The dialogue of two outstanding civilizations of the cultural type – Eastern and Western – has always been important. Many historians still have not found the answer in the unique era of the humanity preceding the origin of Christianity – the Hellenistic period – to the question which civilization had a bigger impact on the other? Was the East westernized or the West orientalized?

In the middle of the previous century, John Dewey, Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, George Santayana expressed their opinion as to a possible dialogue of Eastern and Western cultures. All three said no. “You are speaking about the ‘synthesis’ of Eastern and Western philosophies. But that could have been achieved only by ravaging and emptying both systems.”2 “The dialogue of Western and Eastern cultures is not as much unthinkable as it is actually unrealizable because of the fundamental heterogeneity of civilizations origins and principles; only business and practically positional relations are possible, with comprehension and preservation of their heterogeneity and fatally irremovable antimony.”3

Is education of individuals capable to have an impact on representatives of various cultures hearing each other? According to Hessen’s apt expression, there are as many educations as cultures. How much is cultural and historical “hearing” is on the whole comparable with the human ability to see stereotypes and avoid barriers in communications? As, according to Carl Jung, the nation’s anima is only more complex structure than an individual’s anima.

Civilizations of silence and speech: reasons of non-understanding

The reason of one individual’s non-understanding the other is complex and interdisciplinary, and lies at the level of psychology, philosophy, and logic. In order to avoid barriers in communications, it’s important to teach an individual to go beyond one’s own limits and watch oneself as an onlooker. The deep dialogic basis lies in the main xenologic principle: “We can cognize ourselves as much as what we are not.”

An individual cognizes the surrounding world from himself, “We can cognize ourselves as much as what we are not.” The deep dialogic basis lies in the main xenologic principle: “We can cognize ourselves as much as what we are not.”
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and many others confirm that an individual’s “deepening” and “expanding” are the essence of differences of Western and Eastern cultures that created an enormous barrier in understanding each other by representatives of the two outstanding civilizations of the cultural type. “An individual is deified and worshipped” – “Mind is deific”: these two formulae reflect the character of Eastern and Western cultures.

In China, the worldview ideas of the matter (condition of both material and spiritual phenomena) had a continuous and undulating character; and atomistic, discrete in Ancient Greece and India. These differences can be seen in the language – the mentality matrix. The basis of the Western type of mentality is Figure One (Greek Monad, Christian God – the absolute Figure One). The original Figure One as a starting point assumes a consecutive, cause-and-effect row, disposing for the linear, discursive, extravert type of thinking. The basis of the Eastern or Buddhist type of mentality is Zero, the absolute Zero (Shunya) or the fullness of the non-displayed and non-revealed world. Such an idea could not fail to generate the model of the world as the Buddhist logic of the Whole, it brought about the character of artistic consciousness, individual’s attitude to life and oneself.

George Needham similarly writes that there is a special hieroglyph in the Chinese language – the organic whole, gestalt (image), because of that the mind brought up at the ideographic language would be hardly open for perception of the idea of the atomistic structure of the matter. In contrast to hieroglyphs, letters as phonetic abstractions atomize the fixed experience already at the most elementary level of writing.

According to Erich Fromm, the atomic nature of consciousness generates the logic “A is not equal to B” – the forerunner of communications that demonstrates the outside and not the “inner” history of the individual. It’s not accidental that this principle is similar to the male style of communications based, according to psychologists, on rational ways of interaction.

There are completely different fruits of world perception in case of the “undulatory” theory of consciousness. The Eastern civilization “became attached” to the inner: according to philosopher E. Fromm, the paradoxical thinking is based on the equality of A and non-A, and that generated tolerance, indulgence as well as aspiration for transformation of the self by an individual.

Interrelations of the East and the West can be expressed in the terms of speaking and silence, a sign and lack of
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sign. Soviet and Russian philosopher G. Pomerants says that the essential element of “mystery touching the heart” in the South and Far East is not a sign but negation of all signs – emptiness or silence.1 Speaking as presence of signs is the symbol of the Western culture, silence as a “pause”, deepness has direct kinship to the Eastern symbol of culture, the primary of the inner against the external, continuous against the discrete.

These conclusions are based on numerous cultural studies, and social and psychological research in the field of the dialogue of cultures.2 In particular, they certify the conformity between interaction of interlocutors in a dialogue, interaction of cultures and cerebral hemispheres.

The difference in ways of thinking determines different ideas of the nature of personality as well as meanings and purposes of education. There are two ancient views on the essence of human nature: a Human is a clean sheet, and a Human is a seed of an unknown plant. If a pupil (student) is a clean sheet, the main target is to fill it with as small handwriting as possible. Then the question “What to teach?” will have a fairly certain answer – to teach achievements of the humanity.

A completely different view on what a Human is, allows us to speak about a different system of didactics, the main principle of which is to find out, reveal and realize the individual’s potential. Each seed of an unknown plant has its purpose – cultural, psychological, social, etc., its destiny and its mission. At the same time, the cultural and historical heritage’s role is the role of a mirror in which the student sees the created by him unique educational product and recognizes himself.

Saint Isaac the Syrian wrote in his Devotee’s Words: “Silence is the sacrament of the future age, and words are the tool of this world.”3 The “future” (in those words) 21st century has come. This age is the world of noise and chaos, “more and more increasing speaking,” “the world striving for total expression”.4 Currently, a student drowns in the universal noise – information, he hears himself and the others worse, according to H. Gadamer, he is becoming more and more monologic – in thinking, behavior, and communications. However, the world of total speaking is the world of silence as a stage – when there is nothing to say. The essence of such silence is well-presented in Z. Mirkina’s words: “The Lord is stupefied by our bustle and the Devil by this complete silence...” (Z. Mirkina). Or G. Tranströmer’s words: “Satiated by those coming with worlds but sounding as silence...”

Monologism is the reason of mass copying the alien, aiming to zero the content of communications not only with other people but also with oneself. The student in education is silent literally and figuratively – he reproduces the thoughts of others, has no opportunity for communication.

The “future” (in those words) 21st century is the world striving for total expression – insufficiency of space inside himself, comprehension of phenomena, confirming one of G. Tarde’s theories of historical development.

Gabriel Tarde’s theory says that history is a collision of imitation circles. The number of imitators, patterned and monological graduates of various educational institutions determines the speed of changes in the surrounding world, which also reflects the rapidness of individual’s losing the ability to conduct an intercultural dialogue.

The reason is that a monologue in education leads to thinning of the individual’s inner space – the space of meanings, values, self-identity, ability to hear oneself and the others – representatives of another culture. The well-known psychologist Philip Zimbardo wrote, with the life in big and small cities as an example, that people with regular time deficit were less inclined to help others than those who were not in a hurry to go anywhere. An individual stops “hearing” others because he does not “hear” himself.

The inner individual’s space that lives communicating with other spaces of other individuals is connected with his language and, consequently, the dialogue of inner forms: word, action, image.

Copying information like a virus “kills” the individual’s space of change, meanings and communication. The less space there is inside, the bigger “hunger, ego and aggression” are felt by an individual. He suffers from suffocation – insufficiency of space inside himself, comprehension of his self. Quanta or atoms of information are the “black holes” of meanings and the inner individual’s space. Swallowing up and absorbing information, the student swallows millions of quanta of Trojan horses that destroy him.

Illusion of knowledge as barriers in communications

The loss of individual’s ability to hear another individual means the loss of wholeness and disintegration separately into zero and one, speaking and silence. The wholeness is not zero but only zero together with Figure One like the truth not existing in the head of a certain individual but only in the process of their dialogic interaction (M. M. Bakhtin).
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The loss of student’s subjectivity in a monologue of the external set forth content of education with him leads to polarization of the signifier and the signified (if we use Roland Barthes terms), brings about growth of illusions and stereotypes, making any dialogue more difficult, especially the dialogue of cultures.

The monologue is focused on obtaining a part of the whole – information about the object. It’s not accidental that the system of extracting knowledge in a dialogue – maieutics – has been defining knowledge about one’s ignorance as the main educational knowledge since the time of Socrates. One-sidedness and halfness are the reason of barriers in understanding another one as the loss of wholeness. Translation of the “sign” – achievements of the humanity without taking into account the social and cultural background of the student himself a priori leads to distortions in the world view, “closing” the way to oneself and the others by an individual, inability of a school graduate for the dialogue of cultures.

Seeing the object in all details means seeing it close-up. Thus not having an opportunity to see everything surrounding the object – the so-called background. Hence the isle of knowledge that gets into the student’s field of vision during classes stereotypically being added on by him to construct some pattern, and because of that contains a potential mistake.

Such kinds of illusions are characteristic of physiological processes, for example, optical as well as social. The basis of visual illusions (visual perception error) is similar and means that an individual often sees the object itself without noticing the background. Seeing a particular but not the whole is one of the central reasons of human life’s stereotyping.

Focusing attention on an object is the way to distorting knowledge, space and time, “brain shut-off” according to Buddhists. To put it differently, a sign, speaking is always a mistake. The very thought about something is concentration and because of that it is erroneous from the point of view of the Dao philosophy: “Insight comes when the thought exhausts itself,” that’s one of the Dao maxims.

A vivid example of the social illusion is the fundamental error of casual attribution. The essence is that in this or that event an outside viewer is inclined to overestimate personal qualities of the subject responsible for the event and not notice the background – the situation that brought about the event.

The Chinese phrase that the one who says does not know and the one who knows does not say, confirms the effects listed above. There is always an error in presentation, lacunae of silence in case of transfer from an image, plan or conception to its description in words. The meaning of the original image lost while speaking turns into distortions of the reality, illusions. Lacunae of silence are barriers in understanding Another One, communications with him originate in the course of transfer from the whole to the logical – unidirectional. There are various types of barriers in communications – semantic, informational, and psychological. These barriers characterize the borders of individual’s inner space, the borders of his identity. At the same time they serve the reason of one individual’s failure to understand another individual, inability to hear. There barriers go beyond the framework of a certain individual and spread outside him – to interrelations with other people. The more silence there is inside an individual – silence at the “exhaustion” stage, when there is nothing new to say, the more silence there is between people as silence in the world: total speaking and idle talking.

That’s the logos of education today, and as a result the humanity rapidly moves to the post-humanism stage. The decline of the “clean sheet” concept in education is very well illustrated in the Brave New World, a novel by Aldous Huxley. The hypnopedic teaching method is described there, it means that people were suggested one and the same phase day and night, the same postulates. One of the characters exclaims: “62,400 repetitions – and you have the ready-made truth!” Hypnopedia is similar to translation, it does not take subjectivity into account and because of that it is a monologue.

Copying does not just expand the external borders of an individual but multiplies the amounts of pleasure. That’s the reason why students answer negatively to the question asked by one of A. Huxley’s characters: “Have you ever run across insurmountable obstacles?” There are no efforts in future education.

Learning and mastering the “alien” leads to post-individual’s mentality and knowledge generated by it being “made a prosthetic appliance” by communication and information. A post-individual is an “expanded man”.

One individual’s understanding of another individual is the act of his self-change that takes place in the process of student discovering himself. Discovery of oneself is the change of the inner space in comparison with the outside space. The pedagogical mechanism capable to provide deep understanding of another individual is silence. An individual’s “coming back” – his inner space of meanings takes place in silence.

L. N. Tolstoy, the author of the free development school, wrote that people learn how to speak when the main science is how and when to be silent. “The tragedy of today’s school is that a child there is taken away the right to be silent”, V. V. Bibikhin echoed him.

What do we understand under silence in pedagogy? In the Eastern pedagogic tradition in contrast to viewing an individual as a “clean sheet”, an individual is looked upon as a “seed of an unknown plant”. Such a methodological view of the human essence and the question “What to teach for?” certify the inner, holistic and not the external rational way of cognizing the reality. For example, the main teaching of truth in India is the ontological concept of two truths: the higher – paramartha and the lower – vyavahara. Hence logical and epistemological truths acquire the lower status than truths allowing to achieve the highest level of reality.

Truth in the Sufi teachings is revealed only in personal experience, and the heart is the main organ of cognition. The heart’s cognitive ability is not identical to the epistemic ability of the mind.¹²


The priority of the inner in comparison with the outside means deepening and not expansion of the outside individual’s borders, determines silence as the main methodological tool for cognizing oneself and the surrounding world. Let us mention the specific, mystic and religious role of silence in all ancient Eastern teachings: Daoism, Buddhism, culture of American Indians. Silence is presented as a psychological and emotional practice, manifestation of austerity, reticence and consequently, the method of self-understanding, formation of moral, will-power qualities of the person, the way to communicate with the Creator.

Reflection of the reality without distortions, presenting an opportunity to “all things to be what they are” is the guarantee for one individual’s perception of another individual as an equal. A possibility to see him from different perspectives, have a dialogue with him.

The issue of understanding everything and meta-subject knowledge is close to all-forgiving: “To understand everything, to forgive everything.” The ability “to see things as they really are” introduces the way to the dialogue between representatives of various cultures.

If silence in the East is the practice of psychological and emotional cognizing the truth, “silence” category studies are a considerable theoretical part of the European rational heritage. Many outstanding Western thinkers addressed the philosophical problem of silence, such as S. Kierkegaard\(^2\), M. Heidegger\(^3\), E. Husserl. A number of works under the same title, *The Philosophy of Silence, The Methodology of Silence*, are an attempt of a chorus of rational voices from the West to penetrate the mystery of the East, zealously kept and protected.\(^4\)

There is much more silence in the pedagogical research of silence than in philosophy or linguistics. We’re mainly speaking about the moral and ethical, psychophysiological aspect of silence, formation of child’s discipline, working at his attention.\(^5\) It’s appropriate to remember M. Montessori’s lessons, the lady who proved that the unity of the body, state of mind and spirit was achieved by movement and silence and that inner tranquility in silence helped an individual to build the reality.

As for some results, it has been proved that such lessons in silence help the child to acquire calmness, inner tranquility and control over one’s locomotor activity, meditative and creative concentration that is related to calming. The silence methods form reflection and the ability for inner immersion (concentration), make focusing easier and allow to discover oneself, one’s inner depth thanks to making various actions, without saying a word.

\(^{1}\)“Only the one who understood oneself in oneself can allow all things to be what they are” (Hong Zicheng “Taste of Roots”). See: *Malyavin V. F. Old Chinese Aphorisms*. Moscow, 2004.


Professor T. Olearczyk mentions that silence in pedagogy is of vital importance both in the educational process and bringing-up. However, its role is most important in the teaching process, in self-development and will formation.

“The pedagogy of silence is not an alternative for the pedagogy of word: dialogue, convincing, but it is its basis, its indispensable condition.”\(^7\)

Modern authors M. Zembylas and D. Michaelides ask a rhetorical question: “What’s the value of education that ignores the pedagogical value of silence for an individual and the society as a whole?”\(^8\) “There is something that exists beyond the said, something that is impossible to transmit orally, and he (Merleau-Ponty) calls it a quiet and non-evident language.”\(^9\)

Besides the communicative, psychophysiological potential of silence in teaching, a number of Russian and foreign authors “approach” the didactic component. There are a lot of interesting ancient practices that can be used in today’s pedagogical practice. “The one who knows does not say, the one who says does not know.” Because of that “The wise man teaches silently” is the essence of one of the main philosophical thoughts of Daoism.\(^10\) The words about silence in the American Indian culture are also interesting: “The one who keeps silent knows twice as much as a chatterbox.” It’s appropriate to remember the Pythagorean School where students were forbidden to speak up to the 3rd year at school.\(^11\)

“Silence brings knowledge we have not mastered yet, thanks to our mystery we’re discovering our inner life... After the experience of keeping silent no one will be the same” (E. M. Standing). Special attention should be paid to the works by A. Caranfa\(^12\), A. Jaworski\(^13\), D. E. Cooper\(^4\), Helen Lees.\(^15\)

In the carried out didactic research they mostly speak about techniques, and not so much about methods of using silence at school. “When reading open lessons of the innovative type, you see that they are oversaturated with remarks, teacher’s questions and quick answers by students. There is no place for silence, though it is necessary to think over the asked question, get ready for a remark as an answer, ‘stop’ one’s own thought not coinciding with the one just expressed.”\(^16\)
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It should be noted that there is practically no pedagogical research in the field of methodology of silence in education, in the content of education – standards, textbooks.

What are the principles on which the content of education based on silence is built? What are the mechanisms for extracting knowledge in silence? What is the correlation of silence and speaking during lessons?

There is practically no research about how to include silence in the content of the teaching plans, programs, appraise the “silent” activity of a student – student’s individual experience of knowledge about himself, the surrounding world that can’t be expressed in words.

To put it differently, how appropriate is it to speak about the proper didactics of silence as a complete and whole science of teaching? What are its methodology, content, methods, evaluation criteria?

The philosophical and methodological analysis of characteristics of Eastern and Western civilizations of the cultural type allows to make a step forward. Quietness or silence is the second part of the individual’s being that can’t be separated from speaking as it’s impossible to separate day and night, body and soul. “The one who does not know how to keep silent, does not know how to speak either.” A text turns out to be empty and silent if it consists of words only. The logic of narration only, without silence does not allow to generate images, associations, eliminates creativity, deprives of an opportunity to understand oneself and another person. This, to a large extent, is the reason for distorted perception of the reality, barriers in communications, losing identity – the source of meanings and the inner space of individuals. A text without intervals of silence is monological and linear, it is deprived of an ability for self-continuation.

Silence as the “image-pause” is creativity, metaphor, “transportation” of meanings that leads to discovery. Education does not have enough silence as discovery of themselves by students. Information, common, belonging to no one, alienated from the student is empty and silent, it’s like a text consisting of words only. The outside world muffles, imposes external recipes. Students and teachers need pauses of silence.

The analysis of psychological, pedagogical, philosophical literature, the principle of microcosm’s similarity to macrocosm allowed us to review the concepts of the “question,” human mentality, dialogue of two societies – Eastern and Western – as inseparably interrelated.

Asking “reconciles” the East and the West, the realiy significant and imaginary (silent) parts of the dialogue of cultures. It provides the meta-subject and complete understanding by representatives of two cultures. Silence and translation of information (similar to speaking) at the educational level can’t achieve results separately – to help the student to open himself to the world and to himself.

The question as an essential element of didactic heuristics opens a well of meanings for us, generates the “knowing” silence and is borne out of silence. If asking orients the student to the outside, to creation of his system of knowledge about the surrounding world, silence has a reverse vector – inwards, to people holding hands and forming one whole meta-subject basis like the tree in the well-known movie Avatar.

Going deep into oneself is similar to archaeological excavations: each lower layer is more whole and presentative. The deeper the “well” of meanings, along which an individual goes deeper into his “self” in silence, the deeper his communications become, his competence to understand representatives of another culture. An individual’s “opening” to the world takes place in silence like in the question, “opening in being, towards ontological Another One (the paradigm of ontological opening)” (S. S. Khорузх).

Withdrawal from words and “younger” mentality to older layers of psyche is accompanied by the change, qualitative manifestation of the new knowledge about oneself and the world. There are less questions but each of them contains a bigger and bigger volume of knowledge. Questions become simple, capacious, wise.

The question is the “spear point” of motivation that is always “at the junction” of non-uniformity of meanings (motivation for communication), “borderline” (motivation for historism), rationality and irrationality, transcendence and the immanent, subjective and universal, measurable and immeasurable.

Conclusion

Writer Hermann Hesse thought that there are “in the wisdom of the East and the West... not hostile, fighting forces but poles ‘between which life is swinging’.” The way outside does not deny the way inside, and even impossible without it. This is not just a dialogue of cultures, dialogue of the two human hemispheres. This is the dialogue of cognition and communication. The whole world history is opposition of the logic of cognition and the logic of communication according to S. Neretina and P.A. Ogurtsov.

The ability to listen to Another One is possible in case of interiorization of the external into the inner experience, to put it simply – copying alien and turning it into one’s own. However, there is no change of the inner space, reflecting individual’s belonging to his culture, in this mechanism. The higher level is individual’s ability to hear another individual. The ability to hear lies in the individual’s ability to look at oneself from the outside, to take a detached view of oneself, the ability to change oneself. The individual’s inner space lives only in the condition of transformation in meeting another “non-zero” space.

Education as a process is not a “sum of sciences” that should be passed over to an individual. Education as a result is not a megalopolis with a multi-way infrastructure of roads and aqueducts, encompassing rationality. There should be “roads of spirit” in the megalopolis that lead to reflection of truth. Main roads of student’s discoveries of himself, allowing to uncover the world around him, fill it with his meaning and content. Main roads changing the student.

Finding oneself by an individual as a means of barrier-free communications with another individual is achieved by using heuristic teaching based on dialogue, the didactic system of silence. Silence and asking are the “Gordian knot” of the communication barriers problem.
