

**UDC 171:172.4**I. A. DONNIKOVA<sup>1\*</sup><sup>1\*</sup>National University "Odessa Maritime Academy" (Odessa, Ukraine), e-mail donnikova\_iran@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0002-8504-1578**MORAL SEARCH IN MULTICULTURAL COMMUNICATION**

**Purpose** of the work is to identify and justify the moral priorities in multicultural communication. **Theoretical basis** is the works of foreign and Ukrainian authors, revealing the main approaches to the problem of multiculturalism; studies on ethics and philosophical anthropology that define the problem field in the anthropology of morality. The work uses: the conceptual provisions of phenomenology – for the disclosure of the semantic uncertainty of human existence as a prerequisite of moral search; existential philosophy – to substantiate the essential relationship of a man and culture. **Originality** of the results obtained consists of 1) understanding multiculturalism as a "dialogue of people" (V. Mezhuev), in which the moral search of every person is actualized; 2) in justifying the demand for inter-individual communication of "negative" ethics (A. Guseynov): its requirement not to commit immoral acts stimulates a person to moral search, reveals the specifics of the existence of a "person navigator" (S. Smirnov); 3) in the definition of intercultural communication as the creation of opportunities for the search for tolerant (non-conflict) forms of existence. **Conclusions:** 1) multiculturalism is a contradictory phenomenon, producing conflicts and creating prerequisites for overcoming them; 2) the possibilities of non-conflict existence in a situation of multiculturalism arise in inter-individual communication, which is a situation of moral search for every person; 3) "ethics of opportunities" unites universal and situational moral norms in multicultural communication: people enable each other to remain people; 4) "ethics of opportunities" creates conditions for tolerant (non-conflict) interaction between people and cultures.

**Keywords:** multiculturalism; morality; dialogue; moral search; "negative ethics"; "ethics of opportunities"; tolerance

**Introduction**

Opposite and at the same time related processes—globalization and multiculturalism are unfolding in the contemporary world. Globalization, uniting countries and regions into a single civilizational space, activates intercultural interactions, but at the same time causes the aspiration of people and nations to preserve their national and cultural identity. The migration processes, intensifying in the mid-twentieth century, required the identification and study of factors that, on the one hand, support cultural diversity, and, on the other, do not destroy the integrity of multinational states. Against the background of growing confrontation, multiculturalism is becoming a challenge for modern society, requiring fundamentally new forms of intercultural communication.

Despite the fact that works on multiculturalism are quite numerous, the moral aspect of the problem of multicultural communication remains the least developed. Debates arise mainly in two thematic areas – globalization and liberalization. In fact, these processes gave rise to the phenomenon of multiculturalism, in which the features of Western culture found expression in a concentrated form. The value of individual freedom became the basis for the protection of freedom of the cultural choice and tolerance to it. These ideas, in particular, were defended by the liberal philosophers of the twentieth century I. Berlin, J. Rawls, R. Rorty. The project in defense of justice and solidarity is presented in the "Discourse Ethics" of K.-O. Apel and J. Habermas.

The rapid growth of interest in the problem of multiculturalism is observed in the 90s of the twentieth century. A discussion is unfolding between his supporters (W. Kimlick, C. Kukatas, A. Young, B. Parekh, C. Taylor) and critics (G. Wilders, J. Gray, S. Žižek, B. Barry, S. Huntington, K. Hübner), adherents of "hard" and "soft" of its forms. Various interpretations of multicult-

turalism appear, which gave rise to the American historian R. Bernstein (1994) to note: «"Multiculturalism" is definitely an indefinite notion» (p. 4).

The analysis of multiculturalism focuses on the following aspects: demographic (stating the internal diversity of the society), political (reflecting political regulation and response to ethnic diversity), ideological-normative (on their base models of political activity are created), social-transformative (aimed at eradicating of various manifestations of intolerance), historical (studying cultural diversity and relations between cultures), and others (Vysotska, 2009, p. 11). At the same time, multiculturalism is considered primarily as an interaction of "collective subjects" – national, ethnic groups living within the borders of one state and experiencing difficulties with cultural communication. Factors of collective existence such as religiosity, immigration, globalization, and individualism become indicators of the decline of traditional moral consensus (Nediukha, & Zharkov, 2015, p. 5). Consequently, in philosophical discourse those areas concern primarily about "the policy of multiculturalism", which, according to the comment of J. Habermas (2001), should ensure "...equitable existence of various forms in cultural life" (p. 417). This message expresses the idea of multiculturalism that has become a classic one – "integration without assimilation".

In modern studies, accents are noticeably redirected toward the defense of the person's free choice, understanding the multicultural communication as a practice of tolerance based on morality (S. Benhabib, B. Parekh, C. Taylor, & C. Kukatas). This is happening against the background of growing in cultural diversity and the ineffectiveness of the "multiculturalism policy", which, despite optimistic forecasts, led to the growth of conflicts in several European countries in the first decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. An attempt to find "Middle Way" between culture and politics, custom and law combines these research.

The denial of a single cultural standard, the withdrawal of the centric vector of the development calls into question the possibility of a non-conflict, non-antagonistic existence of peoples and states. In this regard, there is a need to research multicultural practices that become moral search.

### **Purpose**

The identification and justification of moral priorities in multicultural communication is the purpose of the article. We will consider the possibilities to combine of moral universalism and relativism in the dialogue of cultures. These thoughts will require turning not so much to collective subjects, as to individuals who, in direct, personal contacts, search for ways and forms of non-conflict co-existence.

### **Statement of the basic material**

Multiculturalism means the preservation of cultural identity, the polyphony of subcultures in a multinational state. These are, typically not so much about the preservation of ethnic diversity, as the diversity of images and lifestyles, values, traditions, etc. by person's free choice of cultural patterns. However, every person is "rooted" in his national culture, keeps to its tradition, which often have an archetypical basis and presuppose the preservation of ethnic identity. Ignoring this is a failure by purely political and legal means to solve the problem of multicultural existence. Such a policy is not only unproductive, but often provocative, since it produces new conflicts. This gives grounds for critics of multiculturalism to express the idea that the concept of culture and multiculturalism are not productive for understanding the group requirements of self-identity, for thinking about justice and diversity (Maclure, 2015, p. 145). Russian researcher

M. Tlostanova (2003) emphasizes that the concept of multiculturalism is an alternative to logocentrism, justifying a pluralistic cultural pyramid and offering an "ideal" and often utopian vision in accordance with or in contrast to the concepts of "society", "culture of diversity" (p. 238).

Meanwhile, according to the American researcher S. Benhabib, the main task of the culture is the formation of orientations that allow a person to self-identify and identify with a certain social community. Culture is the result of reflection, representation and interpretation of reality. That is why all cultures are similar in structure, ways of building, have moral and evaluative components and are non-conflicting in their essence.

As our knowledge of other cultures and about ourselves are gained, our sense of relativity grows... The more we understand, the more we are able to forgive, and therefore the principle applies in the study of human culture and society: to understand everything is to forgive everything.

(Benhabib, 2003, p. 40)

At the same time, the researcher stresses that it is the values that determine the formation of cultures through contradistinctions, opposing one another. It should also be considered that cultures are a sign of social differentiation and "inevitably political" (Benhabib, 2003, p. 143). Institutionalization and politicization threaten cultural uniqueness and pluralism, since they forcibly place a person among a certain social group, depriving him of free choice. Nevertheless, S. Benhabib believes that the principles of democracy cannot be sacrificed to the "encroachments" of cultural minorities. She concludes that "in a political sense, the right to cultural expression should be based on the universal recognition of civil rights and should not be seen as an alternative to them" (Benhabib, 2003, p. 31). The researcher proposes to precede from the "presumption" of equality of cultures, creating the conditions for free competition of cultural traditions while respecting human rights. "If we believe that human rights are everywhere a moral basis for democracy, but we must be ready to defend their effectiveness, relying on arguments that we consider justified from universal human positions" (Benhabib, 2003, p. 172).

One of the first to oppose the total regulation of intercultural interactions was the Canadian philosopher C. Taylor (2004). He contrasted the recognition of the primacy of individual ideas about the world and their right to exist to the "universalism of general rules". Culture is related to identity, individual or group, therefore multiculturalism is understood by him as the "politics of identity". The philosopher emphasizes that multiculturalism requires the recognition the equal value of different cultures by everyone, "that we not just allow them to survive, but recognize their dignity" (Taylor, 2004, p. 63).

C. Taylor formulates the constructive principle of overcoming the confrontation of cultures – the thesis concerning the public recognition of the other's identity as a way of actual validating one's own identity. He talks about "Middle Way" between the homogenizing demand for recognition of the equal value of cultures on the one hand and "immure oneself in ethnocentric standards" on the other. "Other cultures exist, and we must continue to live together – simultaneously both within the borders of the whole world and intermixed in every individual society" (Taylor, 2004, p. 70). The "presumption of equal dignity" suggests that cultures which for a long time

have created a "horizon of significance" for a large number of human communities with their own ideas of goodness, holiness and beauty deserve admiration and respect. The moral aspect of this issue is the understanding and feeling that "we are only one separate part in the public story about humanity". The "presumption of equal dignity" requires us to be open to comparative cultural research, which will replace our horizons with their final merger (Taylor, 2004, p. 70). In his later works, C. Taylor (2002) writes that political identities must be created by the people themselves, thought out, discussed, and through the inevitable compromises be tailored to each other.

The British philosopher of Indian origin B. Parekh, representing anthropological multiculturalism, reveals this idea in more detail. He considers a multicultural society consisting of "several well-organized cultural communities, each of which has a more or less specific understanding of what is good, and has its own particular history, social structure, traditions, needs and aspirations" (Parekh, 1999, p. 449).

A person masters the ability to reach a consensus only in the culture, in communication with his own kind. Culture gives a person a sense of belonging, identity and solidarity; it is one of the prizes of life per se (Parekh, 2000, p. 95). Emphasizing the dialogueness of culture, B. Parekh insists on the requirement of openness and interaction between cultures as a condition for determining their identity, not accepting universally significant moral and political doctrines or concepts. The dialogue supports cultural diversity, which becomes a prerequisite for its effective continuation. Where one way of life is imposed (no matter, in political or economic forms), moral creativity and cultural differences disappear (Parekh, 2000, p. 147). The philosopher reasons about dynamic multiculturalism, meaning that dialogically constituted society has the concept of the common good, includes respect for civil authority, rights and justice.

In the context of the "policy of multiculturalism", the problem of universal moral values, "political morality" (C. Kukatas), (Dobiaš, 2018) arises, which suppresses violence and slavery. The shift of the multiculturalism problematics towards the interpersonal communication and individual identity actualizes the problem of correlation of generally significant ethical rules and norms and individual moral priorities. The multicultural communication reveals the demand for ethical attitudes and prescriptions that have arisen on unique cultural "soils". They are effective, have practical significance, since there are people – bearers of these culture. As a human phenomenon, represented in a variety of individual formation of forms, culture can become a kind of "controlling parameter", setting the search direction for the forms of coexistence.

Ukrainian researchers M. Nediukha and V. Zharkov note that multiculturalism represents the theory, policy and practice of non-conflict coexistence. He asserts respect for differences, but does not abandon the search of universality; suggests the possibility of the full incorporation into the society of individuals and groups without restrictions on their rights and freedoms, the loss of individually unique characteristics (Nediukha, & Zharkov, 2015, p. 26). Multiculturalism, which promotes a variety of ways of life and worldviews, does not contradict universal moral values, since it upholds respect for individual cultural forms, and therefore, for freedom, equality and self-determination. The principle of cultural diversity is moral one in its basis; is intended to ensure social justice and harmony, the civil rights of minorities in liberal societies (Vitikainen, 2015).

Another difficulty is found in the study of the phenomenon of multiculturalism – the ambiguity or uncertainty in the concept of culture itself. When we talk about collective subjects, culture mainly correlates with tradition in a broad sense – a habitual, well-established way of life with an appropriate value order (including an ethical component). Selection in the problem of multiculturalism of an individual "slice" implies taking into account the existential-personal dimension of culture, connections of culture with the essence and existence of a person, the ways of his self-

realization, the search for self-identity. In this case, it becomes possible to trace how co-creation of a person and culture arises, and through culture – with other people.

It reveals the need for interdisciplinary research of multiculturalism, combining cultural, anthropological and ethical aspects. In this regard, it is appropriate to draw attention to the work of James Laidlaw (2014), which raises the question of building bridges between anthropology and ethics, creating moral anthropology, where the central theme is freedom and personal responsibility. In particular, it notes that the "mirage of relativism", which dominates anthropology, impedes in-depth analysis of ethical issues (Laidlaw, 2014, p. 23). Moral concepts are connected within the framework of certain socio-cultural systems, each of which, based on tradition, habitual actions, denies human freedom. At another point, philosophers, referring to moral issues, research the motivations, judgments, actions of a person, losing sight of the social level. Anthropology is designed to become ethical, and ethics – anthropological. J. Laidlaw (2014) concludes this, "only in this case, freedom will be the object and instrument of anthropological thought" (p. 92).

This idea was developed in another study "*Moral engines: Exploring the ethical drives in human life*" (Mattingly, Dyring, Louw, & Wentzer, 2018), co-authored by J. Laidlaw. The authors emphasize the need in updating and anthropologization of moral issues, wondering what actually obliges us and guides us in our quest to understand our life in ethical terms? They discuss the motivations of human moral behavior, the cultivation of the subjunctive narrative in ethical issues as a manifestation of "caring for a close friend", the moral depth of everyday life, etc. Using the metaphor "moral engines", philosophers and anthropologists try to understand the fundamental questions in moral control of the human life.

Very close to the idea of anthropological ethics is the position of the Russian philosopher V. Mezhuev (2015), who emphasizes that "people are not friends, but people from different nations, and only if they acquire their individual identity, which leads them beyond their ethnic group and allows them to join the values of a higher order" (p. 166). Therefore, it is more correct to speak not about the dialogue of cultures, but about the dialogue of people representing different cultures, "in which the subjectivity of one person exists not through denial, but by asserting the subjectivity of the other one" (Mezhuev, 2015, p. 166). Only by asking others "Who am I?", a man come into human relations with them, seeing in others his continuation and addition.

The question arises, what and how should morality change itself in the situation of multiculturalism? According to the comment of the German philosopher H. Jonas, ethics of the past was grounded on several basic principles:

The position of people, stipulated by the nature of a man himself and the nature of things, are established once and for all by their principles; based on this, it is not difficult to determine rationally the human well-being; the boundaries of human action and human responsibility are clearly delineated. (Jonas, 2001, p. 12)

Similar orientations have determined the appropriate nature of human activity. Understood as "techne", it was limited by natural necessity, and therefore could not cause significant harm to all

natural objects. Ethical requirements extended only to the relationship of one human to another and the attitude of a person to himself. Moreover, the activity in this sphere differed from the activity in relation to nature (*techne*) that it was limited in temporal and spatial relationship. The existing set of moral "constants" determined the "correct" behavior in typical, everyday situations (Jonas, 2001, p. 17).

The attitudes of traditional ethics reflected a person's vision about the world (and society) as ordered, static, and verifiable rational explanation. The so-called "positive morality" corresponded to peace as the order. The Russian philosopher A. Guseynov (2007) defines its essence as follows: "All actions except those which a) were morally prohibited and which therefore took the form of a negative action, as well as those that b) were committed contrary to the ban, in its direct violation, – are considered to be morally sanctioned" (p. 21). As a result, "everyone believes that he acts morally", since any action can be described in moral terms (virtue coincides with goodness) and tied (including by the individual himself) to the axis of moral coordinates. However, according to A. Guseynov (2007), «"positive" morality does not absolve, but strengthens moral relativism, since specific moral rules and evaluations may contradict each other» (p. 21).

Multicultural reality imposes demands on traditional moral attitudes. The multicultural world is a complex, variable, chaotic, unstable and dynamic one. It requires, on the one hand, cultural plasticity, on the other – the preservation of the identity of individuals and social groups. Thus, moral imperatives cease to be absolute and universal ones. They are characterized by variation within specific cultural communities, and even more so beyond their borders.

What is ethics of a complex and value-ambiguous multicultural reality? A. Guseynov (2007) justifies the idea concerning the transition to the so-called "negative ethics", proceeding from the fact that "morality gets its adequate theoretical expression in negative definitions and practical implementation in prohibitions" (p. 6). Prohibitions, in turn, reveal the unconditional, categorical nature of morality, because a person appeals to it "in extreme situations when life is at stake", "when he puts himself at stake", "when he shows and proves that there are things through which he would never step over" (Guseynov, 2007, p. 7).

It is clear that such situations for a person are the exception rather than the rule. However, in the value system that guides him in everyday life, morality sets the direction, the vector of his actions. The man creates his own axiological image of the world and is ready to bear responsibility for it and for him. According to the philosopher, the compliance of absolute moral requirements with actions is completely at the mercy of the individual, depends on his conscious will. And "such are, and in principle can only be moral prohibitions and corresponding to them, implementing their actions, which I call negative". "Not everything that we don't do belongs to the area of negative actions, but only what we don't make, despite the fact that we really want to make and there are all possibilities to do it". (Guseynov, 2007, p. 21).

It is important, in our opinion, that "negative" ethics actualizes the individual choice and responsibility of a person who does not speculate about the relative nature of moral norms, but follows them with the fact that they do not commit immoral acts. In the act of "non-fulfillment", the moral "I" is particularly clearly expressed, since in this situation it is very difficult for a man to deceive himself. He follows exclusively his spiritual principles, devoid of considerations of benefit and situational conditionality. If morally pure acts exist at all, then these are, of course, negative actions (Guseynov, 2007, p. 23). "Negative" ethics, without losing its absoluteness and categorical nature, enables a person of free self-determination as a moral being, independently and responsibly establishing the boundaries of his own subjectivity and freedom. In this sense, it repre-

sents, above all, individual, personal ethics. By limiting oneself to moral prohibitions, a man does not commit anything that can have negative consequences for him and his surroundings.

In terms of cultural diversity, the universal nature of negative actions is revealed. "It is quite possible to imagine that people do not do something together, if they agree that we should not do it ... we, the people, find our moral quality not only and not so much in what we do, but in what we are not doing, from what we are refraining" (Guseynov, 2007, p. 23). Such a "non-action" significantly expands the scope of a possible dialogue, since it highlights the universal human, uniting people.

In this regard, the American philosopher M. Epshteyn proposes to distinguish between the general and universal in ethics. The general always acts as an obligation. That is why «the first and last words in the Kantian imperative are inextricably linked: "act" stands in imperative, because it is necessary to act so that the maxim of your behavior becomes "universal law"» (Epshteyn, 2004, p. 110). The universal is contained in a man himself, and therefore it is manifested not as a duty, but as an opportunity. "One can imagine a universal ethic built in the subjunctive mood, rather than in the imperative one, ethics of possibilities, and not obligations", – writes M. Epshteyn. – "If the primary moral intuition is to clothe one's own need in the form of an opportunity for another, then the meaning of ethics is already defined as a further expansion of the areas of possible for another" (Epshteyn, 2004, p. 113).

Aiming to provide opportunities for the other, a man creates "truly meaningful ethical relationships" that outgrow formal politeness, because the opportunities themselves are created by people for each other (Epshteyn, 2004, p. 113). The situation of "creating opportunities" is always unique, as human individualities enter into a dialogue in it. It is unpredictable in its results in the sense that it exhibits nuances and subtleties of human relations, the preservation and coordination of which is the task of those who communicate. Opportunities can remain only opportunities, but can be realized in completely unique forms of human communication that have arisen in this situation, but are of common human significance.

V. Mezhuev writes about a human relationship, the awareness of which promotes the dialogue not only within his cultural group, but also with representatives of other groups. But the consciousness of human involvement in the entire human race arises only after self-awareness as an autonomous person, a free individuality (Mezhuev, 2015, p. 167). In the awareness of universal kinship a civilization of the dialogue begins, which implies "not the elimination of different cultures, but free access to each of them by those who wish it. It makes movable borders not between cultures, but between people who receive the right to move freely from one cultural space to another" (Mezhuev, 2015, p. 168).

The universality in the civilization of the dialogue is not in the fact that it forms universal ethics, but in an open and tolerant attitude to different cultures, creating conditions for the dialogue, during which any culture can become "my culture", "and the border between what I consider my own culture unlike the other one, it is solely determined by my personal free choice" (Mezhuev, 2015, p. 168). Is it not for this reason that the policy of multiculturalism is facing difficulties in trying to work out universal rules and norms for the interaction of cultures? In a multicultural world, a non-conflict existence implies the discovery and preservation of the universal human in the diversity of its manifestations. And this, in our opinion, implies "Middle Way" between the universality of moral requirements and moral relativism – when every person in a particular situation searches for moral norms, giving the other person the opportunity to do so.

Ethics of opportunity correlate with modern anthropology, which substantiates the idea that a person contains many ontological projects, none of which reveals a person completely. The

Ukrainian philosopher V. Tabachkovskiy (2005) singled out the polyessence as an ontological characteristic of a person, which sets many ways and directions for his self-realization, defines the fundamental need in searching for an ethically fulfilled existence. In the definition of the Russian philosopher S. Smirnov, a man for himself is always a project, an opportunity, a "navigator". Navigation begins when a search cannot end with getting of a ready place and a ready desired subject-guidance.

A man cannot receive support, cannot orient himself, does not recognize, does not hear, does not see, and does not feel... First of all, because he does not find support in the outside world. He needs another – in the search for himself. But he does not exist as an external guidance and cannot be. He has only to come to him, more precisely, to create.

(Smirnov, 2017, p. 189)

Making your own way is impossible without moral guidelines that keep people in the space of culture.

The situation of multiculturalism, in which modern communities are located, can be compared with a collective search or navigation, in which the moral choice and self-determination of every person is important. Understanding ethics as "ethics of opportunity" gives the phenomenon of multiculturalism a positive meaning, although it does not deprive it of contradictions. Multiculturalism is a sociocultural phenomenon associated with the individual essence of culture, but which manifests itself in collective forms. The dialogue itself (more precisely, the polylogue) of cultures produces a special phenomenon of the self-organization of human communities, which "ethics of opportunity" becomes. You can talk about the peculiar switching of the "mode" of the functioning the culture in the situation of multicultural communication: the requirement of compliance with universal moral standards is replaced by giving a person the opportunity not to commit immoral deeds himself and thereby encourage others to moral behavior.

"Ethics of opportunity" echoes the ethical orientations of Eastern cultures, creating a situation for the dialogue between the West and the East. The moral requirements of Taoism ("u wei"), Buddhism ("ahimsa") and others express "reverence for life", gratitude to the world. Eastern philosophy is a philosophy of the way ("dao", "Middle Way" in Buddhism), adhering to which a man eliminates himself as a source of conflict with the world, at this not losing the opportunity to become a man. Multiculturalism practitioners will demand these principles of human interaction with the world. Our nonviolent actions and deeds suggest the same response actions through the awakening of a moral, universal human being in another person. The justification of this idea is found by J. Habermas in the concept of "communicative rationality" revealing the conditions of social cooperation. Openness, readiness to listen to one's own and others' arguments, reasonable debate and discussion make it possible to exchange ideas in good faith. Every of the participants are aware of how every of them understand own vital interests, how a decision is made and how a certain generalized judgment is expressed in it (Habermas, 2001, p. 171). It becomes significant and important for private participants in the discussion "by balancing interests and

reaching a compromise, by means of a targeted choice of methods, moral justification and checking for a legal connection" (Habermas, 2001, p. 391).

Thus, one of the lessons of multiculturalism can be the practice of tolerance as a process-search for non-conflict coexistence. The development of culture is accompanied, on the one hand, by the expansion of the space of human freedom and moral autonomy, on the other – by the increasing involvement of a man in intercultural communication and relations. Both aspects of the development of culture are connected, complement and define each other. A person's willingness to meet not just with another man, but with a stranger and excluded one becomes his existential characteristic as well as the willingness to accept another and someone else's. Ignoring it closes the person in an egoistic existence, recognized as the only correct and accepting only that, to a greater or lesser extent coincides with it or echoes. In this case, the detection and, most importantly, contact with others and initially unacceptable turns into cultural shock and trauma, primarily due to unexpectedness, and therefore surprises. Tolerance as a practice aims to unite alternative moral strategies.

### Originality

Allocation of the individual level of intercultural communication allowed revealing multiculturalism as a situation of moral search. Its specificity lies in the transition to "negative ethics" and the demand for "ethics of opportunities" as the basis for the dialogue of different cultures. "Ethics of opportunity" implies the free self-determination of a person in a multicultural world, not producing conflicts. Thus, multiculturalism becomes a situation of "teaching" people to a tolerant existence.

### Conclusions

On the one hand, multiculturalism provides a favorable environment for confrontation and conflict, on the other hand, it provides the possibility of overcoming and preventing them. The multicultural world becomes for a person a situation of moral challenge, a test of how important to preserve humanity as such, of morality as the existential value of human existence. The origins of non-conflict existence in the conditions of multiculturalism are connected with inter-individual communication, which creates a situation of moral search. The modern man has made a very important step, having recognized the social reality multicultural one, and together with this recognition, having given the ontological status to other vital worlds that are incompatible with their life world. The next step is to learn to live in spite of and with the other and incompatible; develop new sociocultural practices that eliminate conflict. Bridging the gap between moral imperatives and situational requirements is seen in the "ethics of opportunities", giving everyone the right to exercise their choice in defense of human.

### REFERENCES

- Benhabib, S. (2003). *Prityazaniya kultury. Ravenstvo i raznoobrazie v globalnuyu eru*. V. L. Inozemtsev (Ed.), Trans. from Engl. Moscow: Logos. (in Russian)
- Bernstein, R. (1994). *Dictatorship of virtue: Multiculturalism and the battle for America's future*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. (in English)
- Dobiaš, D. (2018). The idea of liberalism in the pragmatic perspective of searching freedom and a better world. *Political Science*, 21(3), 32-54. doi: 10.24040/politickevedy.2018.21.3.32-54 (in Slovak)
- Epshteyn, M. (2004). *Znak probela. O budushchem gumanitarnykh nauk*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. (in Russian)

## АКТУАЛЬНІ ПИТАННЯ ФІЛОСОФСЬКОЇ АНТРОПОЛОГІЇ

- Guseynov, A. A. (2007). Negativnaya etika. *Izbrannye lektsii universiteta*. Retrieved from [https://guseinov.ru/publ/Negat\\_eth.html](https://guseinov.ru/publ/Negat_eth.html) (in Russian)
- Habermas, J. (2001). *Vovlechenie drugogo. Ocherki politicheskoy teorii*. D. A. Sklyadnev (Ed.), Y. S. Medvedev, Trans. from German. St. Petersburg: Nauka. (in Russian)
- Jonas, H. (2001). *Pryntsyp vidpovidalnosti. U poshukakh etyky dlia tekhnolohichnoi tsyvilizatsii*. A. Yermolenko, & V. Yermolenko, Trans. from German. Kyev: Libra. (in Ukrainian)
- Laidlaw, J. (2014). *The subject of virtue: An anthropology of ethics and freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (in English)
- Maclure, J. (2015). Multiculturalism on the back seat? Culture, religion, and justice. *The Ethics Forum*, 10(2), 141-146. doi: 10.7202/1035333ar (in English)
- Mattingly, C., Dyring, R., Louw, M., & Wentzer, T. (Eds.). (2018). *Moral engines: Exploring the ethical drives in human life* (Vol. 5). New York: Berghahn Books. (in English)
- Mezhuev, V. (2015). Dialog kak sposob mezhkulturnogo obshcheniya v sovremennom mire. In A. S. Zapesotskiy (Ed.), *Mezhdunarodnye Likhachevskie nauchnye chteniya. Globalizatsiya i dialog kultur. Izbrannye doklady (1995–2015)* (pp. 161-171). St. Petersburg: Saint Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. (in Russian)
- Nediukha, M. P., & Zharkov, V. O. (2015). Mulykulturalizm yak poniattia suchasnoi sotsiohumanitarnoi nauky. In A. M. Podoliaka (Ed.), *Mulykulturalizm yak sotsialno-pravove yavyshe: vyklyky hlobalizovanoho svitu* (pp. 4-8). Kyiv: Art-tekhnohiiia. (in Ukrainian)
- Parekh, B. (1999). Common citizenship in multicultural societies. *The Round Table*, 88(351), 449-460. doi: 10.1080/003585399107983 (in English)
- Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (in English)
- Parekh, B. (2002). Barry and the Dangers of Liberalism. In P. Kelly (Ed.), *Multiculturalism Reconsidered: "Culture and equality" and its critics* (pp. 133-150). Cambridge: Polity Press; Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell. (in English)
- Smirnov, S. A. (2017). Anthropological navigation. Introduction in concept. *Chelovek.RU*, 12, 159-195. (in Russian)
- Tabachkovskiy, V. H. (2005). Polisutnisne homo: Filozofsko-mystetska dumka v poshukakh "neevklidovoi reflektivnosti". Kyiv: Parapan. (in Ukrainian)
- Taylor, C. (2002). Demokraticheskoe isklyuchenie (i "Iekarstvo" ot nego?). In V. S. Malakhov, & V. A. Tiskov, (Eds.), *Multikulturalizm i transformatsiya postsovetskikh obshchestv* (pp. 11-37). Moscow: IEiA, IPhRAS. (in Russian)
- Taylor, C. (2004). *Mulykulturalizm i "Polityka vyznannia"*. Trans. from Engl. Kyiv: Alterpres. (in Ukrainian)
- Tlostanova, M. V. (2003). Era Agasfera, ili Kak sdelat chitateley menee schastlivymi. *Inostrannaya literatura*, 1, 238-251. (in Russian)
- Vitikainen, A. (2015). *The limits of liberal multiculturalism. Towards an individuated approach to cultural diversity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. (in English)
- Vysotska, N. O. (2009). Kontseptsiiia mulykulturalizmu i pytannia estetyky. *Pytannia literaturoznavstva*, 77, 110-121. (in Ukrainian)

## LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Бенхабиб, С. Притязания культуры. Равенство и разнообразие в глобальную эру / С. Бенхабиб ; [пер. с англ. ; под ред. В. Л. Иноземцева]. – Москва : Логос, 2003. – 350 с.
- Bernstein, R. Dictatorship of Virtue: Multiculturalism and the Battle for America's Future / R. Bernstein. – New York : Alfred A. Knopf, 1994. – 379 p.
- Dobiaš, D. Idea liberalizmu v pragmatickej perspektive hľadania slobody a lepšieho sveta / D. Dobiaš // Politické vedy. – 2018. – Vol. 21, No. 3. – P. 32–54. doi: 10.24040/politickvedy.2018.21.3.32-54
- Эпштейн, М. Знак пробела. О будущем гуманитарных наук / М. Эпштейн. – Москва : Новое литературное обозрение, 2004. – 864 с.
- Гусейнов, А. А. Негативная этика [Электронный ресурс] / А. А. Гусейнов // Избранные лекции Университета. – 2007. – Вып. 63. – 25 с. – Режим доступа: [https://guseinov.ru/publ/Negat\\_eth.html](https://guseinov.ru/publ/Negat_eth.html) – Название с экрана. – Дата обращения: 30.10.2018.
- Хабермас, Ю. Вовлечение другого. Очерки политической теории / Ю. Хабермас ; [пер. с нем. Ю. С. Медведева ; под ред. Д. А. Складнева]. – Санкт-Петербург : Наука, 2001. – 417 с.

## АКТУАЛЬНІ ПИТАННЯ ФІЛОСОФСЬКОЇ АНТРОПОЛОГІЇ

- Йонас, Г. Принцип відповідальності. У пошуках етики для технологічної цивілізації / Г. Йонас ; пер. з нім. А. Єрмоленко, В. Єрмоленко. – Київ : Лібра. 2001. – 400 с.
- Laidlaw, J. The Subject of Virtue: An Anthropology of Ethics and Freedom / J. Laidlaw. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2014. – 258 p.
- Maclure, J. Multiculturalism on the Back Seat? Culture, Religion, and Justice / J. Maclure // Les ateliers de l'éthique. – Vol. 10, № 2. – 2015. – P. 141–146. doi: 10.7202/1035333ar
- Moral Engines: Exploring the Ethical Drives in Human Life / Eds. by Ch. Mattingly, R. Dyring, M. Louw, T. S. Wentzer. – New York : Berghahn Books, 2018. – Vol. 5 : WYSE series in social anthropology. – 266 p.
- Межуев, В. М. Диалог как способ межкультурного общения в современном мире / В. М. Межуев // Международные Лихачевские научные чтения. Глобализация и диалог культур. Избранные доклады (1995–2015) / Сост. и науч. ред. А. С. Запесоцкий. – Санкт-Петербург : Санкт-Петербургский гуманитарный университет профсоюзов, 2015. – С. 161–171.
- Недюха, М. П. Мультикультуралізм як поняття сучасної соціогуманітарної науки / М. П. Недюха, В. О. Жарков // Мультикультуралізм як соціально-правове явище: виклики глобалізованого світу / за ред. А. М. Подоляки. – Київ : Арт-технологія, 2015. – С. 4–28.
- Parekh, B. Common Citizenship in Multicultural Societies / B. Parekh // The Round Table. – 1999. – Vol. 88, Iss. 351. – P. 449–460. doi: 10.1080/003585399107983
- Parekh, B. Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory / B. Parekh. – Cambridge : Harvard University Press, 2000. – 379 p.
- Parekh, B. Barry and the Dangers of Liberalism / B. Parekh // Multiculturalism Reconsidered : "Culture and Equality" and its Critics / Ed. by P. Kelly. – Cambridge : Polity Press ; Hoboken : Wiley-Blackwell, 2002. – P. 133–150.
- Смирнов, С. А. Антропологическая навигация. Введение в концепт / С. А. Смирнов // Человек.RU. – 2017. – № 12. – С. 159–195.
- Табачковський, В. Г. Полісутнісне homo: філософсько-мистецька думка в пошуках "неевклідової рефлексивності" / В. Г. Табачковський. – Київ : Парапан, 2005. – 432 с.
- Тейлор, Ч. Демократическое исключение (и "лекарство" от него?) / Ч. Тейлор // Мультикультуралізм и трансформация постсоветских обществ / под ред. В. С. Малахова и В. А. Тишкова. – Москва, 2002. – С. 11–37.
- Тейлор, Ч. Мультикультуралізм і "Політика визнання" / Ч. Тейлор ; [пер. з англ.]. – Київ : Альтерпрес, 2004. – 172 с.
- Тлостанова, М. В. Эра Агасфера, или Как сделать читателей менее счастливыми / М. В. Тлостанова // Иностранная литература. – 2003. – № 1. – С. 238–251.
- Vitikainen, A. The Limits of Liberal Multiculturalism. Towards an Individuated Approach to Cultural Diversity / A. Vitikainen. – London : Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. – 234 p.
- Висоцька, Н. О. Концепція мультикультуралізму і питання естетики / Н. О. Висоцька // Питання літературознавства. – 2009. – Вип. 77. – С. 110–121.

І. А. ДОННИКОВА<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Національний університет "Одеська морська академія" (Одеса, Україна), ел. пошта donnikova\_iran@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0002-8504-1578

## МОРАЛЬНИЙ ПОШУК В МУЛЬТИКУЛЬТУРНІЙ КОМУНІКАЦІЇ

**Мета** роботи – виявлення та обґрунтування моральних пріоритетів у мультикультурній комунікації. **Теоретичний базис** складають роботи зарубіжних і українських авторів, котрі розкривають основні підходи до проблеми мультикультуралізму; дослідження з етики та філософської антропології, що визначають проблемне поле антропології моралі. У роботі використовуються: концептуальні положення феноменології – для розкриття смислової невизначеності людського буття як передумови морального пошуку; екзистенціальної філософії – для обґрунтування сутнісного зв'язку людини і культури. **Наукова новизна** отриманих результатів полягає: 1) в осмисленні мультикультуралізму як "діалогу людей" (В. Межуєв), в якому актуалізується моральний пошук кожної людини; в обґрунтуванні затребуваності в міжіндивідуальній комунікації "негативної"

## АКТУАЛЬНІ ПИТАННЯ ФІЛОСОФСЬКОЇ АНТРОПОЛОГІЇ

етики (А. Гусейнов): її вимога не здійснювати аморальних вчинків стимулює людину до морального пошуку, виявляє специфіку існування "людини-навігатора" (С. Смирнов); 3) у визначенні міжкультурної комунікації як створення можливостей для пошуку толерантних (неконфліктних) форм існування. **Висновки:** 1) мультикультуралізм є суперечливим явищем, яке й продукує конфлікти та створює передумови для їх подолання; 2) можливості неконфліктного існування в ситуації мультикультуралізму виникають у міжіндивідуальній комунікації, яка є ситуацією морального пошуку кожної людини; 3) "етика можливостей" об'єднує універсальні та ситуативні моральні норми в мультикультурній комунікації: люди дають можливість одне одному залишатися людьми; 4) "етика можливостей" створює умови для толерантної (неконфліктної) взаємодії людей і культур.

*Ключові слова:* мультикультуралізм; моральність; діалог; моральний пошук; "негативна етика"; "етика можливостей"; толерантність

И. А. ДОННИКОВА<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>Национальный университет "Одесская морская академия" (Одесса, Украина), эл. почта donnikova\_iran@ukr.net, ORCID 0000-0002-8504-1578

## ПРАВСТВЕННЫЙ ПОИСК В МУЛЬТИКУЛЬТУРНОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ

**Цель работы** – выявление и обоснование нравственных приоритетов в мультикультурной коммуникации. **Теоретический базис** составляют работы зарубежных и украинских авторов, раскрывающие основные подходы к проблеме мультикультурализма; исследования по этике и философской антропологии, определяющие проблемное поле антропологии морали. В работе используются: концептуальные положения феноменологии – для раскрытия смысловой неопределенности человеческого бытия как предпосылки нравственного поиска; экзистенциальной философии – для обоснования сущностной связи человека и культуры. **Научная новизна** полученных результатов состоит 1) в осмыслении мультикультурализма как "диалога людей" (В. Межуев), в котором актуализируется нравственный поиск каждого человека; 2) в обосновании востребованности в межиндивидуальной коммуникации "негативной" этики (А. Гусейнов): ее требование не совершать аморальных поступков стимулирует человека к нравственному поиску, выявляет специфику существования "человека навигатора" (С. Смирнов); 3) в определении межкультурной коммуникации как создания возможностей для поиска толерантных (неконфликтных) форм существования. **Выводы:** 1) мультикультуралізм являється протирічливим явищем, продуцируючим конфлікти і створюючим предпосылки для их преодоления; 2) возможности неконфликтного существования в ситуации мультикультурализма возникают в межиндивидуальной коммуникации, которая представляет собой ситуацию нравственного поиска каждого человека; 3) "этика возможностей" объединяет универсальные и ситуативные нравственные нормы в мультикультурной коммуникации: люди дают возможность друг другу оставаться людьми; 4) "этика возможностей" создает условия для толерантного (неконфликтного) взаимодействия людей и культур.

*Ключевые слова:* мультикультуралізм; нравственность; діалог; нравственный поиск; "негативная этика"; "этика возможностей"; толерантность

Received: 20.03.2018

Accepted: 19.11.2018