

Monika Kirloskar-Steinbach, Gita Dharampal-Frick, Minou Friele (ur.): DIE INTERKULTURALITÄTSDEBATTE – LEIT- UND STREITBEGRIFFE. INTERCULTURAL DISCOURSE – KEY AND CONTESTED CONCEPTS. Freiburg – München, Verlag Karl Alber, 2012, str.

There is a common prejudice among many professional philosophers that there is no genuine place secured for an intercultural philosophy within the philosophy departments and their respective curricula. Although we can observe many positive changes taking place in the last decades, there still is no major philosopher of an intercultural orientation admitted to the core of the Western philosophical canon. Intercultural philosophy is still claimed, as it were, to be a more or less distant *cousin* of philosophy, being its relative but still not really being a part of the ‘family’ as such. There are many reasons for those prejudices; the book, a bilingual German-English compendium *Die Interkulturalitätsdebatte – Leit- und Streitbegriffe. Intercultural Discourse – Key and Contested Concepts*, is a valuable contribution to one of most pressing issues of today’s world – i.e. an interdisciplinary field of intercultural studies.

There was undeniably a shift that took place in the philosophy of the late 20th century, a new conscience, aiming at something different from or larger than the prevalent monocultural Western philosophical tradition. Schopenhauer, of course, was the first philosopher to seriously attempt to incorporate Indian philosophy into his philosophical system. Later on, his follower Paul Deussen had for the very first time systematically presented his contemporaries with the new concept of philosophical historiography in his *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie* (1894–1917). Paul Masson-Oursel (with his *La philosophie comparée* in 1923) invented comparative philosophy; later, the first serious attempts were to be made in social anthropology to study indigenous cultures. African philosophy is a result of this adventure. Religious science has also tended to followed this trend: it was William Cantwell Smith (1916–2000), one of the major comparative religion scholars of the 20th century, who invented a new pluralist, non-exclusivist theology of religions, aspiring at deeper understanding of different religious traditions and cultures.¹ Within the philosophical tradition, Dewey (in 1952) and Merleau-Ponty (in 1956) were among the first to pledge themselves to a new comparative or intercultural era.² Among key Western thinkers both Heidegger (*Unterwegs zur Sprache* and *Brief über Humanismus*) as well as Derrida (*L’autre cap*) were both aware of the emergence of a new intercultural era. Finally, Luce Irigaray, with *Between East and West* (orig. *Entre Orient et Occident*, 1999), and many other works, surpassed the Western monocultural and monosubjective (masculine) culture – and it is in her thought that intersubjectivity finally meets with interculturality and rescues philosophy from the long oblivion of its two formative but

forgotten and suppressed traits. If there exists a truly dialogic philosophy, respectful of difference(s), it is a thinking, whose character is both intercultural and intersubjective.

Die Interkulturalitätsdebatte – Leit- und Streitbegriffe builds on this history and awareness and presents us with a variety of topics in a form of a compendium, bringing to the fore the very complicity and importance of the interculturality debate. In an era, designated by Rorty with the epithet “hybridization of cultures”³ and its essential trait, the obsolescence of cultural differences, it is indeed very important to discuss the variety of concepts that are pertinent to contemporary debates, which relate to cultural differences as well as their various overlappings. Some of the entries in this book, namely “Cultural Hybridity” (by Jan Nederweert Pieterse) or “Transkulturalität” (by Wolfgang Welsch) are directly linked to this question. The book is organized into six units, bringing to the fore various approaches – from methodological and personal to collective and finally political (public sphere) and economic issues. In this endeavour the book itself already transgresses (intentionally, as it seems to me...) the very



‘concept’ of interculturality. Few entries are maybe even closer to the bioethics rather than to the interculturality debate, and few entries could easily be omitted (“Generationengerechtigkeit” or “Civil Society”, for example), or replaced with some others. Some entries (“Terrorism”) would (for propedeutical reasons) perhaps better fit into a slightly different style of a compendium. Some of the topics would equally or even better work within a similar collection on human rights (“Migration Control” and “Humanitarian Intervention”, for example). But this are only side observations. Let us look more closely into the book.

Heinz Kimmerle once said that there is a deep affinity between philosophies of difference (Heidegger, Adorno, Deleuze, Lyotard, Derrida, Irigaray, Kristeva) and intercultural philosophy.⁴ It is a stunning failure of Western tradition (or its academia) to thus, still not be able to fully recognise and affirm this fact and translate it into a kind of dialogic and intercultural (including political) thinking of and for our age. The editors of *Die Interkulturalität-sdebatte – Leit- und Streitbegriffe* (Monika Kirloskar-Steinbach, Gita Dharampal-Frick and Minou Friele) are fully aware of this lacuna and in their introduction pledge themselves to take a different approach – especially within the philosophical field. For various reasons – as this book also shows – there already exists a kind of inherent methodological ‘consensus’ within the various fields of the humanities (in history and linguistics, for example) as well as social anthropology (ethnology), or even political science and sociology, that interculturality *must* form a part of any research into, say, ‘man and society’. Ram Adhar Mall, one of the most influential intercultural philosophers, is thus rightly placed at the head of this large and substantial compendium.

In his analysis, Mall (“Zur Hermeneutik Interkultureller Philosophie”) warns against a monological way of philosophising and pledges a new hermeneutics of overlapping, a thought being in the vicinity of what J. Rawls suggested with his ‘overlapping consensus’. In this Mall diverges from Habermas and pledges for a ‘weak’ form of discursive consensualism, being respectful of difference(s) and critical of any (internal) rationalistic or aprioristic tendencies. With Georg Stenger (‘Differenz: Unterscheidungen, Differenzierungen, Dimensionen’) we step into what was already mentioned as one of the key concepts for contemporary intercultural debate: the difference. Stenger is also aware – and I would like to put this thought into the forefront of my observations – that interculturality can only work in an atmosphere of intersubjectivity. Lévinas is mentioned but perhaps this topic deserves a special chapter (entry); namely Stenger, who rightly observes that what is meant here is “*ein Erfahrungsdenken, das sich zwischen die großen Pflöcke von Rationalität und Empirie schiebt, oder besser vor deren Trennung statthat*” (p. 50). Later in his chapter, “*vorintentionalen und vorprädikativen Felder sinnlich-leiblicher*

Genesis” (p. 52) are mentioned. This inter- and/or intra-subjective dimension is indeed very important for the interculturality debate. If there is a way toward ‘weak’ consensus or an ‘analogical’ hermeneutics it is precisely here that it could be found. In “Authenzität” Heinz Kimmerle critically discusses and reconceptualises one of the key Western concepts of the 20th century, having huge influence on the entire philosophical tradition. With examples from African philosophy (and Buddhism) Kimmerle reorients and deconstructs the so called ‘authenticity’ debate (author/ity, person/ality, etc.) and proposes a genuine shift towards a new, interculturality-underpinned version of authenticity, now being thought of as a plurality of its different (concrete, historico-cultural) forms. At this point, the book’s initial philosophical focus somehow (and too early?) merges with other – i.e. more transdisciplinary approaches. My criticism of Andreas Niederberger’s “Heteronomie” entry is related to his criticism of some attempts (ethics of care, or Lévinas’ philosophy) that are somehow artificially labelled with a “natural fallacy” etiquette. This is a pity indeed, since, as already said, it is precisely in those attempts, being also sensitive to what Stenger rightly observed as being a certain *beyond* of both empirical and transcendental approaches, that a new intercultural awareness could also emerge or secure its place. Meta-ethical approaches, in my opinion, are here obsolete. Also in the light of an importance of heteronomy in language (earlier in Niederberger’s entry) there perhaps is a possibility also for the analogous idea working in the ethical sphere (and not necessarily limited only to certain aspects of psychological research, as mentioned by the author). In her idiosyncratic and in a way ‘radical’ approach to the “Subjectivity” entry, Asha Varadhavan focuses on many inherent layers of this perhaps most contested concept of Western philosophy (“the self, identity, body, sexuality, and mind”; p. 112). Richard Evanoff’s “Integration” brings us a very important observation: it is close to what Rorty once called ‘edification’ (I deliberately refer to this word to point to the hidden ‘educational’ character of many of the entries in this compendium, which is perhaps a bit neglected) In an integrative context it is the process of being able (again, with Rorty we might refer to his ‘vocabularies’) to experience and acquire a “greater intercultural sensitivity” (p. 139) for other cultures, cultural norms or simply differences. Then it was a good editorial decision to ask an Indian scholar to write about “Multiculturalism” (Rajeev Bhargava). As one of the mostly disputed concepts in today’s Europe, as showed in this entry, this analysis realistically shows the genuine perplexity of this ‘concept’ by distinguishing between its many forms. In Christoph Antweller’s “Universalismus und Kultur-Universalien” I find an important observation – perhaps one that, again, would deserve a special entry in this compendium – namely that, if there is a place where ‘universalism’ and different cultures meet, it is in human suffering, being “*unmittelbar und sinnhaft*” (p. 192). Such a thought

could have huge potential for social ethics and political philosophy, as both are strongly represented in this compendium.

Due to the character of the book it is clear that some of the other entries cannot fully represent some of the topics. For a book that interestingly combines encyclopaedic and monographic styles, this is not a disadvantage. For the entries such as "Solidarity", "Cosmopolitanism" etc. this would indeed be impossible. Still, one would expect more focused approach there. "Moral Imperialism" (by Brett Bowden) is perhaps also a victim of the above-mentioned combination (or compendium style), especially in view of its short and uncritical account of the so called 'Asian values'; or, on the other hand, of extremely sensitive topics such as genital mutilation/circumcision which certainly require more space and context as attributed/allowed in the respective chapter.

This book will contribute many new insights into what the editors have called "intercultural discourse". It is a critical, inter- and transdisciplinary concept which indeed could be of benefit to the "intellectual self-understanding of society in general" (p. 27, "Introduction"). I strongly believe philosophy should not resist this goal too early. As the editors propose, the volume "attempts to bring into philosophical focus central problems and topics of intercultural salience" (p. 26, "Introduction"). For that purpose, topics such as the body,⁵ intersubjectivity (Irigaray), (trans) modernity (Dussel), globalisation(s) and contemporary Critical Theory,⁶ different cosmopolitanisms, and many other approaches, should remain a part of a genuine and devoted philosophical adventure.

Lenart Škof

Ksenija Vidmar Horvat (ur.): VLOGA MNOŽIČNIH MEDIJEV PRI OBLIKOVANJU SLOVENSKE EVROPSKE ZAVESTI: KRITIČNE PERSPEKTIVE.

Ljubljana, Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, 2012, 286 str.

Urednica pričujočega zbornika dr. Ksenija Vidmar Horvat v predgovoru »Evropska zavest, nacionalna identiteta« spomni in opozori bralstvo, da evropejstvo in evropska identiteta nikoli v zgodovini nista bili pomenko zaprti in do kraja opredeljeni entiteti, čeprav se danes, v iskanju evropskih 'korenin' in posebnosti evropske kulture in civilizacije, pogosto opira prav na takšne, mitološke predstave. Nasprotno, Evrop je bilo od nekdaj več, poudarja, konstitutirale pa so se glede na raznovrstne družbene, kulturne in institucionalne kontekste, v katerih se je sklicevalo na kolektivno nadnacionalno in/

ali civilizacijsko pripadnost. In dalje, če je torej multiplost in pretočnost pomena Evrope transzgodovinsko dejstvo, pa sodobni procesi združevanja, globalne mobilnosti in kozmopolitizacije zavesti tej nedoločljivosti dodajajo novo zgodovinsko razsežnost. Potemtakem evropejstvo, naj ga pojmuje kot kulturno fikcijo ali dejansko v resnici delujoče polje identifikacijskih povezav, skupnega kulturnega pripadanja in demokratičnega državljanstva, predstavlja pomemben vidik oblikovanja nacionalnih in lokalnih kolektivnih identitet. Nacionalne skupnosti so torej vpoklicane v evropski projekt z namenom ustvariti medsebojno spodbujajočo dinamiko razvoja nacionalnih in transnacionalnih identitet, ki bi prispevala h kreativnemu zagonu novega prostora evropske družbe. Šele s takšnim prežemanjem nacionalnega in transnacionalnega bi Evropa vstopila na oder globalnega sodelovanja kot akter, ki bi, vsaj po prepričanju uradnih ustanov EU, ponovno pridobil moč in pomen, ki sta mu bila odvzeta s koncem imperialne in kolonialne zgodovine.

Zbornik, ki ga imamo pred seboj, se vpisuje v polje preučevanja oblikovanja nacionalne in nadnacionalne zavesti, pri čemer se osredotoči na vlogo medijev pri tej konstrukciji – medijev kot tistih, ki so po B. Andersonu nujni za oblikovanje nacionalne identitete, vprašanje pa je, ali se podoben model preslikava tudi na nadnacionalno raven. Delo izhaja iz znanstvenega izhodišča, da je kultura ključno polje oblikovanja evropejstva, ki bo dodala skupno identiteto gospodarsko in politično povezani skupnosti. Kulturna raznolikost držav članic Evropske unije je namreč hkrati njeno vezivo in temelj politične participacije, skupna kulturna politika pa predstavlja priložnost za demokratično politiko, ki krepi, razvija in širi prostor evropske javne sfere in sfere javnosti držav članic. Izbor prispevkov opredeljuje pojem slovenska evropska zavest in ga postavlja v konceptualno razlikovalni odnos do evropske identitete. Avtorji in avtorice se sprašujejo, kakšno vlogo pri izgradnji nadnacionalne identitete igrajo mediji – kje in kako se v medijih oblikuje Evropa, kakšna je njena identiteta in kdo jo izreka. Ugotavljajo, da se nacionalna in evropska identiteta med seboj ne izključujeta, pač pa ena drugi predstavljata orientacijsko točko in delujeta hkrati. Zbornik si postavlja vprašanja o vlogi množičnih medijev pri sooblikovanju evropskega prostora demokratičnega, participatornega in aktivnega državljanstva in odgovarja, da le participatorno aktivno vzpostavljanje evropskega prostora lahko zagotovi oblikovanje evropske zavesti, ki bo svojo moč in energijo črpala iz zavedanja o skupnih političnih vrednotah pravičnosti, enakosti, solidarnosti in demokratične odprtosti za kulturne razlike.

Glavnina razprav, objavljenih v tej knjigi, je nastala v okviru raziskovalnega projekta »Vloga množičnih medijev pri oblikovanju slovenske evropske zavesti«, ki je v partnerstvu z Inštitutom za civilizacijo in kulturo potekal pod vodstvom prof. Ksenije Vidmar Horvat na Oddelku za sociologijo Filozofske fakultete v Ljubljani med letoma 2008 in 2011. Knjiga je razdeljena v tri dele. V prvem