

Elena Zhizhko,

Dr. hab., Professor of Academic Unit of Humanistic Studies
Autonomous University of Zacatecas, Mexico

e-mail: eanatoli@yahoo.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9680-8247

Gali-Aleksandra Beltrán,

EDD, Associate Professor of Department of Geophysics
Technologic University of Durango
Durango, Mexico

e-mail: gali.beltranzh@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7186-332X

CULTURAL-LINGUISTIC RELATIVISM AS THE FOUNDATION OF PEACE EDUCATION

This paper presents the results of a theoretic-pedagogical research, which objective was to analyze the peace education from complex thinking and the cultural-linguistic relativism approach through a documentary-bibliographic study. Authors found, that the cultural-linguistic relativism approach must be considered as the epistemological basis of peace education. Its main postulate regarding the equitable articulation of different without a hegemonic center (or universality point); the recognition of the difference and the fairness of the differences; the admission as valid of any practice by the mere fact of being the production of a social group, modulates the pedagogical actions aimed at the development of student's logical pluralism and interculturality, consequently, of the peace culture. Since logical pluralism is achieved from the encounter of diverse visions and social, economic, political and cultural practices, the indispensable condition for this process to occur is interculturality. The cultural-linguistic relativism intones the correct understanding of each other by interpreting cultural manifestations according to their own cultural criteria, trying to understand the symbolic complexity of cultural practices, trying to moderate an inevitable ethnocentrism that leads to interpreting the cultural practices of others from of the interpreter's culture criteria; helps to achieve internal and external peace: participation, dialogue and cooperation, changing patterns of behavior in conflicts; supports respect for the life and dignity of each person, without discrimination or prejudice; effective equality of rights and obligations (ethnic, class, regional, gender, sexual, economic, etc.); it allows the acquisition of unusual ways of acting, making decisions (logical pluralism).

Key words: *peace education, complex thinking, cultural-linguistic relativism, ethnolinguistic diversity and intracultural perspective, disintegration of the point of universality, development of student's logical pluralism and interculturality.*

Introduction. Today, education for peace is not another option but a need that the school must assume, just as it has to be promoted from different contexts. This topic has been addressed since the works of Jan Amos Comenius and the New School. Also, at the end of the 20th century – second decade of the 21st century, this issue continues to arouse the interest of researchers at international and national levels and presents a significant theoretical development as well as in practical action.

The problems of peace education studied Lederach, 1984, 1998, 2000, 2008; Monclús, 1987; Reardon, 1988, 1999; Gómez, 1992; Jares, 1992, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2004, 2005; Hicks, 1993; Bjerstedt, 1993; Fernández, 1994; Rodríguez, 1995; Lozano, 1997; Bajaj, 2000; Cascón, 2004; Davies, 2006; Cabezudo and Haavelsrud, 2007; Pérez-Biramonte, 2008; Oliveira, 2008; Bekerman and Mcglynn, 2009; Sánchez-Cardona, 2010; Acevedo, Duro and Grau, 2011; Fisas, 2011; Valle, 2013; Galtung, 2014; Grasa [11]; Sánchez-Fernández, 2014; Ospina-Garnica, 2015; Salamanca, Rodríguez, Cruz, Ollave, Pulido and Molano, 2016; Hernández-Arteaga [12]; Kremen, 2019; Nychkalo, 2019; Lukianova and Zhizhko [27]; Vargas-Sánchez, 2019, among others. The authors trace the following edges of peace education:

- It's a human rights issue (Nastae, 1986; Tuvilla, 1994, 1998, 2000, 2004; Alba, 1998; Jares, 2002; [3]);
- It implies educating for global responsibility (Reardon, 1988, 1999).
- It's achieved by teaching dialogue with the Montessori method (Duckworth, 2006);
- It's reached by acting in the pedagogical framework of Vigotsky's sociocognitivist model [23].
- It's built from philosophy to make peace [13];
- It must be an ethical-political proposal of democratic emancipation carried out from the Freire's popular pedagogy (non-violent popular resistance) (Ospina [16,17]; Ribotta, 2011);
- It's attained through conflict controlling teaching (Cascón, 2004; Smith, 2011; Hernández-Arteaga, Luna-Hernández and Cadena-Chala [12]);
- It's a way of educating in values[12].

Likewise, the revision of peace education literature allows us to maintain that as its modern antecedent can be mentioned the *Associated Schools Project* of the United Nations and UNESCO, which incorporates in the forties of the 20th century (after World War II), education for human rights and disarmament. Later, in the sixties of the 20th century, peace education is enriched with the contributions of Paulo Freire that link education with the nations' development and overcoming social inequalities, as well as with proposals and social-pedagogical practices of Mahatma Gandhi based on firmness in truth and non-violent action and the development of personal autonomy and disobedience to unfair structures [27, pp. 31-33].

In the eighties of the 20th century, the peace education turns to practical approaches and emphasizes coexistence within the nearby community (the classroom, school, neighborhood, etc.). Thus, it's intended to prepare to participate actively and responsibly in the construction of a culture of peace by acting from the community itself with non-violent conflict management programs. The peace education is perceived as an alternative to change violent, excluding and intolerant human behaviors in peaceful relations [11, p. 53].

In the nineties of the 20th century, the peace education is related to intercultural education. Thanks to new information and communication technologies, contacts are made between different nations and people, with diverse experiences and access to materials, centers and persons working in peace education in very different contexts and situations of conflict and violence. In 1995, the UNESCO General Conference proclaimed the *Declaration and the Integrated Action Plan on Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy*, which in its Article 8 states:

Education must develop the ability to recognize and accept the values that exist in the diversity of individuals, genders, nations and cultures, and develop the ability to communicate, share and cooperate with others. The citizens of a pluralistic society and a multicultural world must be able to admit that their interpretation of situations and problems follows from their own lives, from the history of their society and from their cultural traditions and that, consequently, there isn't a single individual or group that has the only answer to the problems, and there may be more than one solution for each problem. Therefore, people should understand and respect each other and negotiate on an equal footing with a view to finding common ground. Thus, education should strengthen personal identity and favor the convergence of ideas and solutions that reinforce peace, friendship and fraternity between individuals and nations [22].

Therefore, the conceptualization of peace education has gone from the vision of an instruction in human rights, disarmament, and global responsibility. It involves the understanding of the need for teaching dialogue and attention to the student's integral development. Contemplate the improvement of positive, analytical, transformative, conciliatory, tolerant attitudes; the ability to forgive and reconcile, respect the other, handle aggression, anger, hate. It provides for the acquisition of knowledge for the critical analysis of reality, creativity in the search for solutions; the development of skills to think critically: know how to process existing information, understand the conflict and prevent it/deal with it/resolve it, know how to mediate, reconcile and generate peaceful solutions to conflicts, know how to empathize with the different divided parts and build peaceful coexistence environments. It calls to form in values (freedom, equity, justice, solidarity, cooperation, autonomy, critical reflection, creativity, decision making). It aims to transform society, motivate and create new conceptions of the world.

Given the dynamic, non-linear, multidisciplinary, heterogeneous, multiform and transversal nature of the task of peace culture building from the educational field (that definitely implies a diversity of challenges), we set out to analyze in this work the peace education from complex thinking and the cultural-linguistic relativism approach through a documentary-bibliographic study.

Developing. Following the complex thinking, the determining elements in the educational process, which objective is to develop in the student the culture for peace, to create the skills and patterns of peaceful behavior, is interculturality and logical pluralism. The first is a phenomenon that refers to the coupling of at least two cultural codes, each of which generates its own mechanisms for maintaining and producing differences and is possible only from a dialogue [18, 21]. As well, the second provides the tools that allow to act in a non-traditional way and find alternative steps to fulfill daily or professional tasks.

One of the epistemological foundations of the studies of interculturality and logical pluralism is the cultural-linguistic relativism that admits as valid any practice by the mere fact of being the production of an ethnic or social group. Its origins are found in studies of the language-reality/culture/society relationship and can be considered part, on the one hand, of popular psychology¹, and on the other, of linguistic or ethnolinguistic anthropology.

¹ Author's note: *popular psychology* or *common sense psychology* is the implicit theory that people use to explain the behavior of their peers. This group of beliefs includes all those that people use during their daily lives, but cannot be tested experimentally.

Likewise, its antecedents are placed in Vico's constructivist proposal continued in German romanticism (Herder and Humboldt) related to the finding that the background of the linguistic system consists of a program and guide for the individuals' mental activity, for its analysis and impressions [15, p. 13]. In this way, all observers are not guided by the same physical evidence in the same image of the universe, unless they have a similar linguistic history or can be calibrated in some way [24, p. 214].

The cultural-linguistic relativity paradigm is based on the Whorfian hypothesis, or the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (1950s) stating that human cognition depends on language, and that this dependence creates differences in the linguistic communities thinking. This conjecture comprises three main ideas. First, it's assumed that languages can eloquently differ in the meaning of their words and syntactic constructions (this assumption is supported by anthropological linguistics and psychological studies of the word). Second, this proposal argues that the language semantics can affect the way its speakers perceive and conceptualize the world (linguistic determinism). Finally, since language can affect thinking, speakers of different languages think (and act) differently [26, pp. 253-260].

Moreover, Benjamin Lee Whorf argues that language determines the basic categories of thinking (memory, coding and decoding, perception and cognition) and, as a consequence, speakers of different languages think differently creating complex world-language-thinking relationship [7, p. 81]. It's a type of thinking influenced by language that occurs immediately before the use of language, that is, the thought processes associated with speech production. In such a way that speakers of different languages may be predisposed to attend and codify different aspects of their experience while speaking [4].

The theory of cultural-linguistic relativity also starts with linguistic or ethnolinguistic anthropology. According to Coseriu [5], ethnolinguistics has as its object of study the relationship between language and culture, and refers fundamentally to whether the object of the study is language. In turn, if we are talking about linguistic facts determined by the "knowledge" about the "things", we apply ethnolinguistic proper or ethnographic linguistics. If, instead, the object of study is culture and we are talking about the "things' knowledge" manifested by language (and about the language itself as a form of culture among others and in conjunction with others elements), linguistic ethnography is done. And, in a more limited sense, if we take only language as a cultural manifestation, we implement language ethnography [5, pp. 13-14].

Duranti [6], on the other hand, points to ethnolinguistics as a designation similar to that of linguistic anthropology (forties and fifties of the 20th century, in the United States). The choice of one term or another (linguistic anthropology or ethnolinguistic) is due "[...] to the deliberate attempt to consolidate and redefine the study of language and culture as one of the main subfields of anthropology" [6, pp. 20-21]. Thus, he refers to linguistic anthropology as the "study of language as a resource of culture, and of speech as a cultural practice". In this context, speakers are seen first, and above all, as social actors, that is, as members of communities, singular and complex, each of which is articulated as a set of social institutions, and through a network of expectations, beliefs and moral values that are not necessarily superimposed, but intersected.

For its part, the *Lublin School* considers ethnolinguistics as a subdiscipline of linguistics, due to the following reasons: 1) it's based on linguistic data, even when it pays close attention to the social and cultural context; 2) although it begins with the description of small communities, it can be placed in inter-ethnic and even cross-

cultural areas; 3) it proposes questions about the manifestations of culture in language and not about the position and role of language in culture; 4) it focuses on the contemporary *status quo*, which is treated as a stage in the historical process of language development [1, p. 6].

Thus, ethnolinguistics aims to highlight all the relationships that exist between the language and the community of speakers that use it, and secondarily with the culture of the community. It puts the speaker, the human subject and the community in the foreground, and only secondarily relates them to culture. It is, therefore, about the manifestations of culture in language [2, p. 8]. According to the above, in the theoretical conformation of ethnolinguistics three elements converge in general: language, culture and society (interaction).

Luckily, the relationship between language, society and culture consists of a single construct, which axis is communication and its meaning. This construct isn't isolated from the experiences of those who generate it, but corresponds to a social process of understanding/communicating reality, based on a specific language, which constitutes the natural, behavioral, emotional and value reality of a people community, who recognize themselves as belonging and participating in it. In this context, it's not possible to assume a separation or causal relationship between the elements that make up our experiences (language, social and culture), since one requires the others in a process of constant feedback.

In relation to the above, Sapir [19] points out that “[...] the different languages don't occur independently of culture, that is, of the set of beliefs and customs that constitutes a social heritage and determines the context of our life” Sapir [19, p. 235]. Furthermore, for Duranti [6] language consists of a resource and practice of culture, in other words, of a communicative system that allows the individual and social representations that constitute it socially. Thus, to establish causal relations between language and culture seems an unnecessary exercise, since both co-emerge as a linguistic construction of the world. So, language and culture arise from a process of ontological interdependence. Said of another way, language consists of a system, which symbolic limits of meaning are culturally expressed both at the communicative level and at the level of thought. In the same sense, cultural boundaries also represent the intentions and the performance of actions within the symbolic context given by language [6].

In this way, language, understood as cultural boundaries developed and expressed through the apprehension of communicative and, therefore, social property of language, determines the nature of our understanding of reality and our actions in the world. *Culture is language and language is culture*; it's a particular symbolic construction of social reality. It specifies our understanding of the world and, therefore, categorizes and values our actions.

Establishing codependency relationships between language and culture, meanwhile, allows us to propose a conception of language, which universality is given by its ability to generate networks of meaning exercised by a community, which identity and difference with the rest, consists of a cognitive operative lock that is socialized by communicative expressions particularizing it. The language reflects the difference and generates the extralinguistic elements. The speaker, in turn, is always in a context (cognitive, social and cultural) that gives him specific discursive identity. The circularity between language and speaker consists in the emergence of the social from a particular communicative system, that is, from a language [7, p. 84].

In Wittgenstein's words, "[...] imagining a language means imagining a way of life" [25, p. 13]. Language particularizes meaning by reducing the complexity of the world (all worlds are possible) from the limits of language. These linguistic structures of meaning vary from one language to the other, so that their understanding is always self-referential and refers to cultural limits of world appropriation by speakers. In this sense, *a language is a communication system that particularizes an appropriate way (from itself) to describe, explain and understand the world* [25, p. 15]. In line with this, and according to Wittgenstein's conception, a language is a context of experience, which for it to mean, must be communicated. That is, a language is an activity (a game), a way of life, a culture.

Results. The study carried out showed that the cultural-linguistic relativism (Bartmiński [1,2]; Boroditsky [4]; Coseriu [5]; Duranti [6]; Escalera [7]; Fishman [8]; Garagalza, 2003; Golluscio [10]; Humboldt, 1990 [1836]; Koerner [14]; Kramersch, 1998; Kövecses [15]; Rodríguez, 2011; Rodríguez-Barraza, 2008; Sapir [19]; Toledo, 1998; Whorf [24]; Wierzbicka, 2013; Wolff and Holmes [26], among others), advocates the defense of ethnolinguistic diversity for the benefit of *panhuman creativity* (and the development of logical pluralism), problem solving and mutual cross-cultural acceptance [8, pp. 1-14]. According to [24], linguistic knowledge implies "[...] many, different and "beautiful" systems of logical analysis" [24, p. 264].

Further, the cultural-linguistic relativism considers *universality*² as a myth that masks the domineers' interests over the dominated. Following this approach, *science must accept the non-Western as an equal* and it "[...] doesn't see itself as obviously more rational and objective than the so-called mysterious East" [8, p. 8].

Thinking about and from cultural-linguistic relativism necessarily implies an ethical (and aesthetic) apology. In other words, cultural-linguistic relativism formalizes an absolute value experience, assumes the existence of a multiplicity of communicative and comprehensively present worlds in each of the languages; linguistic diversity generates self-sustained realities in the understanding and appreciation of the world that speakers build within an identity process. In this way, *academic processes, both theoretical and empirical, lose their unicultural axis, leading to the emergence of a multitude of intracultural possibilities of (self)recognition* that generate their own values of development and identity understanding [10, p. 41].

Only by establishing the *intracultural perspective* (as a natural consequence of ethnolinguistic diversity) as an element of intercultural link, can a symmetric intercultural dialogue be developed in education, not subject to a context of epistemological domination. It's about *observing the difference from the difference*.

The intracultural perspective is understood as a particular way of apprehending the world, through the language. It's about the linguistic vision of the world, as a key to understanding it by a community. This linguistic worldview would be, in this context, the substrate, from which the construction peculiarities of a sociocultural reality are recognized. It consists of an interpretation of reality deeply rooted in language, which

² Authors' note: *Universality* is the main category of *multiculturalism* (or multisocietal relations), a phenomenon that currently prevails in Latin American countries and accepts diversity only to the extent that it doesn't affect the preeminence of particularism in the hegemonic sectors; it doesn't propose a transformation of power relations and leaves the situation of poverty and exclusion of marginalized populations (indigenous, poor, women, etc.) unchanged [20, p. 40]. Likewise, the *disintegration of the point of universality*, is the task of *interculturality*, a project to be developed in society that implies a profound transformation of power and domination system, to build a genuinely equitable and just society; the recognition and equitable articulation of differences (ethnic, class, regional, gender, sexual, economic, etc.). It means also follow the precepts of cultural-linguistic relativism.

can be expressed in the form of judgments about the world, people, things or events [2, p. 36].

It is an interpretation, not a reflection; result of subjective perception and conceptualization of reality; emerges as a system of values, points of view and perspectives of the speaker, is clearly subjective and anthropocentric, but also intersubjective (social). It unifies people in a given social environment, creates a community of thought, feelings and values, particularizes knowledge and its specific operability, in order to meet its needs for cultural production and [9].

Conclusions. In conclusion, it can be argued that the cultural-linguistic relativism approach must be considered as the epistemological basis of peace education. Its main postulate regarding the equitable articulation of different without a hegemonic center (or universality point); the recognition of the difference and the fairness of the differences; the admission as valid of any practice by the mere fact of being the production of a social group, modulates the pedagogical actions aimed at the development of student's logical pluralism and interculturality, consequently, of the peace culture.

The paradigm of cultural-linguistic relativism argues that being carriers of a culture or speaking a certain language makes us think (or perform cognitive tasks) in a certain way. The meanings of the words refer us to conceptual categories, that is, to sets of things. The fact that two languages have two different categorical systems indicates that their speakers will group the elements of the world (build their culture) in different ways. From this perspective, talking about a particular culture or language with its particular categorical system leads to finding the similarities and differences between the elements of the world.

Therefore, there are complex relationships between culture/language and cognition, since a cognitive task is "affected" by the culture, in which we live and the language we speak. So that the mastery of other cultures/languages allows us to develop *logical pluralism*, possess knowledge of other ways (non-routine, unusual) to do things, act, solve problems, other types of more complicated and multidisciplinary capacities for efficient performance in everyday and professional life.

Furthermore, since logical pluralism is achieved from the encounter of diverse visions and social, economic, political and cultural practices, the indispensable condition for this process to occur is *interculturality*. It's about equitable interrelation and interaction, the interpellation of our worldview/culture from the others and the interpellation of the others from ours, to reach mutual acceptance, respect, interdependence, convergent and complementarity relations, as well as common purposes.

In summary, the cultural-linguistic relativism intones the correct understanding of each other by interpreting cultural manifestations according to their own cultural criteria, trying to understand the symbolic complexity of cultural practices, trying to moderate an inevitable ethnocentrism that leads to interpreting the cultural practices of others from of the interpreter's culture criteria; helps to achieve internal and external peace: participation, dialogue and cooperation, changing patterns of behavior in conflicts; supports respect for the life and dignity of each person, without discrimination or prejudice; effective equality of rights and obligations (ethnic, class, regional, gender, sexual, economic, etc.); it allows the acquisition of unusual ways of acting, making decisions (logical pluralism).

References

1. Bartmiński, J. (2009). "Linguistic worldview as a problem of cognitive ethnolinguistics", Plenary lecture at the 2009 Slavic Cognitive Linguistics Conference.
2. Bartmiński, J. (2012). *Aspects of Cognitive Ethnolinguistic*, London, Equinox publishing.
3. Blanco, R. et al. (2007). *Educación de calidad para todos. Un asunto de derechos humanos. Documento de discusión para políticas educativas en el marco de la II Reunión Intergubernamental del Proyecto Regional de Educación para América Latina y el Caribe*, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 29 y 30 de marzo de 2007, Buenos Aires, EPT/PRELAC.
4. Boroditsky, L. (2001). "Does Language Shape Thought?: Mandarin and English Speakers' Conceptions of Time", in *Cognitive Psychology*, No. 43(1), pp. 1-22, doi:10.1006/cogp.2001.0748, <http://www.idealibrary.com>
5. Coseriu, E. (1978). "La socio y la etnolingüística", en *Anuario de Letras*, XIX, pp. 5-30.
6. Duranti, A. (2000). *Antropología Lingüística*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
7. Escalera, A. (2012). "Relativismo Lingüístico, relativismo ontológico", en *Nóesis*, No. 42, pp. 61-85.
8. Fishman, J. (1982). "Whorfianism of the third kind: Ethnolinguistic diversity as a worldwide societal asset (The Whorfian Hypothesis: Varieties of validation, confirmation, and disconfirmation II)", in *Language in Society*, No. 11, pp. 1-14.
9. Flores Farfán, J. (2013). "El potencial de las artes y los medios audiovisuales en la revitalización lingüística", en *RLA. Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada*, No. 51(1), pp. 33-52.
10. Golluscio, L. (2002). *Etnografía del habla. Textos fundacionales*, Buenos Aires, Eudeba.
11. Grasa, R. (2000). "Evolución de la Educación para la Paz. La centralidad del conflicto para la agenda del siglo XXI", en *Cuadernos de pedagogía*, No. 287, 2000, pp. 52-56.
12. Hernández Arteaga, I., Luna Hernández, J., Cadena Chala, M. (2017). "Cultura de Paz: Una Construcción educativa aporte teórico", en *Revista Historia de la Educación Latinoamericana*, Vol. 19, No. 28, enero-junio, 2017, pp. 149-172, Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia Boyacá, Colombia.
13. Herrero Rico, S. (2012). *La educación para la paz desde la filosofía para hacer las paces: el enfoque REM (reconstructivo-empoderador)*, Tesis Doctoral, Instituto Interuniversitario de Desarrollo Social y Paz, Doctorado Internacional de Estudios de Paz, Conflicto y Desarrollo, Universitat Jaume-I, Castellón.
14. Koerner, K. (1992). "The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis: A Preliminary History and a Bibliographical Essay", in *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, No. 2, pp. 173-198.
15. Kövecses, Z. (2006). *Language, mind and culture, a practical introduction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
16. Ospina, J. (2010). "La educación para la paz como propuesta ético-política de emancipación democrática. Origen, fundamentos y contenidos", en *Universitas. Revista de Filosofía, Derecho y Política*, No. 11(1), pp. 93-125.
17. Ospina, J. (2015). *La educación para la paz en situaciones de conflicto armado. Construyendo un nuevo enfoque desde el caso de los Territorios Palestinos Ocupados*, Tesis doctoral, Instituto de derechos humanos "Bartolomé de las Casas", Getafe.
18. Quiroga Trigo, M. (2012). "Conceptos sobre comunicación intercultural. Comunicación y ciudadanía intercultural", en Antonio Aramayo Tejada (coord.) *Memorias de los Seminarios Comunicación para una ciudadanía integral e intercultural*, La Fundación UNIR Bolivia, pp. 13-21.
19. Sapir, E. (1954 [1921]). *El lenguaje*, México, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
20. Tapia, L. (2002). *La condición multisocietal. Multiculturalidad, pluralismo, modernidad*, La Paz, Bolivia, CIDES-UMSA/Muela del Diablo, revisado el 07 de mayo de

2019 en: <https://es.scribd.com/doc/124379442/La-Condicion-multisocietal-multiculturalidad-pluralismo-modernidad-Luis-Tapia-pdf>

21. Teillier, F., Llanquiao, G., Salamanca, G. (2016). “De qué hablamos cuando hablamos de etnolingüística: Bases teórico-metodológicas para un trabajo con el mapunzugun”, en *RLA. Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada Concepción* (Chile), No. 54 (2), II Sem. 2016, pp. 137-161.

22. UNESCO (1995). *Declaración y el Plan de Acción Integrado sobre la Educación para la Paz, los Derechos Humanos y la Democracia*, en la Conferencia General de la UNESCO, París, UNESCO

23. Vidanes Díez, J. (2007). “La educación para la paz y la no violencia”, en *La Revista Iberoamericana de Educación*, No. 42/2, pp. 10-30, en: <https://rieoei.org/historico/deloslectores/experiencias146.htm> (21.01.2021).

24. Whorf, B. (1978 [1941]). “Language, mind, and reality”, in *Language, Thought and Reality*, New York, The Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

25. Wittgenstein, L. (1999). *Investigaciones filosóficas*, Madrid, Altaya.

26. Wolff, Ph., Holmes, K. J. (2011). “Linguistic relativity”, in *WIREs Cognitive Science*, Vol. 2, May/June 2011, John Wiley & Son s, Ltd. pp. 253-260.

27. Zhizhko, E. (2019). *Aproximaciones a la educación para la paz: dimensiones temporal y teórica*, Kyiv: Publisher LAT&K.

Олена Жижко,

доктор педагогічних наук, професор відділу гуманітарних наук

Автономного університету Сакатекаса

м. Сакатека, Мексика

e-mail: eanatoli@yahoo.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-9680-8247

Галі-Олександра Бельтран,

кандидат педагогічних наук, викладач відділу геофізики

Технологічного університету Дуранго

м. Дуранго, Мексика

e-mail: gali.beltranzh@gmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-7186-332X

КУЛЬТУРНО-МОВНИЙ РЕЛЯТИВІЗМ ЯК ФУНДАМЕНТ ОСВІТИ ДЛЯ МИРУ

У статті представлені результати теоретико-педагогічного дослідження, метою якого було проаналізувати підходи до освіти для миру, підґрунтям яких є теорія складного мислення та культурно-лінгвістичний релятивізм. Автори встановили, що покладання у розбудові освіти для миру на культурно-лінгвістичний релятивізм передбачає гносеологічний підхід до освіти. Основним постулатом культурно-лінгвістичного релятивізму є рівномірна артикуляція різних сторін (часто полярних) одного цілого; така регуляція виключає існування центру-гегемону; тобто, має бути «дезінтегрована» так звана точка універсальності. Важливим є також визнання та прийняття відмінностей різних сторін один одним. За цією теорією, будь-яка практика будь-якої соціальної групи дає право на існування цієї групи лише через той факт, що вона вже існує. Педагогічні дії, спрямовані на розвиток в учнів культурно-лінгвістичного релятивізму у сфері освіти для миру, мають розвивати здібності логічного плюралізму та міжкультурної комунікації. Логічний плюралізм формується на бізі міжкультурної комунікації: взаємодії різноманітних соціальних, економічних, політичних, культурних світосприйнять, світобачень, практик, способів мислення тощо. Отже, володіння логічним

плюралізмом та міжкультурною комунікацією як підґрунтями культурно-лінгвістичного релятивізму дозволяє правильно розуміти Іншого (чужого) шляхом інтерпретації культурних проявів, використання критеріїв адекватного тлумачення «чужої» культури; допомагає досягти внутрішньої та зовнішньої рівноваги (миру), участі у діалозі та співпраці, зміни моделей поведінки в конфліктах; підтримує повагу до життя та гідності кожної людини, без дискримінації чи забобонів; сприяє ефективному втіленню рівності прав людини (етнічних, класових, регійних, гендерних, сексуальних, економічних тощо); дозволяє також використовувати нетрадиційні, інноваційні способи прийняття рішень і розв'язання проблем (логічний плюралізм).

Ключові слова: *освіта для миру, складне мислення, культурно-лінгвістичний релятивізм, етнолінгвістичне різноманіття та внутрішньокультурна перспектива, дезінтеграція точки універсальності, розвиток логічного плюралізму та міжкультурної комунікації.*