



PHILOSOPHICAL PARADIGMATIC PROBLEMS OF INTERCULTURAL DIALOGUE IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALIZATION

Ruziboev Dostonbek Dilmurod ugli

Doctoral student (PhD) of the National University of Uzbekistan,
Uzbekistan

Abstract

This thesis analyzes the philosophical essence of intercultural dialogue within the process of globalization and examines the conceptual and paradigmatic problems that limit mutual understanding in this context. In particular, it highlights the consequences of thought models based on dualism, binarism, and essentialism that restrict cross-cultural comprehension, and substantiates the necessity of dialogical, pluralistic, and postcolonial paradigms of civilizational dialogue that ensure a cooperative and shared future for humanity in the modern era.

Keywords

Globalization, humanism, intercultural dialogue, dualism, binarism, essentialism, dialogical, pluralistic, and postcolonial paradigms of civilizational dialogue.

Introduction

In the 21st century, globalization has acquired a broader and deeper meaning than in any previous era, marking a new tendency in human history that fosters the convergence of cultures, civilizations, and worldviews. Globalization, in general, has been defined differently by various individuals. However, bringing these diverse definitions to a common denominator, it can be said that globalization is the process by which material and spiritual values transcend national boundaries and gain universal significance across the world. Globalization is a phenomenon that manifests itself in all spheres — from economics to politics, and from social relations to cultural life. “Contemporary research on socio-cultural and politico-economic relations shows that many of the emerging modern paradigms stem from the narrative of globalization — that is, from the ideological flow that envisions the world as a single, interconnected space” [1, p-138].

At the same time, there are problems rooted in the era of modernist thought that hinder the establishment of a civilization-based dialogue grounded in constructivism within the process of globalization. Consequently, while globalization itself generates issues such as asymmetrical relations, cultural hegemony, and crises of identity, intercultural dialogue has become one of the central conceptual challenges of contemporary philosophy.

At this point, the concept of intercultural dialogue at the global stage of human development is not only a social necessity but also an object of philosophical reflection. This is because this stage of progress — along with the postmodern mode of thinking — requires overcoming dualistic, ethnocentric, and essentialist approaches and frameworks in intercultural understanding, cooperation, and communication. In this sense, the primary task facing modern philosophy is to identify the ontological, axiological, and epistemological principles that ensure

a stable civilizational dialogue and to integrate these principles into the broader discourse of intercultural interaction.

However, there exist serious philosophical obstacles to enriching this intercultural discourse on the basis of the aforementioned principles. The roots of these obstacles lie in the dualistic and binary structures that have shaped human thought since ancient times. Social categories such as “Us–Them,” “West–East,” and “Center–Periphery,” which have long been embedded in social relations, have led to a hierarchical rather than an equal interpretation of the world.

As a result, the essentialist characteristics of human thinking have caused cultures to be perceived as static and monolithic entities. In human cognition, essentialism expresses a reductionist understanding of knowledge about a particular object — where the part is taken to represent the whole. For instance, in the context of any culture, selecting one specific phenomenon and generalizing it as representative of the entire society has become one of the most pressing problems in contemporary intercultural relations.

Moreover, the expansion of this reductionist and essentialist approach is largely facilitated by modern media systems and their algorithmic structures, which tend to amplify simplified and stereotypical representations of cultures rather than promoting a nuanced, dialogical understanding.

These structures lead to a perception of the world through binary oppositions such as “Us–Them” and “West–East.” Postcolonial thought (E. Said, G. Spivak, H. Bhabha) seeks to deconstruct these hierarchical frameworks — that is, to critically analyze and dismantle them — in order to form a new paradigm of mutual understanding based on equality, dialogue, and recognition of the “Other” [2, p-34].

From the above analysis, it can be concluded that these essentialist and binary perspectives within intercultural discourse constitute the core conceptual problem in forming the principles of equality and justice in the global dialogue system. This tendency is most clearly manifested in forms such as ethnocentrism, Eurocentrism, Orientalism, and Occidentalism. Such approaches do not foster intercultural dialogue but rather produce a cultural monologue, in which one side maintains unilateral dominance over the other.

Globalization has brought this process to a new level: through information flows, mass media, and transnational cultural products, a so-called “global culture” has emerged. However, this culture often reinforces cultural homogenization and the dominance of Western values, deepening asymmetries in global communication. Therefore, globalization must be reinterpreted not merely as an economic process but as a philosophical and cultural phenomenon that requires critical reflection.

At this stage, as humanity aspires to build a shared future based on cooperation, it becomes necessary to deconstruct the deeply rooted dualistic and hierarchical models of traditional thinking. This involves developing new paradigmatic and conceptual foundations for mutual understanding through critical analysis. In this regard, post-World War II intellectual movements such as postcolonialism, constructivism, and communicative axiology, all grounded in postmodernist thought, have played an important theoretical and methodological role in reshaping our understanding of intercultural dialogue and justice.

At this point, the emergence of the following new philosophical paradigms becomes essential:

1 Dialogical Paradigm (M. Buber, H.-G. Gadamer) — emphasizes communication based on mutual understanding and respect within the “I–Thou” relationship. This paradigm supports



subject–subject interaction rather than the traditional subject–object model, thus promoting equality and empathy in intercultural dialogue.

2 Postcolonial Paradigm E. Said, G. Spivak, H. Bhabha — advocates for listening to the cultural “Other” and restoring epistemic equality. Proponents of this approach aim to construct knowledge that is free from the influence of power structures and to establish genuine mutual understanding across cultures.

3 Pluralistic Paradigm This paradigm — views cultural diversity not as a source of conflict but as a fundamental enrichment of humanity’s shared heritage. According to this approach, dualistic modes of perception limit the ability to utilize the intellectual and cultural potential of human civilization in a balanced and inclusive manner.

Through these approaches, intercultural dialogue can be transformed from a mode of thought grounded in ethnocentric universalism into a paradigm of mutual understanding and cooperation. Only under such conditions does globalization acquire a truly humanistic meaning — becoming not a process of absorbing or dominating the Other, but one of recognition and the expansion of subject–subject relations.

It is within such a framework that Bhikhu Parekh’s concept of global ethics can emerge, providing the normative foundation for intercultural dialogue. According to Parekh, the shared future of humanity must be built upon three fundamental principles:

1. All human beings possess equal intrinsic value — this means recognizing the ontological dignity of every person, regardless of cultural or religious differences.
2. People must be treated with compassion — this places empathy and mutual respect at the center of dialogue and cooperation.
3. Cultural diversity must be embraced — rather than erasing differences, globalization should celebrate and preserve them as a vital source of human enrichment.
4. These principles lay the ethical groundwork for genuine intercultural dialogue and contribute to shaping a global order based on justice, understanding, and coexistence” [3, p-152].

Parekh’s principles, in close connection with the aforementioned philosophical approaches, strengthen the conceptual foundations of intercultural justice, epistemic equality, and human solidarity. At the same time, in the current era of intensifying globalization, humanity faces an urgent need to deepen mutual understanding and to seek new models for establishing democracy at the global level. Indeed, it can be argued that this represents one of the most significant intellectual and political challenges of our time.

If humanity continues to tolerate division and exclusion, the result will inevitably be a world filled with injustice, conflict, war, and terrorism, where there are no institutional mechanisms capable of protecting the rights of nations and individuals. Conversely, we must strive to make global relations more just, ensuring that every human being has the opportunity to realize their rights and potential. Democracy, therefore, must not only be strengthened within so-called “developing” nations but must also become an institutional and moral reality on a global scale. This, in fact, is the only viable path toward envisioning a brighter future for humankind.

Thus, the urgent task of our time is to liberate human consciousness from traditional binary perspectives such as “West–East” and “Center–Periphery.” These categories hinder the development of genuine intercultural dialogue and the establishment of global justice. Postcolonial, dialogical, and pluralistic paradigms offer a new framework for intercultural



understanding — one based on equality, reciprocity, and mutual recognition — and thereby lay the groundwork for a more humane and cooperative global order.

The paradigms outlined above, shaped by the demands of the present era, serve as a foundation for fostering intercultural tolerance and empathetic thinking among the younger generation, helping them grow into critical and open-minded individuals. Most importantly, these paradigms define the evolution of tolerance-based values within intercultural dialogue. In this way, intercultural dialogue becomes not merely a form of communication but a philosophical process aimed at building the future of humanity on the principles of cooperation and mutual respect.

Indeed, there is no alternative path left for humanity. Today, we have come to realize that our planet is in danger — and that this danger has been created primarily by humankind itself. As has been aptly stated, “We now find ourselves trapped within a triangle of violence: on one side lies the threat of nuclear war, on another — brutal violence, and finally — the menace of terrorism. Therefore, in the face of these global threats, humanity must unite” [4, p-15-36].

This call for unity underscores the necessity of rethinking human responsibility on a planetary scale — emphasizing that only through dialogue, empathy, and shared moral commitment can humanity secure its own survival and a peaceful common future.

To achieve this, humanity must turn away from all ideological schools of thought that incite conflict and division, and instead focus on preserving the very existence of humankind.

In conclusion, in today's era of globalization, intercultural dialogue—when viewed through the lens of universal human values—has become one of the key driving forces shaping the global intellectual landscape. The dialogical, postcolonial, and pluralistic paradigms now exert a profound influence on the contemporary world order. In the information age, relying on these paradigms creates the possibility of completely uprooting the foundations of Orientalism and Occidentalism and developing a new, contextually relevant model for the global space of the 21st century — one based on equality, empathy, and genuine mutual understanding among civilizations.

References

1. AYKUT, G. Küreselleşmeyi tetikleyen bir unsur olarak Oryantalizm // Uluslararası Çin'den Adriyatik'e Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi: bildiriler to'plamı. – Bakü, 2018. – Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi. – 138.
2. Bhabha H. The Location of Culture. – London: Routledge, 1994. P- 34.
3. Bhikhu Parekh, A New Politics of Identity: Political Principles for an Interdependent World, (NewYork: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), p. 152
4. Samiy Muhammad. Neo-Orientalism: An Analysis of Transformations in Traditional Orientalism // Faslnama-ye Andishe-ye Farhangi. – 1389 (2010). – № 4. – S. 15-36. سمیعی، محمد. نو شرق شناسی؛ باز تحلیلی از نشانه‌های تغییر در روند شرق شناسی سنتی // فصلنامه اندیشه فرهنگی. – ۱۳۸۹. – شماره ۴. – ص. ۱۵-۳۶.

