

Narratives of "Interculturality": Meeting Again Differently

Abbas Manoochehri¹

Received: 5/7/2012

Accepted: 17/3/2014

Abstract

Modern Europe witnessed a historical simultaneity as the result of which, not only Europe ruptured from its own past, rather a forced attachment to the non-European's future was also forged. This historical "development" has been narrated in the "colonial discourse". On the other hand, for the non-Europeans, however, a different historical simultaneity took place. Hence; the colonized/non-Europeans found themselves forcefully ruptured not only from their own selfhood, but also thrown in an imposed 'state of nature' dispossessed of their identity. This historical experience has been narrated in the "post-colonial discourse". The current paper is an attempt to host a 'meeting' between the colonial and the post-colonial discourses.

Keywords: Interculturality; Colonial Discourse, Discourse of the colonized, Clash of Civilizations, Differential Hermeneutics, Hermeneutics of Resistance.

1. Associate Professor, Dept. of Political Science, Faculty of Humanities, Tarbiat Modares University,
Email: manoocha@Modares.ac.ir.

Introduction

At the historical inception of modernity, Thomas Hobbes considered the existing situation in 17th century Europe as a state of “war of all against all”, a situation from which exit seemed to be an imperative. At the same historical juncture, Europeans' 'travel' to the East via new path was undertaken. So, with the emergence of new conditions in early modern Europe, a historical simultaneity took place through which the post–medieval European condition was both a rupture not only from European's own past rather a forceful attachment with the non- European's future. The new European identity and its future was, therefore, an outgrow of simultaneity of modernity with coloniality.

A different historical simultaneity, however, took place for the non – European. In such circumstances, the

colonized/non-Europeans found themselves forcefully ruptured from their own selfhood. Unlike the European who exited from an historical "state of nature" and asserted a new identity, the colonized came to find itself in an imposed 'state of nature' dispossessed of an identity. The "natural state" of the colonized came to be a "state" not of "war of all against all", but a war of one, the colonizer, against the "other", the colonized. As such, two histories merged into one path constructed by a peculiar historical type of domination, a domination which has been prolonged by distortion, destruction and annihilation.

Those two historically "discrepant experiences" were formulated and expressed through two different textual genres: one exemplifying a "colonial discourse" and the other, “the discourse of the colonized”

(Castle, 2001:30-43). These two types of writing, however, pertain to two sides of the same experience, one side being the colonial experience and the other side being that of the colonized. In the colonial discourse, the non-European is portrayed as the “other” of the European civilization. As such, this discourse has been the product of the European “will to power” which was implemented to the colonized by making it “the other” of itself (Said, 1978:42). By the end of the 20th century, this discourse extended the Hobbsian notion of 'war' to a civilizational plane by the idea of the 'clash of civilizations'.

The textual discourse of *the colonized*, however, reveals the illocutionary *act of resistance* against the cultural domination of colonialism. The writings of Enrique Dussel and Ali Shari'ati¹ are

noticeable examples of post-colonial discourse. They have both analyzed and challenged the colonial act of subjugation and cultural negation. Their work is oriented towards a liberating self-resurgence and self-reassertion. Thereby, they have brought to light the impact of cultural colonialism in the creation of the subjugated “other” and, at the same time, the process of the reemergence of a new cultural identity. The “turn” from subjugated otherness to that of assertive selfhood in the post-colonial discourse, however, takes place exactly at the historical juncture in a “postmodern turn” when the European sense of selfhood is being questioned by a disillusioned generation. In other words, while the colonized tends to assert its negated selfhood, the ‘postmodern’ European ‘turns’ either to the negation of the

1. Ali Shari'ati (1934-1978) is the late Iranian

thinker.

“selfhood” *per se*, or to have dialogue with its historical 'other'. As such, the two historical 'discrepant experiences have now been extended to three different discourses, namely, those of 'the clash of civilization', 'intercultural dialogue', and the 'intercultural resistance'.

This paper is an attempt to host a 'meeting' for these discourses. In this meeting, Hermeneutics of Difference, comes to the recognition of the impact of the process of negating its 'civilizational other' in the constitution of its own identity; while the emerging postcolonial identity reaches the awareness of the distinction between two incommensurable discourses in the contemporary European civilization territory.

1. The Clash of Civilizations: 'State of War' Revisited Interculturally

Describing 'nationalism' as a 'sense of belonging, Berlin has pinpointed

to the fact that the need to belong to a collectivity, which goes back to Greeks, has always been concomitant with the sense of confronting “the other”. So, nationalist sense of belonging has always emphasized the difference between one group and its neighbors, the existence of tribal, cultural or national solidarity, and with it, a sense of difference from, often accompanied by active dislike or contempt for, groups with different customs and different real or mythical origins, and so was accepted as both accounting for and justifying national statehood (Berlin, p.338).

Such a sense of difference has in recent years become the foundation of notions such as “the end of history” and “the clash of civilizations”. In “the Clash of Civilizations” Huntington has referred to the emergence of new

cultural conflicts on the world arena. According to him, the “clash of civilizations” is the last stage in the process of conflicts in modern world history. He defines “civilizations” as “cultural units” and gives six reasons for “clash” among them.¹

Huntington’s text, as Ricoeur and Skinner found, has a “world” and a “message”. According to Ricoeur, a text can be read as a written discourse. A written discourse has both common and particular characteristics when compared with the spoken discourse. Ricoeur considers four “traits” constituting a speech as an event and a text as a written discourse. Regarding a text as a “fixation” of “intentional exteriorization”, Ricoeur distinguishes

between what is spoken in a speech and what is “said” in a text. According to him, what in effect writing fixes is not the event of speaking but the “said” of speaking, where we understand that intentional exteriorization constitutive of the aim of discourse thanks to which the *sagen*, the saying, wants to become *Aus-Sage*, the enunciation, the enunciated. In short what we write, what we inscribe, is the noema of the speaking, it is the meaning of the speech event, not the event as event. (Ricoeur, 1991: 146)

By referring to three levels of the speech act, as locutionary, or “the act of saying”, illocutionary, or “that which we do *in* saying”, and perlocutionary, or “that which we do *by* saying”, Ricoeur concentrates on the third level as “the least inscribable” and yet that which “is the discourse as stimulus”. Ricoeur, in his article “the hermeneutic

1. The first reason, in his view, is the existence of “basic” differences amongst various civilizations. The second reason is “the diminishing of the world”. The third reason is the experiencing of economic modernization that has led to the social alienation of people around the world. The fourth reason is the emergence of a kind of civilizational consciousness emerging out of the dual impact of the west, namely the powerfulness of the west and the cultural particularism of non-Western societies.

function as distancing”, describes the perlocutionary level as having “direct influence upon the emotions and the effective dispositions” (Ricoeur, 1991: 147).

By reading “The Clash of Civilizations”, one can observe both the “world” and the “message” constituting the text. Huntington’s “world” is clearly described by him in the form of “reasons” for the “clash” among civilizations.

Huntington’s fifth reason is cultural differences, which are the cause for disharmony amongst cultures. The last reason is regional economic integration (Huntington, 1993: 22-29).

Huntington expresses this view of the world in which:

...the fundamental source of conflict... will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating

source of conflict will be cultural. ...

The clash of civilizations will dominate the global politics. The fault line of civilizations will be the battle line of the future (ibid., p. 22) .

With such a view of the world, Huntington enters into a discourse in a written form and gives a message with a perlocutionary act of *ultimatum*. Huntington’s message can be read all throughout his article. In a way, this message of ultimatum has permeated the article which is pre-structured by his worldview. His world is that of a threatened subject and his message is an *ultimatum* to the “threatening” other; his fundamental concerns are that as the West at the peak of power confronts, non-West that increasingly have the desire, the will and the resources to shape the world in non-Western ways (ibid., p. 26)

Huntington then makes it clearer as to what he means by the “non-

West”; according to him, as the ideological division of Europe has disappeared, the cultural division of Europe between Western Christianity, on the one hand, and Orthodox Christianity and Islam, on the other, have emerged (ibid., p. 30).

He then expresses his thought through a speech-act of a threatening *ultimatum* by saying: The West is now at an extraordinary peak of power in relation to other civilizations.... The very phrase “the world community” has become the euphemistic collective noun replacing the free world to give global legitimacy to actions reflecting the interests of the United States and other western powers (Huntington, p.39).

Then he adds:

The central axis of world politics in the future is likely to be, in Kishore Mahbubani’s phrase, the conflict between “the West and the

Rest” and “the responses of non-western civilizations to western power and values” (ibid., p. 41) .

So, as Huntington can see it, “a new form of arm competition is thus occurring between Islamic – Confucian states and the West.” Therefore, he concludes his argument by the final *ultimatum*:

In the short term, it is clearly in the interest of the West to promote greater cooperation and unity within its own civilization... ; to limit the expansion of the military strength of Confucian and Islamic states; to moderate the reduction of western military capabilities and maintain military superiority in East and Southwest Asia; to exploit differences and conflicts among Confucian and Islamic states; to support other civilizational groups sympathetic to western values and interests; to strengthen international institutions that reflect and legitimate

western interests and values and to promote the involvement of non-western states in those institutions (ibid., p. 49) .

2. Differential Hermeneutics: Dialectics of 'Master and Slave' Revisited Interculturality

According to Hermeneutic Philosophy, understanding (*verstehen*) is pre-structured in the world in which we live with *others*. These pre-structures, in Hermeneutic perspective, make up one's being. The problem, however, is our alienation from what has made up and is making us. It is like an alien (*atopan*) that is ignored. Hermeneutic tends towards familiarization of what has remained alien. Such familiarization is the result of *andersverstehen*, "understanding differently". This understanding is not just consensus or repeating something after the other, but amounts to "a willingness to enter the border zone

or interstices between self and other". In fact, this understanding can be attained only at "the risk of self-critique and self-decentering" (Dallmayr, 1996:47). The result of this understanding, in Gadamer's view, is the intertwining of Difference and Identity: "Difference exists within Identity; otherwise, identity would not be identity" (ibid, p.49). As such, hermeneutics is:

[A] process of reciprocal questioning at the intersection between self and other, between familiarity and strangeness. (Dallmayr, 2000:831)

Liberation from alienation is therefore possible through the familiarization of the *atopan* (the alien) which is a – part (both a part and apart) from/of us. The sphere of this familiarization is, however, "in-between". As Gadamer puts it: "the true locus of Hermeneutics is in-between" (Gadamer, 1989: 295-307). This process of familiarization,

however, can take place on the cultural level through a process of “double injection” referred to by Derrida (Dallmayr, 1996: 57).

Derrida, on the one hand, rejects “cultural assimilation” and, on the other hand, warns of “cultural narcissism”. Difference, hence is kernel to a hermeneutics of cultural identity. For Derrida, “what is proper to a culture is to not be identical to itself” (ibid, p.58). This differential hermeneutics of self-identity is possible through the sphere of “in-between”:

Life-world is surely given, it is given to me and to us, but in such a way that it is co-given with whatsoever may be given at all (Waldenfels, p.73).

The co-givenness of the life-world is, however, not confined to the intra-cultural level:

Apart from [the] intracultural articulation of the life-world, we

have to take into consideration intercultural worlds varying historically and geographically (ibid, p.75).

So, unlike Huntington’s global atomism, which leads to clash in a global level, Hermeneutic begins with the differential co-being as the ontology of human-being-in-the world; an ontology which is extended to global level. In a way here we can think of an “ontological difference” between being-antagonistic and co-being.¹ This conception of human being, however, is itself rooted in Herder’s conception of humanness which is not geo-culturally confined. This conception “constitutes a bulwark against the relentless standardization of the world” (Dallmayr, 1996:55). Standardization of self-understanding

1.This is said in the spirit of Heidegger’s “ontological difference” between Being (das Sein) and beings (des Seinden), by which he means not to reduce the one to the other.

is in accord with the Cartesian ethnosubjectivism coupled with Hobbsian atomism and conjoined with realpolitik, in which:

Whatever exceeds the confines of sovereign *cogito* must either be appropriated/assimilated, or else be excluded and controlled (Dallmayr, 2000:829).

What is lacking in such perspective is the possibility of the experiencing of "reason's exposure to what is unfamiliar or alien" (ibid.). In contrast to such vision, and in accordance with "Hermeneutics of Difference" in Gadamer's thought:

[I]t is completely mistaken to infer that reason is fragmented because there are various languages. Just the opposite is the case. Precisely through our finitude, the particularity of our being which is evident even in the variety of language the infinite dialogue is opened in the direction of

the truth that we are (Gadamer, 1977:16).

One can therefore, in agreement with Fred Dallmayr say that any dialogue needs to be "both intra-and inter-civilizational", so that linkages can be established "across both historical and geographical boundaries" (Dallmayr, 2001: 72). In Gadamer's word:

[T]he future survival of humankind may depend on our readiness..... to pause in front of the other's otherness-the otherness of nature as well as that of historically grown cultures of people and states. In this way, we may learn to experience otherness and human others as the 'other of ourselves' in order to partake in one another. (Gadamer, *Das Erbe Europa*, p. 31-34. In, Dallmayr, 1996: 53)

Therefore, the intercultural dialogue can facilitate true "diminishing of the world" by closing

the distances which seem inevitable from a monological perspective. This is when the globe becomes truly *globalize*. This would help us to follow the “path” towards what Dallmayr would call “grassroots globalization or globalization from below”, which means: The attempt to forge or build up the global city through the interaction of cultures and peoples from around the world. (Dallmayr, 1999:330).

3. Hermeneutics of Resistance: The Intercultural Turn of Post-Colonial Discourse¹

As a post-colonial thinker, Enrique Dussel refers to a “geopolitical space,” in which there is a tenuous relationship between centre and periphery, where the centre is the core of power and the periphery is the space of the application of such

power. According to Dussel, domination is an act by which others are forced to participate in the system that alienates them. This is how the modern European has approached the non-European. The *cogito* of the centre has exercised power over the peripheral *other* in the geopolitical space created by colonialism. The actualization of the modern European self through the *proyecto*, “the striving to achieve,” has created “the wretched of the earth” (Dussel 1985: 10, 17, 24, 43-44). This historical fact has not, however, been headed by modern thought, neither has it been by Hermeneutics.

Hermeneutics of Reality

For Dussel, hermeneutics does not merely mean the discovery of the meaning of what can be observed, but actually “the discovery of the hidden reality.” When one speaks of

1. Most of what is discussed here has already come in the following paper: Enrique Dussel and Ali Shari'ati on Cultural Imperialism in *Cultural Imperialism*, edited by B. Hamm and R. Smandych.

the hidden dimension, it means that something might be upholding a reality contrary to the fact that the colonized masses have been driven to the periphery through domination. The reality, in Dussel's view, is not merely the development in political and economic fields in one part of the world that is justified and explained in the framework of the dominant view. Through the discovery of the reality by hermeneutics, what becomes more understandable than anything else is the life of "the wretched of the earth." Such a discovery of a reality which happens beyond the dominant horizon actually looks into what rules over our minds, namely, into the symbols. This means that the truth is in the understanding of the reality of the domination of one part of the world over the other. "Imperialist culture" or "culture of the centre" is "the culture that is dominant in the present order"; it is

the refined culture of European and North American elites against which all other cultures are measured (Dussel 1985: 74-102).

According to Dussel, the colonial culture also has functioned through the process of "assimilation." The effort of a certain part of the colonized community to "become like Europeans" has led to the formation of a culture that was neither the original native culture nor the culture of the colonizing Europeans, but a fabricated culture made by the local elites in the image of the imperial culture. This process was particularly refracted in the oligarchic culture of dominant groups within dependent nations of the periphery. It is the culture that they admire and imitate, fascinated by the artistic, scientific, and technological program of the center... On the masks of these local elites the face of the center is

duplicated. They ignore their national culture, they despise their skin color, they pretend to be white... and live as if they were in the center. They are the outcasts of history (Dussel 1996: 79).

Such cultural alienation, however, does not remain confined to elites and, when extended to the colonized masses, plays an instrumental role for the imperialist economy. Therefore, the culture of the oppressed, not as a people but as repressed, is the culture of the masses. It is the reproduction and *Nausom*, the kitsch vulgarization of imperialist culture refracted by oligarchical culture and passed on for consumption. It is by means of the culture of the masses that ideology propagates imperialist enterprise and produces a market for its product (Dussel 1985: 91).

As a response to such predicaments, Dussel (1985: 92)

suggests the notion of “the return to the subjugated other.” He discusses the need for return to the other who in his view is on the periphery of the geopolitical divide created by colonialism.

Hermeneutics of Assimilation

In his ‘hermeneutics of assimilation’, Shari’ati distinguished between civilization and modernization (*Tajaddud, va Tamaddun*). Relating modern technological developments to the realities of the non-Western world, Shari’ati makes a distinction between civilization and modernization. According to him, civilization involves a long process of development within a community; modernization of contemporary Third World societies, however, has been an apocryphal form of progress. In fact such modernization is symptomatic of a fundamentally destructive tendency within the

contemporary non-Western world, which is suffering from the various internal and external forces of domination and exploitation of the past two centuries. Imperialism (*Iste'mar*), tyranny (*Istebdad*), economic exploitation (*Istesmar*), and cultural colonization (*Istehmar*), which have been justified by the alleged necessity for modernization, have together inflicted deep wounds on the peoples of the Third World. Third World modernization is simply an historical extension of the process which began with the emergence of private ownership and was then intensified by machinism. Having already gained control over a vast part of the world by colonial domination, Europe now has more reasons to sustain its economic grip over these areas.

Therefore, parallel to the developments within the European world following the emergence of

the machine, other parts of the world have also been greatly influenced by the expansion of the machine. The penetration in other societies could not, however, be successful without the eventual reorientation of their cultures. To be attracted to western commodities, non-western people had to be "modernized." Non-westerners had to be "westernized," that is, they had to develop a "modern taste" for Western products. As an essential component of imperialism, therefore, acculturation of the traditional societies of the non-European world became an imperative for the economic interests of Europe. The necessity of finding markets for the vast surplus of industrial products, which now complemented the European need for cheap raw material, forced the industrial world to penetrate the non-European world of Africa and Asia. This historical penetration then led to the formation

of the socio-political realities of the postcolonial world up to our own time. In Shari'ati's words:

The problem was to make people in Asia and Africa consumers of European products. Their societies had to be restructured so that they would buy European products. Literally, this means changing a nation ... to accept new clothing, new consumption patterns, and adornments. Now, what part has to change first? Obviously one's morale and thinking (Shariati 1989: 339).

In Shari'ati's view, the theoretical and historical mediation between modernity and modernization of the Third World consists of colonialization, assimilation, and *comprador bourgeoisie*. Colonialism came as the result of the need for markets. To reach new markets in turn necessitated political and military maneuvering. This in turn

brought about its functionaries, namely, the *comprador bourgeoisie*, who are the ones who benefit from the exchange of consumer products with the resources of the Third World countries. All this, however, could not proceed unless the cultural sphere provided the opportunity. This happened through "assimilation": the non-European becoming, or pretending to be, like a European. This applies to the conduct of the one who, intentionally or unintentionally, starts imitating the manners of someone else. Obsessively, and with no reservations he denies himself in order to transform his identity. Hoping to attain the goals and the grandeur, which he sees in another, the assimilated attempts to rid himself of perceived shameful associations with his original society and culture (Shariati 1979a: 12, 2).

Assimilation is, in fact, an historical product of the process of

monoculturalization. This is the essential path in the type of cultural imperialism exercised by the modern European colonial powers. "Monoculture is a colonial phenomenon-notion [which] ... goes along with monoculturalization of civilizations. All civilizational lands, with their centuries of various aesthetic and historical experience should be harvested by the colonial combine, left bare and in need of what the colonizer can give it" (Shariati 1979b: 6-15). The point, however, is that the assimilated pretends to be more modern than the European whom s/he has imitated. A European knows her historical past and heritage, the assimilated, however, disassociates from his past, destroys it and runs away from it (Shariati 1978a: 257).

Shari'ati was highly critical of those intellectuals in modernizing societies who identified themselves

with Western culture. To him this was as much a consequence of colonialism as was economic exploitation. He criticized these intellectuals for their failure to understand these developments in the context of the peculiarities of their own societies. He believed that they had lost their sense of protest and creativity. Instead, Shari'ati proposed the need for a methodological leap towards a more concrete perspective and the courage to search for and find new ways and fresh possibilities to deal with the problems of Third World societies. As a possibility he proposed the idea of the "return to the self."

Return to the Self

If we were told, says Shari'ati, that we have never had a civilization, we could disprove such a claim by returning to what we have had. But, what can or should we do when our

past is metamorphosized and misrepresented? What can be done when colonizers have not necessarily negated Eastern culture and its history, but try to convince the colonized that they are “negative,” “of the second ontic rank,” and “unable to think?” So, Shari’ati asks, what are we to do? Should we let ourselves be dissolved in notions such as “internationalism,” which would mean becoming the second-rank ontic partners of capitalism? If we lack culture, what would be our status in such a partnership? Would it be anything other than cultural annihilation? As long as there is such a dichotomy as local (native) versus human, how can we be in a partnership with the colonizer? To answer these questions, Shari’ati speaks of “a difficult moment of a great choice” between two poles:

.....a pole which we have inherited from the past and the pole

which we have imitated from the West.... The first pole is a unique *Weltanschauung*, philosophy of life ... and a set of certain social relations. The second one is a new *Weltanschauung*, a new school and a new philosophy of life, [a] new way of being and moving forward, though in various and even contradictory schools (Shariati 1978a: 306).

What is common for the followers of these two poles is that they both are imitative. The task of both sets of followers, Shari’ati says, is easy, because a traditionalist does not have the difficulty and the anxiety of choosing; for it is chosen for him and he only follows. The follower of the second pole too “does not have the responsibility and preoccupation for choosing. For, as packages of the technical and consumer goods come from the West to be opened and consumed, various schools too come

in ready packages and known standards" (Shariati 1979a: 2-15).

As a point of departure, Shari'ati first attempted to redefine the concept of "the intellectual." He argued that an intellectual is anybody who is aware of his or her human condition and whose awareness gives him/ her a sense of responsibility. Such a person knows his or her own society, understands its pains, its spirit, and its heritage; he or she is a person who can choose consciously and responsibly. Such a person should seek intellectual leadership in his or her own society. Hence, an intellectual does not necessarily need to be highly educated. In fact, Shari'ati believes, a worker might be more of an intellectual than might a highly distinguished scholar (Shariati 1979b: 21).

Historical self-discovery and cultural self-reliance are other

dimensions of Shari'ati's definition of "the intellectual." He introduced these by way of the idea of the "return to the self." This idea, he says, does not relate to a nostalgic romanticization of the forgotten past. Rather, it is an attempt at the creative incorporation of the repressed historical origin of a cultural self, not sought as an end in itself but as the beginning of a challenging self-assertion by an alienated and disillusioned generation. This can, in turn, reinforce an historical self-recognition capable of confronting the forces of domination and oppression.

"Returning to the self" means that those people whose historical and cultural heritage and identity have been either denied or misrepresented "restore history to themselves." This notion is a part of a challenging discourse versus colonial discourse.

Unlike the locus of the colonial discourse which negates, misrepresents, and then draws into assimilation, the illocutionary act of textual resistance reverses this process in three moments of cultural archeology, the refinement of cultural discourse, and finally self-historical restoring (Shari'ati 1978b: 27).

“The Return to the Self” then means recovering one’s own human identity and cultural-historical authenticity: it means self-consciousness and liberation from the illness of cultural alienation and spiritual colonialization (Shariati 1989: 305).

4. Meeting Again Differently: A Critical Intercultural Hermeneutics

The notion of the “clash of civilizations” is a declaration of cultural exclusionism and antagonism proclaimed by the latest orientalist

theoretician, Samuel Huntington. One of the main reasons for "clash of civilizations", according to him, is “cultural differences”, which he believes are cause for disharmony amongst cultures. ‘The Clash of Civilizations’ is in fact a ‘discursive effort which reveals the fundamental historical reality of how "European culture was able to manage- and even produce – the Orient." (Ashcraft *et. al.*, 1999:8, and Dallmayr, 1999:57)

As such, “the clash of civilizations” is the ultimate outcome of the existing situation as seen by Huntington. Therefore, the notion of “clash” is the talk of the ultimate; the ultimate “clash” for the ultimate “result”. As such, “the clash of civilizations” is an *ultimatum* or a naming by a power-subject. Ultimatum is a speech-act saturated with power and spoken by the subject of superiority in power

relations. Therefore, the talk of “clash” is the ultimate word in the metaphysical language of will to power. Such language of threat and ultimatum is rooted in Hobbsian atomism and its monological epistemology. In Hobbsian vision, everyone is threatened by others and is mediated to them by power. Such self-understanding is the extension of an atomistic and mechanical-empirical conception of the world. Therefore, man’s self-understanding is affected by power. Huntington’s “reasons”, as regards the “inevitability” of the clash among civilizations, are actually cases of behaviorist “reasoning” applied to the arena of intercultural relations. Indeed, the theory of “the clash of civilizations” is the new-global plane entered in by the behaviorist theory of Modernization. However, unlike its previous forms of speech-act, in which modernization theory tended

to prescribe to other (non-western) societies the way for “development”, now it threatens other (non-western) civilizations to extinction.

The textual discourse of *the colonized*, on the other hand, reveals the illocutionary *act of resistance* against the cultural domination of colonialism. The post-colonial condition is a pre-given condition into which the colonized people found themselves “thrown”. It is a "natural state" in which the inhabitants have at a certain point in their history become dissociated from their own identity. The history of the colonized reveals *thrownness* in a pre-given¹ condition in the construction of which s/he had no say. In this condition of *thrownness*, the life-world of the colonised is a systematically distorted world by the imposition of the colonial "system" on the native world. The 'post-

1. One can compare this pre-giveness with Hermeneutics' pre-structure.

colonial discourse' had epitomized this *thrownness* differently.

The post-colonial discourse is a discourse emanating and exteriorizing a *double-disenchantment* resulting from the colonial experience which goes further than European *disenchantment*. Max Weber has referred to *disenchantment* (*Entzauberung*) in the modern era as the European's sense of intellectual and cultural disassociation with its way of living and thinking. He has argued that such intellectual and cultural reorientation has had essential association with "calculative rationality" (*Zweckrationalitat*) through which modern European's conception of the world changed. Economy, politics and culture were recreated by rationalization of life and life-world. Capitalist economy, bureaucratic system and secular culture were the three fundamental dimensions of the new "disenchanted

world" (Weber 1979:105,221). He, however, did not say anything about the forced geo-cultural extension of the phenomenon of *disenchantment*. In fact, in a unique historical conjuncture, *disenchantment* was imposed on the non-western world. Whereas in Europe "calculative rationality" replaced whatever had been disassociated with through *disenchantment*, the phenomenon of acculturation and self-dispossession resulted in a *double-disenchantment* as the experience of simultaneously being *disenchanted* and becoming a disenchanted *being*. Being *disenchanted* means to disassociate *oneself* from what belongs to one as her/his believes, way of living, etc. Becoming a disenchanted *being*, on the other hand, is a loss of *one's self*; it is withdrawing from one's own selfhood and becoming an absence, a lack, a void. This happens when one is negated and is deprived of any

original identity. This experience seems to be the predicament of the colonized world and, as such, one of the most fundamental preoccupations of post-colonial thought.¹

The writings of Enrique Dussel and Ali Shari'ati reveal this sense of disenchantment very explicitly. They both express a preoccupation with a long process of the annihilating experience of *double disenchantment*. They have both analyzed and challenged the colonial act of subjugation and cultural negation. Their literal work is oriented towards a liberating self-resurgence and self-reassertion. Thereby, they have brought to light the impact of cultural colonialism in the creation of the subjugated "other" and, at the same time, the process of the reemergence of the selfhood which has been negated and annihilated. This assertive re-emergence has

necessarily taken this cultural detachment to the point of intercultural resistance. But, if one takes the Hermeneutic/intercultural turn in the western consciousness as serious as it actually is, the European 'self' seems to have taken new historical turn which imbeds new terms for a constructive 'meeting' between the two 'others'.

In the Hermeneutic Turn, language and intersubjectivity have been considered as fundamental and have led to the centrality of Dialogue. As if, now the "world spirit" (Geist), resides in the modus of interlocutor with spokesman such as Heidegger, Gadamer, Apel, and Rorty. Hence, the "spirit" has in its subjective side been transformed into conversation. So, against the Hegelian 'mind', which has been ignorant of the *in-betweenness*, Hermeneutics is the reaching of European mind to the point of *dialogics* (as against the

1. For further discussion see *Cultural Imperialism*.

logistics) by pointing to the common heritage of humanity. In Differential Hermeneutics, Dialogue has its ontological, methodological and ethical justification. Gadamer regards 'understanding' as universal which can be regarded as the meta-theoretical coherence of hermeneutics. Perhaps, what Gadamer claims to be universal is the universality of dialogue? But, such universality cannot stop at a cultural particularity. Cultural universality, however, is not the same as Hegelian, or Marxian 'totality'. Since, in hermeneutic interaction, totality is nothing but the interaction of particulars. Hermeneutic circle provides the possibility for 'the global' and 'the universal' to be free both from the hegemony of 'the Total' and from reduction to fragmentation and struggle of particulars.

Philosophical Hermeneutics, assuming that historical factors which

made the present identity are intercultural, does not see the intercultural factors present in the making of history and identity of Europeans. Recognizing extra-cultural factors effective in the making of the European identity, what can perhaps be named as "wirkungskultur" (the effects of culture), can lead to an understanding of self which inherits the 'sharing of horizons' in the civilizational plane. While the thought of 'clash' is explicitly contra 'other', Differential Hermeneutics comes short of recognizing Europe's 'cultural other' as actually constitutive of its identity. In other words, the notion of *wirkungsgeschichte* needs to surpass its monoculturality and host the cultural other as a significant element in its 'pre-structures'. Differential Hermeneutics speaks of 'the sharing of horizons' within the European cultural context, which due to the centrality of the notion of

'tradition' takes an exclusive exposition of dialoguea dialogue which entails the historical and contemporary European 'other'. 'Hermeneutics of Subjugation' on the other hand, from beyond the geographical borders of Europe, but with a prefigured interconnection during the time of colonialism, speaks from the stand point of the 'European's other' about a return to self by this "other" which has been negated historically and civilizationally. A return to self to rebuild the future. This "return" is a 'sharing of horizon' with a self which, due to its becoming other than itself by colonialism, no longer is itself. It, therefore, reaches at an intercultural Resistance. Therefore, Gadamer has taken a turn to its historical other to understand itself, but Shari'ati, with a critical perspective has turned to a self which has been negated by the

historical other of Gadamer. Therefore, Gadamer's tradition which entails the historical otherness of the Europe has actually been what it has been via its oppressive negation of a civilizational other. Hence, the hermeneutic enterprise to come to an understanding of itself, can not do without taking into consideration such constitutive negation for the European self, which is absent in Gadamer's Hermeneutics.

The task of critical intercultural hermeneutics is to complete the Hegelian project of 'Master and Slave' mutuality at the global level. This happens when the previously enslaved world has reached a point that Heidegger has envisioned as "Entschlossenheit' (deceiving). Now it is not just the inner-cultural communication which is distorted, as Habermas has envisioned, but this very distortion has taken place in a

grand historical distortion of communication between people of different cultures. By critical intercultural hermeneutics, which is possible as a dialectical moment resulting from the meeting of Differential Hermeneutics and the Hermeneutics of Subjugation, the conditions for dialogue is met. In other words, by dialogue on civilizational plane, the dialogicality of Hermeneutics is actualized. Therefore, critical civilizational dialogue is the essential extension of a 'sharing the horizons' which would lead to better 'self – understanding'.

If the inner-cultural sharing of horizons is proximity to selfhood beyond *anonymity*, the inter-cultural dialogue is proximity to the self understanding beyond *animosity*. The result of such understanding, understands self now and here in relation with intercultural (true) past and the historical other; and hence,

the path is opened to peace and simultaneously closed to war. Consequently, Hermeneutics finds its true position and "brings to proximity what is afar" and bridges "we" and "them" culturally and civilizationaly. We can therefore, reach awareness about our intercultural being besides our *exclusivist historical awareness* and build a world in which, the wholeness of our being can be actualized.

If Hermeneutics function is " to save us from naïve submission to the experts of technology" now, at the age of "globalization", human relations can easily be subjugated to the 'global technology', hence, globalization of dialogue can save us from global domination, a domination which undertakes the kind of planning and steering at the global level which has similar destructive consequences that it has at the particular social level.

Conclusion

Critical Intercultural Hermeneutics leads us to an historical, and not logical or philosophical, necessity, of *responsibly* understanding 'the other' of cultural selfhood. Critical Intercultural Hermeneutics is an invitation to a *synchronic return*; since, History is not possible to be made again' it is, however, possible to *respond* to history in its contemporary manifestations, namely to the 'civilizational other' in whose making the European 'I' has been self-reconstructively present in the past. Therefore, we can not understand our-self by dialogue with/in tradition, as Gadamer suggests, or pragmatically as Habermas suggests, but *synchronizing* time through a dialogizing our identity by culturally reshaping our self understanding via *intercultural synchronicity*.

Such *synchronicity* can be conceived and understood by a "diatopical hermeneutics", which, in Raimondo Panikkar's word is:

[T]he required method of interpretation when the distance to overcome, needed for any understanding, is not just a distance within one single culture or a temporal one, but rather the distance between two (or more) cultures, which have independently developed in different spaces (*topoi*) their own modes of philosophizing and ways of reaching intelligibility along with their proper categories (Panikkar, in Dallmayr, 1996: 61).

If done so, the globe truly becomes global, not as a sphere for exploration of resources by great economic powers, but as a human 'reservoir' in which various and different cultures reflect dimensions of Man's cultural life as Man.

References

- [1] Ashcraft, Bill & Ahluwaila Paul (1999). *Edward Said*. London: Routledge.
- [2] Berlin, Isaiah (1982). *Against the Currents*, London: Penguin
- [3] Castle, Gregory (ed.). (2001). *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*.
- [4] Dallmayr, Fred (1996). *Beyond Orientalism : Essays on Cross-Cultural Encounter*, New York: Suny.
- [5] (1999). 'Globalization from Below', *International Politics*, No, 36 (September 1999).
- [6] (2000). 'Borders or Horizons? Gadamer and Habermas Revisited', *Chicago-Kent Law Review*, Vol. 76, No 2 (2000).
- [7] (2001). 'A Gadamerian Perspective on Civilizational Dialogue', *Global Dialogue*, 66 (Winter 2001).
- [8] Dussel, Enrique. (1996). *The Underside of Modernity*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- [9] Dussel, Enrique. (1985). *The Philosophy of Liberation*. New York: Orbis.
- [10] Gadamer, H.G., (1971). *Philosophical Hermeneutics*, trans. D. Linge, Berkeley: University of California.
- [11] Hamm, Bernd & Smandych, Russel. (2005). *Cultural Imperialism*, Toronto: Broadview Press.
- [12] Heidegger, Martin. (1971). *Poetry, Language and Thought*, trans. A. Hofstadter, New York: Harper & Row.
- [13] Heidegger, Martin (1977). 'Question Concerning Technology', In *Basic Writings*, trans. D. Farrell Krell, New York: Harper & Row.
- [14] Huntington, S. (1993). 'The Clash of Civilizations', *Foreign Affairs*, (Summer 1993).
- [15] Kennedy, Valerie (2000). *Edward Said: A Critical Reader*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- [16] Mendieta, Eduardo (2005). "Neither Orientalism nor Occidentalism: Edward W. Said and Latin Americanism", Paper presented at the International Conference on Edward Said. Tehran.
- [17] Ricoeur, Paul. (1988). *From Text to Action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- [18] Said, Edward (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

- [19] (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- [20] (2001). "Discrepant Experiences." In *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*, ed. G. Castle. Oxford: Blackwell. Pp. 26-38.
- [21] Shari'ati, Ali. (1978a). *Collected Works*. Vol. 14: *History of Religion* (1). Tehran: Ershad.
- [22] (1978b). *Collected Works*. Vol. 12: *The History of Civilization* (2). Tehran: Ershad. Tehran.
- [23] (1979a). *Civilization and Modernization*. Houston. TX: Free Press.
- [24] (1978a). *Collected Works*. Vol. 4: *Return to Self*. Tehran: Ershad.
- [25] (1980). *Machine in the Captivity of Machinism*. Houston, TX: Free Press.
- [26] (1989). *Collected Works*. Vol. 31: *Peculiarities of Modern Times*. Tehran: Chapakhsh.
- [27] Skinner, Quinten (1988). "Motives, Intentions and interpretation of texts", in *Meaning & Context: Quinten Skinner and his Critics*, ed. James Tully. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- [28] Weber, Max. (1979). *The Protestant Ethic and Spirit of Capitalism*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.
- [29] Young, Robert. (2001). "Colonialism and the Desiring Machine." In *Postcolonial Discourses: An Anthology*, ed. G. Castle. Oxford: Blackwell. Pp. 73-99.
- [30] Waldenfels, B., (1998). 'Homeworld and Alienworld', *Phenomenological Studies*.

روایت‌هایی از بینا فرهنگی بودن: ملاقاتی متفاوت

عباس منوچهری^۱

تاریخ پذیرش: ۹۲/۱۲/۲۶

تاریخ دریافت: ۹۱/۴/۱۵

با ظهور شرایط جدید در اروپای مدرن یک همزمانی تاریخی اتفاق افتاد، که از طریق آن شرایط پسا و سطانی اروپا در عین حال هم گسستی از گذشته خود اروپا بود، و هم یک پیوست تحمیلی با آینده عالم غیر اروپا. اما، برای غیر اروپائیان، همزمانی تاریخی متفاوت رغم خورد. آنها خود را گسسته از گذشته خود، و پرتاب شده در یک «وضع طبیعی» تحمیل شده یافتند. تجربه اروپائیان در گفتار استعماری روایت شده است. تجربه دنیای مستعمره شده در گفتار پسا-استعماری روایت شده است. این مقاله تلاشی است برای میزبانی نظری ملاقاتی بین گفتار استعماری و گفتار پسا استعماری.

واژگان کلیدی: بینا فرهنگ بودگی، گفتار استعماری، گفتار استعمار شده، برخورد تمدن‌ها، هرمنوتیک تفاوت، هرمنوتیک مقاومت.

۱. دانشیار، گروه علوم سیاسی، دانشگاه تربیت مدرس.