is a person in the present and in the future, one of the potential of which is an open attitude to the world and creative dialogue interaction with the world;

- the principle of the unity of the educational space. Proceeding from the multicultural environment of the corresponding space, all its parts, secular and religious education systems form unified integrity in the relationship of trends: the integration of parts of the system through the universalization of scientific knowledge and the differentiation of parts of the system through regional traditions and ethnoconfessional identity;

- the principle of educational competence, which contains a set of pupils' competencies in the sphere of cognitive activity within the framework of socio-cultural dialogue with elements of logical, methodological, general education and social activity, as well as system

integrity with value-oriented, general, cultural, informational, communicative, social and religious competences;

- the principle of socialization as an active, effective desire to find a common-sense plane that will become the place of voluntary involvement of the participants in the dialogue as higher religious values and participation in a single event;

- the principle of polydiscursiveness, which involves mastering hermeneutics as a reading of various linguistic practices (scientific, philosophical, literary, religious, etc.) for an adequate understanding of the socio-cultural traditions of society. Thus, educational discourse is important in the field of dialogue since it adapts other types of discourses to the consciousness of its participants, including them in creative self-expression and reflection of the themes of the dialogue.

This is the way in which the principle of recognition of the monotheistic nature of the religion can proceed. First of all, it should be noted that a complete education cannot be built, leaving out the constitutive factors of influence on the spirituality of a man, because the changes taking place now in the world environment are increasingly "compressing" the cultural space by the expansion of interconnection, the interdependence of different countries, peoples, cultures (national, ethnic, gender, political, economic, religious, etc.). At the cultural level, humanity cannot be interested in finding an agreement, consent in resolving controversial issues, and preventing the escalation of violence in resolving controversial issues, which may lead to conflicts and other threatening phenomena.

Moreover, if one understands the discourse (from the Latin discere to wander) as "an orally or in writing an articulated form of objectification of the content of consciousness, which is determined by the type of rationality dominant in a certain socio-cultural tradition [17, c.148].

Consequently, the scientific discourse in the dialogue focuses on the rational organization of communication and its social effectiveness, but its representatives are obliged to "remove" ideological contradictions and to carry out the proliferation of the principles of cognition, reflectivity and objectivity, to provide a high logical culture, target unity and complementarity of positions in the sub dialogue, as well as science and historicity, deideologization and deliberation, emotional and psychological support, etc.

Discussion

It is impossible to ignore the tradition of philosophical discourse in a dialogue that has a rich history and which at all times differed from all other discourses by the principle of plurality, polyphony, the diversity of epistemological, ontological, methodological, value-semantic concepts that preserve definitions of correctness, transparency, logical coherence and semantic value.

In this context, philosophical discourse in any dialogue has the advantage since it represents a higher degree of reflection, and comprehension of the essence of the subject of dialogue, based on philosophical categories and universals. The categories as "the most general concepts of a particular field of knowledge and science serve to reduce the experience of finding objective relations, dismemberment and synthesis of reality ... and universals, which belong to a being" allow you to liberate the essence of the phenomena around which the dialogue is unfolding, from denotations and connotations of other discourses [5, c.522].

You should bear in mind that the active, emotional and rational relationship between a man and spiritual phenomena, especially in the modern world, which, as ever, shows many contradictions, uncertainties and impossibilities of complete rational assimilation of the world

is always about horizons of metaphysics and metaphysical thinking forms, in particular, "the communicative mind in the diversity of its votes" [9].

At the same time, the dialogic form of communication within an everyday communicative practice without the use of heuristic teaching methods and the study of intercultural relations shifts the emphasis from the person to the objective world, from the intelligible world to the sensory-emotional one, etc. Consequently, translating the dialogue into a cultural and educational space is necessary.

These issues have been updated and widespread in some areas of modernization, humanization and democratization of education. However, in today's transition from the "educational" paradigm of education and upbringing to a culturally oriented human development that includes all the various discourses as influential factors in human development, the formation of a person who is spiritually enriched, capable of understanding the meaning of one's own and another's culture, should be recognized as an expedient and absolutely necessary strategy of dialogue interaction.

Such a detailed analysis will also help today in establishing a "dialogue bridge" between cultural and religious practices, which, as it is known, is thoroughly represented in the anthropological and religious philosophy through dialogism, and understanding of the other, in which M. Bakhtin has a leading place. The analysis of the works of philosophers made it possible to draw some conclusions, which should be presented as follows:

- the dialogue is presented as a human dialogue, that is, a dialogue that unfolds in various vital senses (gender, ethnicity, socio-age, educational and cultural, etc.);

- in this sense, the dialogue appears aimed at the proportionality of human beings with all living and non-living worlds;

- the dialogue becomes, in this sense, a genuine multifaceted interaction of subjects of communication (subjects of knowledge and subjects of activity), a way of establishing the integrity of human existence;

- in this way, the dialogue from a simple conversation becomes a phenomenon of culture, which involves the formation and development of the body-spiritual and spiritual integrity of a man in the comprehension of the socio-natural environment and the establishment of constructive relations with him;

- regardless of the different types and forms of understanding (understanding of the sign language), that is, the understanding (assimilation) of a certain sign system, the understanding of the creative work, that is, understandable language, various transitional stages, different subjects of language styles (believer, official, merchant, scientist, etc.) cannot, according to M. Bakhtin, focus on semantic interrelations, on the total the meaning of the dialogue always focuses around the meaning" [3, c.450];

- the real interaction of the subjects of culture reveals the facts of existence in different planes and monologic, in which all other people's thoughts other ideas fall into two categories: the faithful, meaningful thoughts, which precede the author's consciousness, tend to become a purely semantic unity of world outlook; these thoughts are not depicted, they are established; this statement finds its objective reflection in a special accent, in a special condition in the whole of the work, in their own verbal-stylistic form of their statement; the established opinion is always heard differently from the one that is not approved; other thoughts and ideas, as incorrect or indifferent to the author, do not fit into his outlook ... become simple elements of characterization, mental gestures of the hero ... [3, c.450].

- the fundamental dependence of the effectiveness of the dialogue on its logical "algorithm", which in our opinion, is much simplified and identified as a conversation of two people, must go the way where the first stage of objectification is the presentation of oneself, which means to make oneself an object for the second person and for oneself ("reality of consciousness"), and then to see and understand another person – it means to see and understand another consciousness and its world, that is, another subject; moreover, it should be borne in mind that in simple clarification – there is only one consciousness, one subject; in

the sense of the two consciousnesses, there are two subjects; therefore, the clarification is devoid of dialogical moments (except for the formal-rhetorical), and understanding is always to some extent dialogical [2].

Consequently, the criterion of depth of understanding is one of the higher criteria for learning dialogical interaction and the organization of dialogue in practice. It is known that any practice has a historical character, a variety of forms, it is open to the outside world and it cannot be identified with either the absolute thing or the substance. In addition, the practical relations take place in the same interaction planes (in essence): in the object-object plane (the transformation of the world under the influence of a man) and in the subject-subject plane (communication of people in the process of these transformations). In particular, regardless of the types of activity, economic, religious, or other, the person as its subject constantly implements the process of inextricable, continuous reproduction of unity with the object, even if their views do not coincide. Moreover, they coincide with the components of activity that can be structured according to procedural characteristics as follows:

- value-motivational, that is, the component which causes, initiates and directs the action (and, as V. Abuzhenko notes, "... not knowledge creates a need for something, but, on the contrary, the need leads to cognition, because the subject needs understanding ... "[1, c.767];

- informational and regulatory, which contains many different ideal programs and models of action;

- operational, in which motives turn into the physical actions of the subject;

- effective, in which the actions of the subject are objectified and acquire a certain form of existence.

Polish professor E. Matinya writes that "... in society sometimes there is a protest, as well as a struggle with imposed forms of behavior ... these protests can be compared with the carnival, along with the temporarily sanctioned disagreements embedded therein. But, she says, "... this volatile sphere of community and dialogue plays a significant role in the emergence of a network of civic attitudes and the revival of the embryonic public sphere", and suggests several thoughts that can be transposed into social and religious practice: they should be viewed locally to the ground under their feet, to the places that each of us knows best, to places and narratives that have helped each of us overcome political and cultural separatism, reduce tension ...; one should learn the readiness to desolate the truth in the ecumenical approach; hospitality and generosity should be a key element of practice ... regardless of context; epistemologically it is necessary to pay attention to "knowledge with an accent", which can become for us the source of new plans and decisions of the problems of divided communities and societies; to bring to life the hospitality and openness that spread the dialogue in all its diversity, to embody them in the model of "civil architecture" - the agora as a place of "appearance" of a dialogue, a place where there are those who otherwise would never meet ..., but they (people) stayed here voluntarily" [6, c.559-567].

And finally, it should be noted that all previous analysis makes sense only if the dialogue needs to be learned and practiced in the cultural and educational space, which today is only in the stage of formation and which only begins as "full" subjects to engage in religious practices. It is in this space that the scientific and vital knowledge, rational values and semantic orientations, education and culture, intentions and aspirations of the subjects of education, the goals, content and organizational and managerial technologies of the institutes of science, education, religion, culture should be in dialogue. and social life.

This scientific search must be, of course, problem-oriented and object-oriented both in the past and in modern times. In addition, it should first of all be aimed at substantiation of dialogical strategies, which, by purpose, through the purpose and mechanisms of the implementation of the idea of dialogue, carry out a theoretical transition to operational action, from the theory to practice. Moreover, it is necessary to do this in the cultural and educational space, in which cultural and educational practices among them should unfold the mode of the

traditional institution of socialization of personality and the translation of experience in the mode of cultural and educational designing of equal interaction, in which communication and dialogue appear not only regulators of relations of objects, but also ways of persuading a person in the necessity of cooperation with other people, assimilation of basic moral and ethical truths, filling of individual existence with the meaning of comprehension with a bundle of their individual being with a certain spiritual integrity.

An analysis of the ways of communication and dialogue in the form of communicative and dialogic strategies, which are important ways of constructing self-development of the individual and various forms of social relations, shows the need to consider any activity, including religious, through the prism of the components of activity as such, its functions, and the conceptual dimension of the actions of the person himself.

Conclusions

Modern cultural and educational space is characterized by constant expansion, acceleration, strengthening of communication ties and their internationalization. They engage more and more people in different cultures, confessions, and communication technologies that enable informal communication, that is, dialogue out of control by social institutions and free personal representations, etc., in communication and dialogue. Outside public institutions that act as forms of regulation of social relations, the content of which is a dialogue, new structures "work" on the feeling of belonging to one or another community.

Everyday dialogical communication outside the philosophical and non-scientific worldview positions of subjects often loses human activity and even makes it impossible for certain productive ways, means and receptions of interaction. In an effort to understand the world and another person, the person always faces new problems that require the abandonment of previous views, so the constructs allow you to gradually move in the world of objects by doing logical operations and interpreting them for mutual understanding.

This becomes most obvious when it comes to communicative and dialogic strategies, the formation of which involves a significant number of subjects in the cultural and educational space (students, teachers, scientists, heads of cultural and educational institutions, representatives of state power, local authorities' self-government, political parties, religious and confessional movements, communities, public organizations, national-cultural movements, mass media, etc.).

Recognition of dialogue by the principle of theoretical and methodological support of religious practices of a particular cultural and educational space, which is the space of the peoples of the North Azov region, as well as the perception of this support by a certain (new) educational technology, requires the development of conceptual foundations of dialogical strategies. A worthy place in these developments should be to justify the theory and methodology of discursive dialogue in which religious discourse will be present along with others. Moreover, it is necessary to do this in the general cultural dialogue, as well as in interreligious and confessional communication.

Thus, in the interaction of principles of scientific, philosophical, educational and religious discourse, the specificity of the educational model of interreligious dialogue and its further perspectives at the present stage becomes clear. It should be acknowledged that the dialogue is becoming more and more relevant, as in recent decades, in connection with the development of modern communications, the representatives of these two major religions have become increasingly interacting with one another. The fact of peaceful coexistence of religions and confessions today reveals the civilization potential of peacemaking of world religions, the historical role of the peacekeeping model of their relations in an increasingly globalized world, and for man, the opportunity opens up to master all the richness of national and world culture and build stability in society.

The logic of the deployment of dialogic understanding situations involves the division of each type of situation into species. Information situations are divided into situations of solving ethical (controversial) tasks, ethical difficulties and valuable interpretation of subjects

of dialogue, the comparison of oneself and the other, and the identification of the meanings of the life of another, the search for the meaning of life and ways of helping the other.

Consequently, dialogue cooperation, as a certain humanitarian technology, should direct all educational discourses into the development of a dialogue of cultures and its orientation towards philosophical reflection in the educational process. It is a philosophical reflection that approximates the notion of "multicultural dialogue," "intercultural dialogue," "dialogue education," "multicultural education," and other terms and even categories that function in the scientific and educational life; communication space is often contradictory to determine at least the meaning of these concepts and release them from stereotyped connotations, from falsifications and quasi-intellectual layers.

References:

Abuzhenko V.L. (2003). Understanding / The New Philosophical Dictionary: 3rd ed., Corrected. Mn.: Book House, 1280 pp. (World of Encyclopedias). P. 767-769., P. 767.\

Bakhtin, M. (1979). Aesthetics of verbal creativity. M .: Art, 424 p.

Bakhtin M.M. (1990). Problems of Dostoevsky's creativity // Makhlin V.L. Mikhail Bakhtin: The Philosophy of the Deed. M .: Politizdat. P.49 -54.

Borodina T.V. Social dialogue: communicative strategies for the personal representation of social relations. - Electronic resource: http://cheloveknauka.com/sotsiialnyy-dialog-kommunikativnye-strategii-lichnostnoy-reprezentatsii-obschestvennyh-otnosheniy#ixzz3ZHassy/

Bulatov M.O. (2009). Philosophical Dictionary. K .: Stilos, P. 522.

Dialogue / Head Guides. Ed. I. Belov / Translation by D. Viren, A. Davtyan, V. Okun. Copyright by the Foundation "Borderland", Seyne, 2015. P. 559-567.

Contemporary global transformations and the problem of historical self-determination of the East Slavic peoples / Ch. S. Kirvel [and others]; ed. Dr. Philosoph. Sciences, prof. Ch.S. Kirvel. 3rd ed., Minsk: Four quarters, 2010. P.544-545.

Dobrenkova, E.V. (2007). Social morphology of educational discourse: theoretical, methodological analysis: author's abstract. diss ... doc. sociologist sciences. Rostov-on-Don, P. 14.

Habermas J. (1985). Ruckkehr zur Metaphysik. Eine Tendenz in der deutschen Philosophie? In: Merkur, H.439/440, 898 p.

Habermas J. (1981). Theorie des kommunikativen Handels / J. Habermas. Bd.2. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 348 p.

Hosle V. (2006). Der Philosophical Dialogue Eine Poetik und Hermeneutit / V. Hosle. Munchen, Verlag C.H.BeckoHg, 494 p.

Guattari F. (1998). What is philosophy? = Qu'est-ce que la philosophie? [Tr. from Fr. by S.N. Zenkina] / Guattari F., Deleuze J. M .: Int. Exper. sociology; SPb .: Aleteey, 260 p.

Kendzor P.I. (2016). Integration through dialogue. The system of organizing multicultural education at school: [monograph]. Lviv: Publishing House "Panorama", 378 p.

Koran (by I. Yu. Krachkovsky). Dushanbe, 1990. 443 p.

Kozhemyakin E.A., Krotkov E.A. (2008). Methodological problems of the study of discourse practices // Journal of the Institute of System Analysis, No. 37. P. 67-72.

Krotkov E.A., Nosova T.V. (2009). The nature of the philosophical (metaphysical) discourse // Epistemology and the philosophy of science. No. 3. P. 37.

Modern philosophy: Dictionary and textbook. Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix, 1997. P. 148.

Philosophy / Sub. Ed. A.F. Zotov, V.V. Mironov, A.V.Razina. 6 ed., M .: Academic Design, 2009. P.520.

Proleev S. (2014). "Society of knowledge" as an anthropological situation // Philosophy of Education. No. 1 (14). P. 7-24., P. 7-8.

Radionova N.V. (2008). Representation of philosophy in the educational space of Slobozhanschina in the nineteenth century. Sumy: OJSC "SOD", publishing house "Kozatsky val", 320 p.

Schmitt H. (1998). Beauftragter der Stadt Mannheim für ausländische Einwohner // Abschlußbericht: JUST Modellprojekt für interkulturelle Jugendarbeit. Mannheim, P. 43.

Schweizer, A. (1992). Awakening to life. M.: Progress, 258p.