

ІНАКШІСТЬ: НЕОБХІДНІСТЬ ОБГОВОРЕННЯ АСПЕКТІВ ПОЛІКУЛЬТУРНОГО НАВЧАННЯ

У статті акцентовано увагу на найбільш важливих аспектах полікультурного навчання, викладених у філософських анотаціях педагогічної антропології. За допомогою рефлексії та стислого викладу матеріалу в руслі основоположних поглядів Мартіна Бубера на Я і Ти розкрито і проаналізовано філософію діалогу в топографії Зигмунда Фрейда, погляди інших представників деяких із найбільш важливих галузей кроскультурної педагогіки, а також ідеї про «свідомість» латиноамериканської педагогіки (Пауло Фрейре).

Ключові слова: діалог, педагогічна антропологія, свідомість, З. Фрейд.

The statement of the problem. To speak about «one's own» and about «the foreignness» shows the need to discuss anthropological and deep-psychological aspects in education. This question «What is one's own and what is foreign?» touches our identity, whoever we are, wherever we are. Those who reject others, reject themselves. If one wants to reflect the question of multiculturalism, one will certainly have to look at and for history. It is quite useful to look for it seeking the own personal and common roots especially in quickly changing times. So many people have had to leave their homeland either temporarily or even for economic or religious reasons or they are refugees. There were and are migrant workers. From my country – the Tyrol – masons travelled around the whole of Europe. Children were packed off to earn their keep. Others were offered on labour markets.

Due to poverty and need, as well as the lack of land to work, many in Middle-Europe also went as far as Eastern Europe and even to America; in fact, in all these American countries one can find villages or cities with names like European ones. Then there were migrants for religious reasons (like the Hutherian-Brothers of the Tyrol, today in Canada and USA) who were not allowed to remain in their home-countries.

These examples, representative for similar events in Europe (thinking how many Irish settled because of famines in the USA), teach us to look at the terms «multi- and cross-cultural learning» with open eyes [4], [16, 3].

We need such open eyes as the ones I see now in the icons of your churches in Ukraine, treasures of your country so deep in the dignity of your landscape. Jabés wrote: «The stranger allows you, to be yourself, by making you a stranger» [10, 32].

The aim of the article is to have a general view about «What's one's own and what's foreign?».

The research outcome. After this historical short-digest, I want to give a brief deep-psychological abstract: «Foreignness and the Ego» shows anthropological and psychological aspects. «Foreign territory» is not only a geographical concept, but also, according to Sigmund Freud, a psychological one. In terms of inner-psyche or soul, «foreign territory» might correspond the ID, in contrast to the EGO and SUPER-EGO. The ID is the foreign, «dark» continent. Here geographical and psychological topography meet. In both fields, the term «geography» refers to a description of place. «Topos» literally means «place», whereas «graphy» is linked to «graphó» («I write»). Geography makes use of lines to locate the sources of the river Pruth. Psychoanalysis makes use of the hermeneutic (or interpretative) method of empathetic listening, as well as balanced care and attention, in order to locate the Unknown-known, deeply recessed, but still exerting a clear affect. The primary aim here is to help to bring the «foreign» into the area of the personally known, the EGO.

What we need is education for peace which reflects basic knowledge of deep-psychology and dialogue-pedagogics. Martin Buber's (in «I and you» [1923]) and Paulo Freire's ideas (in «Pedagogics of the Oppressed» [1970] and in «Education as Praxis of Freedom» [1980]) invite to look at a Philosophical-Anthropology of multi-cultural learning, too. Buber helps to pay attention to the process of engaging in a truly form dialogue.

Freire invites to reflect what decodification of situations by searching «generative words» («prejudice» for example) mean. Despite the fact of oppressing circumstances, both philosophies, which are central aspects of «practiced freedom», can show us some steps of education in today's Europe with its old and new (and sometimes blocked or hidden) paths towards democracy.

I want to point out, that this learning, which effects everybody continuously, intends steps of changes, which have to be seen within the framework of collective social political responsibilities. Apart from ethnocentric questions, various terms of culture and fields of consciousness-learning have been dealt within consideration of Europe as a place of learning.

The forced mobilities (migration for example) are linked to a global political and economical change. International trade, tourism and the prosperity

on the electronical sector bring new questions and new problems. One goal of multicultural, cross-cultural learning is to bring what is called doing, what is called practice from an unknown, not reflected base to a base of consciousness and reflection.

The invitation to international learning is concentrated in seeking contact with ethnical, religious, etc. minorities (which often have been living for centuries in the so called «majority-countries»). These minorities came to majority-countries because of looking for work (labour-migration) or looking for asylum. Multicultural learning means to respect the *differences* between cultures, means to recognize that these differences are an enlargement. Multicultural learning is learning by doing. The nonsense of splitting between praxis and theory is clearly shown here. For example, I have to know that I wear a hat when I go to a Jewish funeral, or that I take off my shoes when entering a mosque. I have to have what is called information, but I have to practice the knowledge.

With «doing learning» I prepare the base to meet «other people» (whatever their «otherness» is, and however they live it). Indeed, I have to do with so-called «other» people the same why I have to do with «other people» of the same cultural circle I belong. It seems that there are two types of strange, of «other» people: there are «own other people» and «strange other people».

Multicultural learning is linked to both inland-other and foreign-other. Both we have in our countries. It includes all, not only minorities, migrants or asylum seekers. There are different tendencies to recognize foreignness. There are harmonious, conflictive, idealizing and assimilating tendencies, according to power of definition. Who is strange? What is own? Who belongs to the foreignness? (I relate to Mario Erdheim a Swiss ethno-psychoanalyst).

The pressure of suffering by confrontation with all cultures (cultures are psycho-territorial continents) has many faces. Questions of authenticity, of congruence of actions, questions of the «continuous» (to continue roles, to continue customs, norms ...), questions of the process of identity (which is a lifelong process) are expressed here.

Multicultural, cross-cultural learning is a learning *by place* and it *takes place* (in a literally sense), when I am trying to understand cultural orientations-systems (of observation, of care, of thought and ways of thinking, of esteem and acting), systems which are not mine. It takes place, when I try to integrate some of these aspects into my own cultural field of acting and when I try to act with more consciousness in «another», at first sight «strange» cultural field [1, 172].

Mario Erdheim writes: Culture is all that what originates when we are confronted with foreignness. And M. Mead speaks about cultures as the «body of learned behaviour» [17, 307]. Petzold sees culture, communication and the systems of human acting linked to each other. So culture is such a wide term,

that it is not possible to understand it by just one single aspect (for example language-communities). Culture is, as Herskovits puts it, «the man-made part of the human environment». In addition to personality the concept «culture» is an accent of social acting. Significant symbols are representing «these structures of orientation and of behaviour» that form a culture [17, 306].

Cultures' functions are process' functions, developing in actual historical, political, economical fields, it is like a «whole» (Greek: *holón*) of behaviours. These behaviours are accepted self-evidently. Certainly, the circumstances and the conditions can change (I remember for example the situation in Europe during and after the Second World War); new influences are added. I come from a region with a lot of tourism, we have more and more migrants and some of them are working in tourist-centres.

Sometimes culture is presented in a form which is a reflex of alienation of outside- and inside-colonial thinking. This kind of discourse is essentialising culture. Cultural differences are described in a specific manner: i.e. «I» am «per se» different from the distant «other», for example I am Christian and NOT Muslim. You have nothing to do with me and I have nothing to do with you. We are separated like different periodical systems in chemistry. In Europe we have the actual phenomenon to say «I am Christian», not by religious feelings, but only to distance yourself from Islam. These people don't go to church, but if it is an argument against Islam they claim to be Christians. In that and many other ways: The «unchangeable» is «marked» by definitions, and all are obliged to insist on the distance to «foreign» people.

An example: A Muslim family has been living for generations, even centuries in a majority- (Christian-) country but it is still treated as alien, its' culture is perceived as «foreign». Nowadays, the horrible imaginary triangle Islam-refugees-terrorism is a source of a peace-destroying and very dangerous situation, creating prejudices and hate, forgetting that the first victims of IS are Muslims. Also forgetting the humiliation and oppression of non-European countries by Europe which is resulting in anger and bitterness in these countries. One can consult the books by Almicar Cabral, Frantz Fanon, Joseph Ki-Zerbo, Eduardo Galeano, Julius Nyerere, Leopold Senghor, Patrice Lumumba, Paulo Freire, Peter Gstettner, Farid Hafez ...

By that way, we also have to think about and to remember that culture is a social product, it is not the most natural event. It is just a type of «frame» of thinking, feeling, acting.

One can understand that when different cultures are coming together in one geographical circle, in a region, there can be tensions. Tensions arise in times of crisis and tendencies to look for *scapegoats* become stronger. In that case differences of «the others» (religion, language, customs ...) often are taken as a pretext to defend one's own interests as «majority-interests» (majority-interests which «serve» for the self-declared better-ones under the titles

«nation», welfare, etc.). In that case a problematic concept of culture exists, i. e. culture «given by nature». Just a little step and one determines and decides for the «others» what's natural (behaviour).

Multicultural learning can invite to reflect the history of ethnocentrism and the history of concepts and the construction of the relationship «nature – culture» in different cultures. It invites to reflect what Ivan Illich called «conviviality» (living together). Larcher uses a picture linked to Sigmund Freud to explain culture: it is like the tip of the iceberg above the water. The part of the iceberg, which is known as cultural formed part, is the part you can see. Most of the time it is just a little part and that part is dynamic (persons as culture-bearers are very different, but sometimes uniformed, too, especially in consumerism).

The goal of multicultural learning is the equality of cultures, religious and ethnic groups within a rainbow of colours which makes Ukraine so rich. This equality has to be accompanied with pedagogic responsibility. This aims at the acceptance of dimensions of your own experience.

This includes questions of conceptions of the world and of ideology. The «world-outlook» always is a reflection of the picture we take from Man (the anthropological theme: conceptions of Man). Instead of theme I could say subject. Human being as *subject*. Subject is connoted grammatically and philosophically. The human being as object is the alienated human being. Here grow racism, fascism, sexism. Here human being is only a «thing», which you can throw away. Like a bottle. First drink, after throw away. There is the danger to see the human being and the fruit of that being (the cultural manifestations we mentioned) as an object.

Only a being that is related to my inner-most «own» is a being as a subject. The old Jewish tradition of Chassidism calls it «sparks of the soul», just as the philosophies from the Middle-age (Meister Eckhart) called it «scintilla animae». To be a thing, that is not being, but dis-progress, dis-being (as Prof. Grünwald, my reverend teacher of psychoanalysis, told us).

Cultural, social and economic basic questions (alimentation, to live, old-age-status, religion ...) and the process of trying to resolve the linked problems are like matrices of modes of thinking and behaviour in the different living conditions and missions in life: woman, man, child, labour ... and so on. We always have to reflect the *difference* in all manifestations of culture and human being. But these differences are an addition to welfare, to peace, to conviviality and to consciousness, at last the goods for peace.

Not a static, a dynamic concept of culture is needed (so does the «Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies» in Birmingham). Values, ideas, meaning and signification (personified in religious systems, customs, habits, morals ..., in the use of material life and nature, too) make the circuit (the circumference) of culture. When speaking about culture, I would like to cite

Dietmar Larcher: «Culture is like the special form, in which that material and that social organization of life are expressed» [15, 185]. It contends, Larcher says, the «maps of meaning», which explain phenomena to members of a certain society. Forms of social organization and relationship are objectifications of these maps. Like this, the individual human being becomes a social human being (Larcher, *ibid.*). Culture is the form «how a group's relations become structure and form», it is the way how these modes «come to know», how they are told and learned, how they are understood, formed and «interpreted»: «Therefore human beings are formed and are forming themselves by society, culture and history» (Larcher, *ibid.*). The central question is the otherhood. Paul Posch was right when he said: Every society is as good as it is respectful to its' minorities.

Hostility and ill feelings against foreigners are some of the most striking problems we have to cope with today. Often it is told that history is an omnipresent and unsuccessful master. I believe in the process of clearness and of conscientisation. In this way history can teach everybody who wants to listen to the lessons. So learning by history doesn't have to be a fallacy (despite the fact that many want to miss lessons which history can teach).

The lack of empathy and respect means to be afraid, to fear or to hate. It is necessary to decode the aims of demagogues who misuse the masses and threaten processes of understanding. One central question is: How can we overcome growing problems of radicalism and racism. How can we *overcome* our own *prejudices*. The question stresses a philosophy of value education. Tracing the various tracks of childhood show that fear is a recurrent theme. Many of these people have anguish. Many people who are hateful and prejudiced were homeless when they were children. Maybe they had present-absent parents. With such a fate there is danger of projection, i. e. projecting inner problems onto underprivileged persons like slides on a wall. This danger of projection (the term is linked to Freud's concept of psychoanalysis) is a high danger in times when there are no (or too few) sparks of hope, for example to find a job, or when family values are replaced by material economic values of consumerism.

Concerning an engagement for more justice and respect one must consider the important question of social justice (which means «NO to social segregation») and of «congruence», a term that Reinhard and Annemarie Tausch used to point out that acting and thinking are strongly linked to each other.

In my opinion there has to be a rapprochement of religions, too. I would like to point out that the ecumenical and interreligious forms of dialogue need a stronger impulse. Symbol of that impulse is the winner of the Peace Nobel Prize Desmond Tutu. We are also invited to reflect hidden intolerances towards other ways of thinking or living together, with all consequences. The fact that there are grievances, too, in other cultures does not justify the opinion that our cultural systems of living together are better ones.

It is undoubtedly true that it is difficult to make the dream of a peaceful «togetherness» with the foreign neighbour come true. Maybe «dream» has a romantic sound. I think of dreams as Martin Luther King, Martin Buber and Mahatma Gandhi did. Dreaming with consequences.

Conclusions. The confrontation with the foreign is the confrontation with the self. Con-frontation consists of «front» and «con». *Con* (Latin) means originally «together». It means foreignness is a front, but a front «together» and not against. There is a front to share and not a dividing front. By sharing fronts one can recognize that the fronts are inner-fronts (inside our own), dividing us from the so-called Self. Listening to ourselves makes us sensitive for old stories which come from a great distance, stories which – despite that distance – seem *to be* and are indeed very near ...

It can be a childhood story, it can be a story of my home country, coming from «unknown» ancient times, channelled in myths, in fairytales and legends. I found an article by Jane Taylor and Laurens van der Post (1984) about creative patterns in former Africa: These patterns appear to me like a process of transforming «I am my own» to «I am my foreignness» and from «I am my foreignness» to «I am my own». The quotation is finishing when the story can begin ... just as life itself. They wrote: *«Thou knowest that I sit waiting for the moon to turn back for me, so that I may return to my place; that I may listen to all the people's stories ... that I may sitting listen to the stories which yonder came, which are stories that come from a distance, for a story is like the wind, it comes from a far-off quarter and we feel it. Then I shall get hold of a story ... For I am here, I do not obtain stories (...). I must first sit a little, cooling my arms that the fatigue may go out of them, because I sit and listen, watching for a story which I want to hear; while I sit waiting for it that it may float into my ear. I must wait listening behind me for when a man has travelled along a road and sits down he waits for a story to travel to him, following him along the same road ... I will sit at my place, that I may listening turn backwards with my ears to my heels on which I went, while I feel that a story is the wind».*

References

1. Auernheimer G. Einführung in die interkulturelle Erziehung / Georg Auernheimer. – Darmstadt : Wissenschaft. Buchgemeinschaft, 1990. – 268 s.
2. Bayer M. Interkulturelle Erziehung als Herausforderung für allgemeine Bildung – Symposiumsbericht / Manfred Bayer, Werner Habel // Zeitschrift für Pädagogik. – 21. Beiheft. – 1987. – S. 191 – 210.
3. Buber M. Ich und Du / Martin Buber. – Heidelberg : Lambert Schneider, 1983. – 162 s.
4. Dialog zwischen den Kulturen in Zeiten des Konflikts / Peter Graf (ed.). – Göttingen : V&R uni-press, 2003. – 150 s.

5. Dickopp K.-H. Begründung und Ziele einer interkulturellen Erziehung / Karl-Heinz Dickopp // Interkulturelle Pädagogik im internationalen Vergleich / Michele Borelli ; Gerd Hoff (ed). – Baltmannsweiler : Schneider, 1986. – S. 37 – 48.
6. Erdheim M. (1992): Das Eigene und das Fremde / Mario Erdheim // Psyche. – Frankfurt/Main, 1992. – XLVI, 8. – S. 730 – 740.
7. Erdheim M. Psychoanalyse und Unbewusstheit in der Kultur / Mario Erdheim. – Frankfurt/Main : Suhrkamp, 1988. – 384 s.
8. Freire P. Erziehung als Praxis der Freiheit. Beispiele zur Pädagogik der Unterdrückten / Paulo Freire. – Reinbek b. Hamburg : Rowohlt TB, 1980. – 136 s.
9. Freire P. Pädagogik der Unterdrückten. Bildung als Praxis der Freiheit / Paulo Freire. – Reinbek b. Hamburg : Rowohlt TB, 1970. – 156 s.
10. Gamper S. Mix of Cultures, thesis of educational science. Master's Thesis / Sabine Gamper. – University of Innsbruck, 1999. – 135 s.
11. Gstettner P. Die multikulturelle Gesellschaft – ein neues Feindbild? / Peter Gstettner. – Klagenfurt : Carinthia, 1993. – 36 s.
12. Gstettner P. Interkulturelles Lernen versus regionaler Nationalismus / Peter Gstettner, Vladimir Wakounig // Stimme von und für Minderheiten. – Wien, 1993. – Nr. 7. – S. 12 – 14.
13. Interkulturelle Pädagogik im internationalen Vergleich / Michaele Borelli, Gerd Hoff (ed.). – Baltmannsweiler : Schneider, 1986. – 245 s.
14. Kristeva J. Fremde sind wir uns selbst / Julia Kristeva. – Frankfurt/Main : Suhrkamp, 1988. – 212 s.
15. Larcher D. Kulturschock. Fallgeschichten aus dem sozialen Dschungel / Dietmar Larcher. – Meran : Alpha-Beta, 1992. – 198 s.
16. Mecheril P. Multikulturalismus und die Konstruktion des Anderen. Ein anerkenntnistheoretischer Kommentar / Paul Mercheril. – Münster : Westfälische-Wilhelms-Universität Münster – Arbeitsstelle Interkulturelle Pädagogik, 2002. – 35 s.
17. Petzold M. Kulturvergleichende Sozialisationsforschung. Probleme und Aufgaben aus psychologischer Perspektive / Matthias Petzold // Psychologie in Erziehung und Unterricht. – München-Basel, 1992. – XXIX. – S. 301 – 314.
18. Stöger P. Das Fremde und Ich / Peter Stöger // Erziehung und Unterricht. – Wien, 1991. – CXXI, Nr. 9. – S. 748 – 760.
19. Stöger P. Wo liegt Afrika? Pädagogisch-anthropologische Grundpositionen zum Nord-Süd-Dialog. Mit einem Vorwort von Peter Graf / Peter Stöger // Frankfurt a. M. : Peter Lang. Europ. Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2000. – 278 s.
20. Taylor J. Laurens: Witness to a last Will of Man / Jane Taylor // Testament to the Bushmen. – http://www.ratical.org/many_worlds/LvdP/WLWM.html.
21. Zimmer J. Interkulturellen Erziehung zur Internationalen Verständigung / Jürgen Zimmer // Interkulturelle Pädagogik im internationalen Vergleich / Michele Borelli ; Gerd Hoff (ed). – Baltmannsweiler : Schneider, 1986. – S. 225 – 230.

Штерер Петер. Инаковость: необходимость обсуждения аспектов поликультурного обучения. В статье акцентировано внимание на некоторых наиболее важных аспектах поликультурного обучения изложенных в философских аннотациях педагогической антропологии. С помощью

рефлексии и краткого изложения материала в русле основных взглядов Мартина Бубера на Я и Ты раскрыто и проанализировано философию диалога в топографии Зигмунда Фрейда, взгляды других представителей некоторых из наиболее важных отраслей кросскультурной педагогики, а также идеи о «сознании» латиноамериканской педагогики (Пауло Фрейре).

Ключевые слова: диалог, педагогическая антропология, сознание, З. Фрейд.

Stöger Peter. The foreignness: the need to discuss aspects for multicultural learning. The character of the publication lays the emphasis on some of the most important aspects of multi-cultural-learning seen by philosophical annotations of the pedagogical anthropology. By reflection and concise exposition of the material in line with Martin Buber's fundamental ideas on I and You the Dialogue-Philosophy of Sigmund Freud's topography, of the Otherhood (foreigners) of some of the most important fields of inter-cultural pedagogy and the ideas about «consciousness» of the Latin American Pedagogy (Paulo Freire) are touched and pointed out.

Key words: dialogue, pedagogical anthropology, consciousness, Z. Freud.

Одержано 29.01.2016