V. I. Tchouechov
(Belarusian State University of Informatics and Radioelectronic,
Minsk, Republic of Belarus, v.chueshov@bsuir.by)

IT IS NECESSARY TO TAKE A THIRD STEP IN UNDERSTANDING THE ESSENCE AND BARRIERS OF SUCCESSFUL INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

These days, we know about thousands of barriers to intercultural communication. Before the 20th century, only friends, casual acquaintances, writers, and poets told us how to overcome them.

The first step in scientific understanding of how to overcome barriers in intercultural communication was made in the 20th century. This was due to the discovery of the fundamental role of the theoretical and practical context of intercultural communication in this process. A step was taken by E. Rogers and W. Hart, who deeply studied the theoretical context of intercultural communication. They identified the difference between intercultural communication theory (ICC) and international communication (INC) and development communication (DC) theories. INC and DC theories examine the communication context at the macro level. ICC theory examines the communication context at the micro level, studying the intercultural communication of specific individuals [1].

A careful study of the theoretical context of intercultural communication has shown that the macro- and micro-contexts of intercultural communication are more closely related in practice than in theory. For example, the influence of «Voice of America» broadcasts, a mouthpiece for US information imperialism, was neutralized in the USSR at the macro level through technical jamming. However, at the micro level, according to D. Lerner, the broadcasts fostered empathy for Western values among specific Soviet citizens. After the collapse

of the USSR, this empathy became the basis of the emotional context for successful intercultural communication in the 1990s between residents of the USSR and the USA.

The scientific study of the practical context of intercultural communication in the 20th century showed the following. The success of intercultural communication depends on the time of day (B. Malinowski). Success also depends not only on the use of a common language for intercultural communication, but also on the peculiarities of its use by different nations (E. Sapir and B. Whorf). G. Hall established that communication barriers are not only situational, but are also linked to the general cultural context of the behavior of the subjects of communication, their understanding of space and time. Political sociologists have also established that communication barriers are differences in the contexts of both recognition (A. Honneth) and the right to justification (R. Forst) of communication subjects, and understanding of communication as integration (unification) and/or separation, assimilation (dissolution), marginalization (assimilation-distortion), etc. (J. Berry) [2].

The dependence of the context of intercultural communication on the strategy for overcoming communication barriers was established by negotiation theorists R. Fisher and R. Mnookin.

R. Fisher demonstrated that the context of interests of the parties to a communication plays a crucial role in negotiations. R. Mnookin demonstrated that barriers to negotiations and communication are linked not only to the emotional context but also to the rational context (the set of arguments) of the parties to a communication.

According to Mnookin, an accurate knowledge of the rational context of negotiations allows one to correctly answer the question of whether one should even make a deal with the Devil.

In parallel with the first step taken by scholars of various specialties in the scientific study of the theoretical and practical contexts of intercultural communication, philosophers in the 20th and early 21st centuries took a second step.

The step consisted in the fact that S. I. Povarnin, M. M. Bakhtin, M. Buber, Ch. Hamblin, F. van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, P. Grice, D. Walton and others proposed to understand the essence of any communication as a dialogue and began to build not a contextual, but a universal dialogical model of successful communication.

Unfortunately, today there is still no unity among philosophers themselves in understanding which general model of intercultural communication, as a dialogue, is the best. That is why, without claiming to solve this complex issue as a whole, we will propose our version of the third step in understanding the essence and barriers of intercultural communication [3].

It seems to us that the basic law of dialogue as the essence of any intercultural communication is the law of the defining role of argumentation in it. Argumentation is an alternative to physical violence, threats of its use, and misunderstanding.

The basic law of successful intercultural communication states: if intercultural communication is not built on the basis of dialogue using argumentation, then physical violence, threats of its use, as well as a lack of understanding between the subjects of intercultural communication dominate.

The basic law of intercultural communication is realized through its five following rules.

The first rule: the subjects of intercultural communication must be interested in achieving its goal. The second rule: participants in intercultural communication must take a serious and responsible (emotional, rational) approach to achieving its ultimate goal. The third rule: subjects of intercultural communication should not conceal from each other essential information about the subject of communication, its features at the macro- and micro-level. The fourth rule: only true information should be used in argumentation in intercultural communication. Rule number five: Intercultural communication should use information that is relevant to its context and understandable to the participants.

The proposed version of the third step presents the following sequence of understanding the overcoming of barriers to intercultural communication as a dialogue. The transition first from the everyday to the scientific understanding of the barriers of intercultural communication, as well as the philosophical understanding of the essence of intercultural communication as a dialogue. From this perspective, the third step in understanding the essence and barriers to successful intercultural communication is a synthesis of three components. Namely, a synthesis: lessons in common sense from representatives of different cultures with the results of a scientific and philosophical understanding of the essence and barriers of intercultural communication. The proposed synthesis, after its comprehensive and critical examination, can be the starting point for our fourth and fifth steps towards the apparently still ultimately unattainable Ideal of successful intercultural communication. Therefore, if we want to get closer to this Ideal, in intercultural communication we must learn, firstly, to think contextually, secondly, and thirdly, to act dialogically and globally. No more, but no less.

References

1. Rogers, E. The histories of intercultural, international and development communication / E. Rogers, W. Hart // Handbook of international and intercultural communication. – 2 ed. / eds. W. Gudykunst, B. Mody. – Thousand Oaks, London : Sage publications, 2002. – P. 1–18.

2. Tchouechov, V. I. Some dialogic features of intercultural communication / V. I. Tchouechov, B. V. Markov // Novaya paradigma okhrany kul'turnogo i prirodnogo naslediya : sb.

nauch. st. po materialam IV Mezhdunar. nauch.-prakt. konf., Minsk (11–12 apr. 2019 g) / redkol.: T. S. Suprankova (otv. red.) [i dr.]. – Minsk : Kolorgrad, 2019. – S. 536–546.

3. Tchouechov, V. Theory of argumentation: the argumentological twist is necessary / V. Tchouechov // Proceedings of 8-th International Conference on Argumentation. – Amsterdam : Amsterdam university: SicSat, 2014. – P. 1360–1367.