



Zoja Morochojewa

Relationalism and Transcivilizational Communication

WYDAWNICTWO DIG

Recenzenci:

Irina Boldonova, Prof. Dr. in Philosophy, habilitated Nankai University, China

Skład i projekt okładki:

Laura Swornik-Ognicka

Publikacja dofinansowana ze środków Wydziału „Artes Liberales” Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego

© Copyright by Wydział „Artes Liberales” Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego,
Wydawnictwo DiG i Zoja Morchojewa

ISBN 978-83-286-0229-8



Wydawnictwo DiG Sp.j.

PL 01-987 Warszawa, ul. Dankowicka 16c lok. 2

tel./fax: (+48 22) 839 08 38

e-mail: biuro@dig.pl, <http://www.dig.pl>

Druk Totem Sp. z o.o., Inowrocław

Content

Introduction.....	9
-------------------	---

Part I

I and the Image of the Other in the Context of the West-East Dichotomy

Chapter 1. Crossroads as an Event in the Contact of the British and Indians	
According to Kipling's Kim.....	15
1.1. I and the Other: The British Civilization and Essentialism	
in the 19th Century.....	17
1.2. I and the Other. British India and Relationalism	29
Chapter 2. Time in the Symbolic Universe of the American Indian Hopi	
as the Basis of 'I — the Other' Relation	45
Chapter 3. Time in the Symbolic Universe of the Nganasans of the Northern Asia:	
Relation with the Other as One's Own and the Alien	67
Chapter 4. Hospitality As an Event in <i>I - the Other</i> Contact in Central Asia:	
Symbolism of a Yurt.....	86

Part II

Relationalism as the Basis of Transcivilizational Communication in the 21st Century

Chapter 5. Relationalism in Substantialism.....	111
5.1. Karl Mannheim and Change	111
5.2. Pierre Bourdieu's Distinction	115
5.3. Dialogic Relationalism (Martin Buber, Lew Karsavin, Mikhail Bakhtin)	123
Chapter 6. Relationalism in Postmodernism.....	132
6.1. Derrida and Différance	134
6.2. The Immanence of Deleuze	139
Instead of Conclusion	145
Bibliography	153

Introduction

Due to dramatical change in the ways of transmitting information, we get increasingly interested in the concept of communication today. This concept becomes a key to understanding disputable interpenetrations of various cultures and civilizations taking place in the world. Globalization brings the outside world closer to every person living on the planet via information technology. Thanks to created openness to other cultural samples and spread of the mass culture, there is an intensification of human contacts on the planet. It is no coincidence that the concept of *communication* (lat. *communicatio*, derivative of *communis* - general) has become very capacious because its meaning has transformed integrating technical and social meanings of communication and developed the concepts of neural networks, global networks, neural chats, etc. Also, a general notion of communication includes a number of its types – dialogue, biocommunication, message, etc.¹ The philosophy of communication allows us to view the world differently.

We can represent various aspects of the universe as fields of connections that arise in the process of information exchange (energy, vitality, etc.) in events of a different order. It is clear that these aspects are qualitatively different from each other in every area. Accordingly, interactions on the level of social communication have their own specifics. In order to describe it, there are approaches such as anthropocentrism and deanthropocentrism (in the versions of cosmo- and biocentrism). Anthropocentrism places the phenomenon of man at the forefront. Starting from *Know Thyself* by Socrates, *Man Is the Measure of All Things* by Protagoras, as well as the Judeo-Christian tradition, according to which man is a crown of God's creation, anthropocentrism remains an important vector of the West European rationality. But in the 20th century because of globalization, a strategy of posthumanism develops in the Western thinking, which proposes deanthropocentrization of a person and presents substantial concepts of essence, object, subject in relational concepts of field and connections.

Nature centrism is characteristic of the traditional East. This approach is characterized by recognition of integrity and interdependence of man and the universe, which is holism. To what extent are the prospects for deanthropocentrization in the West and holism in the East open in the era of globalization? What can be solutions of the global problems of mankind – poverty, hunger, epidemics, shortage of energy sources, demography failures. Study of communication allows us to designate interactions of specific agents/actors.

¹ See in: <https://classes.ru/all-russian/russian-dictionary-synonyms-term-30259.htm> Accessed January 7, 2022.

They can be either groups or individuals. They can wish to differ from each other and know that they fit well into a certain identity. There is a growing demand for specificity. Methods of differentiating social and cultural ties have become more complicated. A high degree of cultural diversity is a signal that the perspective of communication theories can suggest much in seeking an explanation of these processes.

I use the concept of transcivilizational communication in the context of the concept of *Transculturality* of a German philosopher Wolfgang Welsch.² He believes that the traditional concept of culture is the concept of internal homogenization and at the same time external isolation. The concept of *transculturality* paints a different picture of relations of cultures. Not dividing isolation and conflict, but confusion and commonality, contributing to exchange and interaction. 'The transcultural webs are... woven with different threads, and in different manner.'³

The book focuses on relationalism as a philosophical approach to the phenomenon of transcivilizational communication. Relationalism is a kind of lens that allows us to see the universe and social phenomena in a 'processual' way. Based on the principle of difference, the world appears dynamic and diverse. The universe is described as a network of relationships. This network of relationships is constantly evolving. All properties of things refer to such relations. Actors are involved in a network of relationships and their worldview is greatly outlined by what information they receive from the network of relationships. Moreover, each of these views is incomplete due to their embeddedness in the network. Relationalism is associated with the formation of a temporal picture of the world. Unlike substantialism, which proceeds from the assumption of absolute space and time derived from space, relationalism is based on the assumption of absolute time (time-space).

In the book, the author's objective is to reconstruct various approaches in relationalism in the perspectives of the East and the West. Traditional pictures of the world in the East have been temporal. East Asian (especially Chinese) societies are thought to be rooted in local forms of hierarchical relationalism, where social structure is created by relational commitments of the ethical and normative nature. In the West, the roots of substantialism go back to ancient Greece, to teachings of Parmenides. The Western science and philosophy got interested in relationalism in the 19th century. Today there is a relational turn. In particular, in sociology, it is associated with an attempt to perceive, define, study, etc., social phenomena as fluid social processes, rather than solid, defining social substances.⁴

In search of answers to these questions, let us turn to the concepts of civilization and culture. Both concepts reflect a person's ideas about the universe, the *Others*, and the Self (*One's Own and Strangers*). These are the two sides of the same coin, since culture displays a holistic perception of the world in its unity, while the concept of civilization incorporates

² See in: Welsch, *Transculturality - the Puzzling Form of Cultures Today*, 59-86.

³ Welsch, *Transculturality - the Puzzling Form of Cultures Today*, 81.

⁴ See in: Dépelteau, *The Palgrave Handbook of Relational Sociology*, 3.

diversity in all its manifestations. Thus, culture is a picture of the world that combines 'the concepts and forms of perception of reality as time, space, change, reason, fate, number, a relation of sensual to supersensible, relation of parts to the whole ... These universal concepts in every culture are interconnected, creating a kind of *model of the world* - that *grid of coordinates* according to which people perceive reality and build an image of the world existing in their minds.'⁵ A Russian historian A.Ya. Gurevich writes that 'an individual is guided in all his/her behavior by the model of the world that has been created in a given society; with the help of its constituent categories, he/she perceives impulses and impressions coming from the outside world and transforms them into data of his inner experience. These basic categories, as they are, precede ideas and worldviews of individuals and social groups, and therefore, no matter how diverse ideologies and beliefs of these individuals and groups may be, they can be based on universal, obligatory concepts and ideas for the whole society, with lack of which it is impossible to build any ideas, theories, philosophical, aesthetic, political or religious concepts and systems.'⁶ T. Lukman and P. Berger define the highest level of institutional legitimation, covering the entire cosmos and all knowledge about man, as a symbolic universe.⁷ It is the 'order of things' that demonstrates human experience from generation to generation.

For the universe, considered in the aspect of diversity, a social-historical context is significant. The defining moment in the concept of *civilization* is that cultures close in their structure in the process of interaction create fields of similar values. Civilization is a combination of different aspects of human relationship to the world - consanguineous, social, spiritual, economic. A configuration of these aspects in the social-historical perspective gives an idea of a concept of civilization. In the study of interaction of cultures there is a concept of a local culture. In substantialism, a local culture is associated with a relatively isolated territory, which determines its specificity. In our case, locality is associated with activity, and this allows us to consider integrity in the social-historical context, integrity in the aspect of local diversity.

In communication exchange of information is an exchange of meanings. By virtue of the relational approach we have adopted, it becomes necessary to separate concepts of intercultural and transcivilizational communication. On the level of analysis of civilizations, comparative studies using the relational concept of transcivilizational communication become possible. A relational methodology for research is being developed. The concept of intercultural communication refers to the substantial picture of the world. Cultures describe phenomena in their static state, from the standpoint of anthropocentrism.

In the second half of the 20th century, a problem of development of tools to describe processes became acute in the social sciences. The relevance was caused by the processes

⁵ Гуревич, Категории средневековой культуры, 30.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Berger, Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality*, 113.

of globalization related to change in the scale of interaction between man and nature in all aspects, both social and economic, regional and planetary. The intensification of human contacts on the planet affects ongoing events in a way that they are measured on a global scale. They are the issues of fundamental changes in production technologies, migration of labor, an impending threat of depletion of natural resources and disruption of balance on the Earth. Actually, globalization means that social processes starting in one local place rapidly spread throughout the planet, ensuring the simultaneity of what is happening thanks to information and technical means. As a result, the world, in the words of A. Giddens, in the process of globalization does not become more 'manageable', but, on the contrary, gets out of control and 'is runaway of hands'.⁸

If we consider globalization as a whole in the aspect of unity, then civilizations characterize the reverse side of this unity – the aspect of diversity. Accordingly, all interactions between civilizations will be in the nature of transcivilizational communications.

The task is to find adequate means of describing processes of interaction between representatives of civilizations with their values, norms, and traditions. Because of differences in mentalities displayed in the processes of communication, interacting parties create a lot of stereotypes and biases. Therefore, in order to regulate social centers of instability and conflicts rising every now and then in different parts of the world, there is an urgent need to develop means for transcivilizational communication that are appropriate to the changed conditions.

To describe a process of transcivilizational communication, it is necessary to recreate it in the temporal picture of the world. Accordingly, concepts in this perspective will be presented differently than in substantialism. They are context dependent. An interaction of cultures develops with imposition of contexts of bearers of different cultural traditions. These contexts as media, financial, ideological, technical, ethnic scopes⁹ make territorial boundaries more and more permeable, blur cultural traditions. As a result, we deal with the phenomena of deterritorialization, non-historicity, polycentrism, relationalism, which are characteristic for cultural globalization.

The success of transcivilizational communication is in strengthening contacts and intensification of exchange of information and cultural values. Mutual understanding and intense cooperation are an effect that can be achieved by coordination of communication components, that are a situation (context), outgoing meanings of a message (subject, topic), personal traits of communication actors along with their goals, motives, actions, deeds. Dialogue is one of the important ways to coordinate transcivilizational communication. An opportunity for a dialogue is possible when there is a desire for cooperation, subject to indispensable recognition of special interests and equality of each of the parties involved. A number of papers emphasize that dialogue is a way of civilized coexistence of cultures,

⁸ See in: Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*.

⁹ See in: Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, 33.

peoples, which would balance opposing tendencies.¹⁰ The methodology of relationalism (procedural approach), using the principle of difference, helps to clarify the mechanism of dialogue as a process in which there are two vectors, a) homogenization, unity aimed at finding common meanings, and b) heterogenization, focused on plurality, difference in positions of participants.

My previous books were devoted to the interaction of the East and the West, the problem of personality in the context of the East and the West. At the beginning of my exploration of the picture of the world in the West and the East, I was inclined to agree with R. Kipling's 'Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet.'¹¹ I didn't see common grounds for the meeting of substantialism in the West, relationalism in the East. The result of the contacts was the colonialism of the 19th - the first half of the 20th century, which culminated in the dominance of the West. But time turned everything in a different way. The problems that globalization has brought with it generated fundamental changes in the world, in society, stimulated primarily by acceleration of time and information technologies, growth of contacts of representatives of cultures and civilizations. I see opportunities for dialogue of the East and the West because of transition to the information society. In the West, there is critical rethinking of substantialism with its philosophy of identity, development of the principle of difference in post-structuralism, constructivism, relationalism and other areas. Being the core of transcivilizational communication, an interaction of *I and the Other* is considered from the perspective of relationalism, a dialogue between the West and the East. 'But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth, When two strong men stand face to face, though they come from the ends of the earth!'¹² R. Kipling thinks.

Since global problems of preserving life on the planet cannot leave us indifferent, in search of their solution we turn to the experience of civilizations and cultures. Relational methodology, based on the principle of difference, makes it possible to develop means for successful transcivilizational communication. The 21st century workplace is filled with diversity — with workers of different ages, religions, genders, cultures, beliefs, ways of thinking, abilities, ways of communicating, and many more. Many jobs today, regardless

¹⁰ See in: Диалог цивилизаций. Повестка дня. Москва, ИФ РАН, Горбачев-Фонд 2005; Seyed Hossein Seifzadeh. Discourse of Dialogue: Dialectic of Civilizational Cooperation and Cultural Coexistence. Journal of National Studies, Volume 3, Issue 12, Winter 2002: 27-43; Hans Köchler. Unity in Diversity: The Integrative Approach to Intercultural Relations. UN Chronicle, Vol. XLIX, No. 3, September 2012 <https://web.archive.org/web/20140101182742/http://unchronicle.un.org/article/unity-diversity-integrative-approach-intercultural-relations/index.html> Accessed March 12, 2021

¹¹ Kipling, R. The Ballad of East and West. Accessed July 15, 2022. https://www.kiplingsociety.co.uk/poem/poems_eastwest.htm

¹² Ibid.

of location, require working with other people who are quite different from each other.¹³ We can consider this field of diversity a frontier. Each of us is looking for mutual understanding in the situation of *I and the Other*. ‘Henceforward there is no longer anything absolutely foreign. Everything is within reach. Accordingly, there is no longer anything exclusively one’s own either.’¹⁴ The author hopes that the book will motivate a reader to think about solutions of a problem of cooperation of diverse civilizations and cultures.

I am grateful to the Faculty of „Artes Liberales” of the University of Warsaw.

I would like to thank to my family and friends for your continued support and love.

The book consists of two parts, where part 1 considers the temporal picture of the world in the East, the relational model of relations of the *I and the Other*. In Part 2, the focus is on development of a relational model of the *I and the Other* in the concepts of Western thinkers (K. Mannheim, P. Bourdieu, J. Derrida, G. Deleuze).

¹³ See in: Darla K. Deardorff. A 21st Century Imperative: Integrating Intercultural Competence in Tuning. December 2015. DOI:10.18543/tjhe-3(1)-2015pp137-147

¹⁴ Welsch, *Transculturality - the Puzzling Form of Cultures Today*, 69.

Instead of Conclusion

Could relationism be the basis for transcivilizational communication in the 21st century? To answer this question, let's try to turn to the content of the book offered to the reader. Today, when the world has become global and dynamic, it is necessary to explore the social world as a process. Diversity in the global process cannot be brought together on the basis of the principle of similarity into some kind of unity. The principle of difference and the principle of similarity refer to different pictures of the world – to relational or temporal and substantial. Globalization is manifested in acceleration of the pace of changes taking place in the social world, intensity and diversity of interactions on a planetary scale, which is expressed in a sense of the transience of time. We live in a changing world, where there is a transformation of the picture of the world. Change must be its foundation. Change is time, but not substantial time, not derived from space. In other words, there is a radical turn to the temporal picture of the world from the uniqueness and identity in substantialism, where A is A, and where there is constancy of time here and now. In substantialism, I designate discreteness as the principle of similarity or autonomy. The basis of the temporal picture of the world is change, where *is* / *is not* is the ratio of the elements of judgment. The principle of interrelation or difference forms a relational field. There is no unambiguity here, since dynamism of interactions leads to emergence of various contexts with a high degree of uncertainty with multiplicity meanings. The principle of interrelation or difference can become a methodological key for describing modern social-cultural processes. Through the prism of transcivilizational communication, it seems possible to study the interaction of civilizations and cultures, considering the main relationship of *I and the Other*, as well as terms and conditions for their peaceful coexistence. For dialogue to become an essential tool in transcivilizational communication, participation of partners in contexts with a high degree of uncertainty on an equal footing is necessary.

In the text I have considered the two forms of the relational perspective. They can be characterized by referring to the opposition of unity and diversity. The priority of the aspect of unity is given in the traditional Eastern relationism with a dominant center and a hierarchy of relations based on the principle of interrelation. The priority of the set is inherent in the relational perspective in postmodernism based on the principle of *différance*. Its feature is absence of a dominant center or polycentricity, as well as absence of a hierarchy.

The Classical Western ontology as a doctrine of being is a transcendental ontology as a result of division of being into material and ideal, objective and subjective, absolute and relative, etc. The boundary between the world of ideas and the world of similarities in one form or another is found in the teachings of being of the Eleatics, Plato, medieval philosophy, Hegel, the philosophy of nature of modern times, phenomenology, etc.

However, in modern times, the emphasis shifts to the problems of the subordination of being to a person as shaping, collecting the world from it (both in terms of cognitive and practical). As a reaction to Christian creationism, the theme of non-being, Nothing is actualized. The deontological concept of being becomes a challenge to the transcendental Absolute. In the twentieth century, M. Heidegger rethinks being as Dasein human being, a concrete unity of things and a person - *being-there/there-being*. Assumptions about transcendence of being are preserved in contemporary concepts, but they rather serve to solve epistemological problems. The emphasis is shifted to development of the principle of difference in the problem of plurality.

Unlike the classical Western thinking, in the East there is no opposition of the one and the multiplicity. They do not question being, but question formation of the one in the multiplicity. At the same time, the difference of opposites is not perceived as an opposition, as a contrast, but as a transition from one state to another. Thus, in the Eastern temporal pictures of the world, concepts are formed differently – there is no being here as some kind of permanent unity. The One (Brahman, Atman, Sky, etc.) in connection with the multiple manifests itself (*is/is not*) in the hierarchy of relations. Accordingly, relational concepts are constructed in space-time chronotopes as events. Unlike the concepts of the substantial picture of the world, they are multi-valued, indefinite in their boundaries and depend on the context.

The hierarchy of opposites (*yin-yang, winter-summer, I-You, etc.*) in the Eastern model is built relative to the dominant center, the ideal balance. Unlike binary oppositions in the substantialism, oppositions in the relational model are interdependent and tend to neutralize each other. It is then that an ideal order is possible as an equilibrium of connections. In particular, in relation to *I-Thou*, it can be argued that opposites are interdependent. Without *I* there is *no You*, and vice versa. *I and You* in a situation of perfect balance cease to exist. That is why it is argued that a reality of qualities is illusory. If one can say what is true, then it is only about the ideal balance and *the Middle Way* as a means to achieve it. Dialogue in the East is a search for truth, following The Middle Way.

Traditional worldviews in the cultures of the Indians Hopi (Central America), the Nganasans (Arctic) and the Buryats (Central Asia) describe the life force (breath) as a cyclic temporal process. An element is a moment, which manifests itself in the qualities of intensity and duration. Cyclic time is realized in oppositions. The purpose of functioning of *I – the Other*, along with other oppositions, is ultimately to maintain balance throughout the cycle. The peculiarity is that not a separate individual, but his relation with the Others (*I – the Other*) is the starting point in understanding of relational cultures. The Other is an integral component in opposition.

Considering *Ngo* as a whole in which the Nganasans live, we can state that this world is divided into levels of *Ngo*, or breed, forming the *Ngo* hierarchy. Each of these levels is a special local sphere. Both the whole and the local in this picture of the world are determined by change and time. The local is correlated with varieties of *ngos*, which

symbolize deities, spirits, natural phenomena, animals, plants, things, people's abilities, etc., characteristic of a given event or locality. This world is closed, it is permeated with the unity of the *Ngo* life force. Any external influence, both natural and social (other cultures, peoples), must either enter a state of balancing in the *Ngo* field, or any violence from outside can lead to destruction of the *Ngo* world. In the process of vitality, centrifugal tendencies will dominate over centripetal ones, in other words, an *Alien* will take over *One's Own*. Criteria for defining *Us* and *Aliens* apply to the entire universe, not just society. *One's Own* and an *Alien* are the characteristics of the qualities of a Nganasan's relation with *the Other* in the process of interaction. Everything that falls into the category of *Aliens* testifies to a flawed *Ngo*, devoid of vitality. *One's Own* means participation in the process of circulation of the vital force.

The *I – the Other* opposition is seen as a process of overcoming Eurocentrism by the American researcher Benjamin Lee Whorf. The Indian Hopi is described by him, on the one hand, as *the Other* in relation to the scientist, and on the other hand, on the basis of observations and interviews with Whorf's representatives. He reconstructs how the Hopi represent *the Other* in their culture. Whorf compares the perception of space and time displayed in the language of the Anglo-Saxons and the Indian Hopi and comes to the conclusion that a language and thinking depend on a position of an actor in diverse cultures.

Considering the Buryat culture, we explicate the interaction of the relational systems of shamanism and Buddhism. In the process of transformation of the *I – the Other* model under the influence of Buddhism, a symbiosis of shamanism and Buddhism relations is formed, organized in the focus of the release of a karmic personality. Moral responsibility of an individual combines with obligations to a clan, a group. The analyses of symbolism of a yurt – a traditional Buryat hut, allow to state extreme hospitality and very warm attitude towards their guest in the *I – the Other* contact. Hospitality rituals aim to invite a Guest to become a participant in the process of recreating the life force.

R. Kipling conveys the ideas of his project of diverse civilizations interaction on the Borderland throughout the *Kim* novel. He describes relational identification of a person in transcivilizational communication on the example of India and the British Empire's interactions in the 19th century. The writer depicts various civilizational codes of interaction typical for British England and British India. Both events in the novel, as well as critics and readers' discussions of the novel testify to the essentialist and relational modes of the text. But it is the relational perspective that Kipling uses to propose his project of communication, opening up a possibility of new solutions of the Western individualism in the context of Buddhism. Mutual affection and friendship of the heroes of the novel, Kim and Lama, helps them to discover a common meaning. Both return to the roads of the Wheel of Things. They serve the Law. It is possible that Lama will return to his monastery, and Kim will come to the world of people to create right things and events. Identity is no longer a problem for Kim. He is both the West and the East, and mountain and the plain-Earth, and mother and father at the same time. This everything can happen because he and Lama

find a starting point. Kim's search for a self-help man brings him to the discovery of Nothing in a completely different temporal dimension - The Middle Way of Becoming.

In Part II, the possibilities of transcivilizational communication in the XX-XXI centuries are considered. Due to the changes that globalization entails, interactions between the West and the East are determined by the temporal field, but the relational framework can facilitate dialogue.

Because of the return of the West postclassical thinking to ontology, the problem of justification of practical activity of a person in this world becomes relevant. Relationism in the history of the Western thought is associated with rejection of a universal subject, a transcendent Ego, with recognition of multiple points of view, multiple subjects. Man as a transformer of nature and society is the key idea of the era of modernism. Freedom of an individual in the concept of a self-made man is manifested in the right of everyone to have his/her own point of view. Relationism by Mannheim suggests considering a society as a situationally determined sphere, as a process. Priority is given to identifying features. He argues functions make it possible to identify situational-transcendental elements of mentality. However, Mannheim presents structural-functional dynamics while retaining the classical concepts of absolute space and time derived from space. It is relationism in substantialism.

Pierre Bourdieu considers relationism due to his desire to explicate social conditions of knowledge. He names his direction of the study structuralist constructivism. He argues objective structures do not exist in symbolism, language and myths only, but they do in the social world as well. With constructivism, he connects a social genesis of patterns of perception, thinking and action, which are reproduced in result of interaction of agents and structures. The researcher deals with the opposition of *structure (structures)* / *action (agency or social action)*, in which social representations and ideas, interpretations of individual and collective experience, communication methods, language games play a key role. Any communication of agents should not be just a decoding of the structure but be a generating model. It is an open system subject to change. In the process of communication, mechanisms and structures create events and experiences in which they are comprehended. Bourdieu overcomes an opposition of objectivism and subjectivism by introducing a third party - the relational field. A constructive element is a position in which agents find themselves when they enter into various social relations. Positions are points of intersection of the field lines of force, that is, relations. Position is formed in the process of discrimination. The relational concept of an *agent/agents* indicates that this concept is derived from more structured relations, one of which is the field. An agent's activity lies in his practical activity.

The meaning of practice lies in the temporally structured activity of an agent. Bourdieu starts from the completeness of the relational system, the elements of which are interconnected. Being a relational concept, practice concretizes the concept of force, emphasizing the concept of an agent's social activity as a driving force. The researcher shows that

activity is due to the relationship of such oppositions as *habitus* and *field*. Their interaction is based on the principle of hierarchy. As a result, the intensity of the field of interaction is reflected in the specifics of the fields that Bourdieu calls *capitals* (social, economic, symbolic, cultural). Thus, P. Bourdieu rethinks the concepts of substantialism. While relation-alizing concepts, he still does not affect the foundations of classical Western thinking.

Concepts in the philosophy of dialogue turn out to be the most representative in the developments of ontological relationism. Martin Buber marks his ontological approach with a turn to the Other. However, it does not mean rejection of a substantial, integral and unified being. The I-Thou relationship brings being to fullness and completeness but is not absorbed by the relationship. They are preserved as subjects I and You. Dialogue is a world of action aimed at recreating the fullness of being, the reciprocity of being - this is a movement towards a full-fledged I-Thou relationship. Through relationism, Martin Buber introduces an individual's personal experiences into the world of human thought. A person is and exists and acts mainly as a participant in a community of relations. The essence of a person is *relation*. To be a person is to be related.

Dialogic relations are considered as a process. The emphasis here is on attitude, on becoming. Spatial characteristics are replaced by other dimensions - time, rhythms. Such an approach to interpretation of the dialogic attitude is found in the concept of a symphonic personality of Lev Karsavin. He writes a perfect person in an instant. It is created by a plurality of instants and qualities, which, in turn, are instants and personalities. There is neither the first person nor the last one, but there is All-One person, that is Logos. In order to understand the dialectic of instants, it is necessary to take into account that uniting is an aspect of non-substantiality or temporality, in which relations are not determined from the outside (and in this sense space is not an external container for instants), but through internal relations of instants. *I and the Other* are presented as all-unity instants. *I*, as an instant of all-unity, becomes an instant of another *I*, etc., creating a symphonic person. The dialogic process includes both instants of different levels (hierarchy of instants) and instants of the same level. Symphonic persons as instants perform in the temporal perspective. The relation of God with a person is an integrating foundation of the humanitarian principle.

M. Bakhtin continues developing a dialogic relation outside a subject-object relationship. Dialogue is concrete as a field for creating new senses. Bakhtin associates dialogic relation with an event. An event in the novel is not a monologue; it is an interaction of different consciousness. An event as becoming is involved in the logic of difference and subjected to the principle of interrelation. Bakhtin designs this specific spatial and temporal characteristic (space-time) of an event as *chronotope*. Therefore, an event is described in a different way than in a monologue. An event continuously recreates itself as both a field and a result of a dialogic relationship at the same time. The author's position in the novel neutralizes due to recognition of independence of each of the participant's being in the event. Each of the participants becomes a center and takes responsibility for

his/her uniqueness, for his/her being. A person manifests him/herself in the process of being-event in an interaction with *the Other*. The situation of out sidedness facilitates a comprehensive understanding of *the Other*. Interactions between *I* and *the Other* are not limited by one sphere. Moreover, like in cultural interactions, the longer and more versatile encounters of *I* and *the Other* are, the deeper meanings they find. According to M. Bakhtin, an encounter with other cultures and the phenomenon of their diversity contributes to understanding of one's own culture and enriches other cultures with new senses. Thus, Bakhtin's dialogue is a being - event, participation in which breaks up and co-exists in the polyphony of voices. The opposites there do not interact according to the laws of dialectic and do not correspond to subject-object relations in this process.

Parting with substantialism occurs as a return to ontology of the multiplicity. The final transfer of relationism into the context of diversity becomes possible thanks to the development of the principle of *différance* in the concepts of postmodernism. J. Derrida deconstructs metaphysics. In result of criticism of the classical position of Presence in the Western thinking, referring to various kinds of centrisms (logo-, phono-, ethno-, phallocentrism) and accordingly, to binary oppositions, where one of them dominates, the philosopher offers an interpretation of being as becoming on the basis of the principle *différance*. The deconstruction of the transcendental and its replacement by the quasi-transcendental opens the way for affirming the existence of the world without us.

Chronotopes gift (*Don*), fairness (*justice*), hospitality (*hospitalite*), friendship (*amitie*), secret (*secret*), responsibility (*responsabilite*), etc.), being laid out to the other side, take on the character of imaginary transcendence (quasi-transcendence). They are the contexts of *I and the Other* relationship lack of which makes a relation impossible. For example, disappearance of death issues results finally in loss of somebody's own ego. Only face to face with death *I* acquires itself, manifests itself as a person. Blessing as an unselfish gift is an attitude towards *the Other*, but not a transcendent ideal. All these concepts characterize transitivity from *presence* to *non-presence* of being disappearing from space-time structures. As a result, the relation *I – the Other* as the infinite designation of the elusive, unconditional is nothing more than the world of *différance*, the world of an individual, of culture. The situation of *presence / non-presence* of being gives rise to paradoxes. In a situation of paradox, it becomes possible to acquire an identity of both the Self and the Other. It is not entirely correct to assert that Derrida's logic is resolved in favor of the primacy of plurality over singularity. Rather, the problem of single and plural is translated into other registers that are relational.

Deleuze's ontology is based on the relationality of the one and the multiplicity. There is no center, no whole in relation to which the parts fit into a hierarchy. There is a rhizome organization of the continuum, any point at which can be attached to any other. Instead of subjects, Deleuze proposes some decentered structures, networks representing sets. Deleuze presents communication as a meaningful activity. The sense is a relational concept. It replaces essence; therefore, a meaning cannot be caught only within

the boundaries of the substantial Whole. It is not an attribute of a sentence, but a state of a thing. This means that the relation of a word and a thing is expressed as the 'state of the thing'. Deleuze considers two worlds, an actual world and a virtual one. The virtual half is qualitative and intensive, and the actual one is quantitative and extensive. Their basis is the relation based on the differentiation. Their difference lies in the fact that the series of series and their effects proceed in two different modes. Series are stacked (virtually) and unfolded (actually).

In Deleuze's temporal picture of the world, an interaction of a word and a thing takes place in the process of becoming. The result is not the uniqueness (one-to-one correspondence) that we observe in static being, but the ambiguity that crumbles into convergences and resonances of series, condensation of singularities. In this process, the functions of the moment are revealed as a random point separating the past and the future, as an operator of difference. There is no present, but there is a moment that contains *already* and *not yet*. In the simultaneity of the past and the future, these two tendencies running in different directions, there is a mechanism of formation.

The times are multiple and take different dimensions. But it is necessary to single out a main trend – absolute and sensual formation. Sensual becoming is connected with the actual present. Sensory becoming is an intermediate sphere between the virtual (Event) and the actual (being). The production of multiplicity in the sphere of sensory becoming unfolds as heterogenization. But the process of becoming has another side, that is production of the one. It is about absolute becoming, about the tendency of homogenization. Production of unity and plurality is defined by Deleuze as an *eternal return*. That which is directed as an affirmation leads to absolute becoming, to oneness. That which is multiplied in events leads to sensual becoming, to multiplicity.

Pure has become zero duration, that is, any pulsation of time, an instant is extinguished. This is a pure Event, Aion. It is eternity. It is a process matrix that realizes itself in the 'eternal return' and is a condition for multiplicity of singularities, simulacra, their compositions, etc. That affirms life returns. Man must understand himself as an ever-changing collection of forces, an epiphenomenon arising from accidental mergers of languages, organisms, societies, expectations, laws, and so on.

Therefore, becoming-activity is the only form of becoming that returns as being. Becoming is reactive to a nihilistic form. It has no existence. In contrast to the transcendent essence, the Event is a paradoxical instance representing the paradoxical present of absolute becoming. Paradoxicality is a sign of a meeting (simultaneity) of two contradictory tendencies; it is nonsense, it refers to a sense. In every moment of sensory becoming there is absolute becoming. The foundation of absolute becoming is its scattering in the multiplicity of sensual becoming. It brings about production by means of quasi-causes.

The mechanism of differentiation as a source of change operates both in absolute and sensory becoming, manifesting itself in actualizations (deployment) and contra-actualizations (condensation) of relations. Since virtual absolute becoming is always present

in actual sensory becoming individuals are the result of intense relations in virtual one. They are the result (expansion) of virtual folds. An intensity of communications depends on the meaning that is revealed in the processes of actualization. In immanent metaphysics, Deleuze substantiates the real continuum between the One and the multiplicity.

Justifications for this-worldly (in-worldness) practical activity of a person are aimed at interpreting immanence of thinking and practice, at rejecting substantial transcendence. One path to immanence is relationalism. Paradoxically there a potential meeting point of the West and the East is revealed. Like a drop of dew in which the whole world is reflected, or Leibniz's monad, ---- these symbols refer to the idea of identity of the micro- and macrocosm. It is nothing but the key that gives us the opportunity to open the doors to any event - whether it be the West or the East. The focus on transcivilizational communication in the study of the processes of interaction of cultures and civilizations serves as a transitional bridge for the formation of the West-East field, the mechanism of which is the principle of *différance*. In the *I - the Other* opposition, the relation *is/is not* contains the principle of *différance*. In their striving to harmonize relations, participants in communication can create a dialogue event, identify themselves in it. This is the path of Kim and Lama.