

Pragmatism on Cross – Culture – Identity

K. Sunitha Devi

Abstract : Bromley : “The political changes that took place in 1989 marked the end of a bi-polar power system’, and were responsible for an increasing sense of ‘a lack of fundamental political, social & economical impasse in ways of thinking future’.

The cross – cultural texts hyphenated writers)

Black / Asian – Chinese – American, Indo –Caribbean , Asian Canadian – etc.) ‘Broderline fictions’ speak from and across migrant identities’. Negotiate across ‘heavily policed zones of identity, Hegemony of Kingdom rules, New world ideological constructs on nationalists.

The hybridity of exploring & empowering.

a) *Fusion of culture*

b) *Resurgence of Ethnicity or cultural dislocation.*

c) *Travel writing.*

I. Introduction

Cross – Culture, or Multi – Culturalism suggests a human being whose identifications and loyalties transcend the boundaries of nationalism and whose commitments are pinned to a larger vision of global.

The Bonding & melding of human manifested linguistic merged in innovation culture, the oriented world, with varies degrees “ International, “transcultural, “Multicultural”, or inter- cultural.

The multi- cultural person is intellectually and emotionally committed to the basic unity of all human beings while at the same time recognizing, legitimizing, accepting and appreciating the differences that exist between people of different culture.

It is an identity based not on a “belongingners” implies. “To be a universal man”. (Including men and women).

“How much we know about the intellectual depth & breadth, how we relate to it”.

The traits in our life, towards birth, death, god, nature, self-aware of the embodies incorporate the shared premises, values, beliefs and day to day, largely unconscious, patterning of activities. It is all the integrated values. Cultural identity always takes the shapes of names. The cultural identity is a fabric of such images and perceptions embedded fusion of biological social, philosophical, gyro-scope.

Humanity’s essential physiological needs, food, sec avoidance of pain etc. are one part of the reality pattern of cultural identity. The parameters of identity are neither fixed nor predictable, being responsive.

According to James Joyce: “A language in its own right” not divorced under other cultural productions.

The first cross – cultural studies were carried out in 19th century by anthropologists such as Tylor & Morgan. The phenomena of intercepting culture are then accused of mistaking colour, concepts of justice, linguistic.

II. Objectives :

Values & world view:- “ Bicultural families” in which the parents come two different cultures, (one from hierarchical and other from minority) both identity, traditional beliefs. Racism & prejudice, economic status, posses the impact on psycho-socio status. The diversified diasporic impact on the growth.

The differing world views, and ethical practice are silent issues of cross – cultural identity.

- 1) **Ethical Dilemmas:-** The need to protect the statutory rights of members of social community, the need of remain sensitive to. Informed self – regulation and reasoned discussion are essential.
- 2) **Cross – culture pragmatic :-** It explains how language users are able to overcome the Ambiguity, meaning relies on the manner, place, time, of an utterance. It pervades linguistic anthropology & describes a situation object or mental state.

All the cultures do not posses the same history. Different cultures perceive different ideas & relationship. It negotiates identity in a given host and allusion. Metaphor claims to serve both as an analogy for the act of cross – cultural communication and cognition.

Derrida’s opinions difference and ‘fragmentation’, “hybridity”, and diaspora.

- a) “Our identity is constructed and we are positioned through texts written by other people”.

- b) Andre green (9th Balibar – 2002 : 75) has remarked that “ you can be a citizen or you can be stateleters, but it is difficult to imagine being a border”.
- c) Charles Taylor writes : “ We want our lives to have meaning or weight, or substance, or to grow towards some fullness (sic) (.....). But this means our whole lives. If necessary we want the future to “redeem” the past to make it part of a life story which has sense or purpose, to take it up in a meaningful unity (....)

It seems clear from all this that there is something like an a priori unity of a human life through its whole extent.

Cognitive Procedures :

- a) It is regarded not some port of identity but as a “being in becoming”. There is a large space in between receiver and sender.

Eg :- Aristotle (1926 – 395-7), for whom metaphor was not mere decoration or adornment, but a cognitive instrument which teaches by making us understand something after a process of syllogistic inference.

- b) **Intertextuality** : Traditional genres to ethic experience shows how to represent the alien subjectivity on semiotic level. Intertextuality bridges the experiential and cognitive gaps that separate disparate subjects enables empathy to be generated between subjects from different cultures.

Intertextual is intrinsically a dual sign on account is intertextuality is a transposition of one text to another which leads to the latter’s transformation the arrival of foreign subjects always transforms the host society.

As a working definition, the trans-cultured self may be described as one who Can dwell in travel, that is who can temporarily acculturate to the other’s world, but without losing hold of the self. It is not hybrid but a fuller recognition of itself through confrontation with difference, and simultaneously, to the sense of its own limitations.

‘Literary competence and heuristic reading’, “Ungrammaticality” make the culture gaps.

- c) **Culture as a Coherent** : Culture is something ‘Out there’, and an inter-cultural event is one in which ‘Cultures Collide’, English as a bridge across races. The spread of English to all the countries expanding circles and resultant changes in the language at phonological, lexical, grammatical & discourse levels.

People describe the multiple new varieties of English as manifestations of a transplanted, indigenized, reincarnated language. The language was transported from its native soil (U.K.) transplanted into an alien soil (India eg:) English being a Cultural bearer of the British or Western world is in the hands of Castrator given it a new shape, & dimension.

Raja Rao (1938) echoes the views voiced by Achebe, ojaide and Soyinka. In the foreword to Kanthapura he admits that a language that is not one’s own “is inadequate to express” the spirit that is one’s own.

Raja Rao is his theme in Kanthapura breaks the formal English Syntex. Nearly after sixty years after independence Indian English finds it difficult to free itself from the weight of “Received Pronunciation”.

National cultures are homogeneous V/S heterogeneous programming.

Culture :- Arts and other manifestation of human intellectual achievement regarded collectively the customs, institutions and achievements of a particular nation people or group.

Table – 1

Social Identity	Historical context	Economic parameters	Institutional factors	Geography
Mass public culture, language, religion, literacy, sec ratio, territorial mobility for members.	Myths, historical memory, homeland, colonization extent of external influences.	Economic systems, economic development technology, industries.	Government Legal law right and duties	Climate topography

The Interpretation of Language :- The pragmatics on language depends on he “identity relates to desire for security and safety”. Through the use of mother – tongue one constructs his/her identity. By pragmatics study of language use and “the study of relations between language and context that are basic to an account of language understanding”. What is meant by a particular sentence is not necessarily what a speaker literally means by that sentence in a particular context.

The incompatibility in behavior, attitudes and values between ethic and the mainstream cultures may cause psychological stress.

The cross – cultural Metaphors :- In 1980 Lakof/ Johnsom introduced it to a cross cultural corpus. It is the inter-disciplinary term for inter – cultural communication.

The concrete ways of experiencing the world; to express abstract target domains. The culture – bound of mapping. We use universal and non-universal constructs while communicating. In contrast to the term culture

specific it does not make the claim of describing something culturally unique. The cultural dimension in verbal and non-verbal interaction.

The “images” different languages and cultures employ diverse. There are 4,600 languages spoken around the world today. Lack off distinguish between “complex metaphors from” primary metaphors. “Theories are buildings” from “Logical organization is physical structure’. The human experience is the major force.

Rakova emphasize the quote :- “My claim is that experientialism is often relativism is the strong sense, and that the supposed universality of directly meaningful concepts and kinesthetic images schemes is not consistent with the idea of culturally defined conceptualizations”.

The variation of cross – culture :- The variation can occur along a number of dimensions including the social, regional, ethnic, style, subcultural,, diachronic and individual dimensions; they do have their idiosyncratic metaphors.

In poetry:- Eg. In Sylvia plath, the relationship of her mother is conceptualized metaphorically both umbilicus. The cultural belief system also involves the religious beliefs that are entertained in a given culture.

Sub-lateral of cross-cultures :- a) The configurations of elements & characteristic ways of interrelating that are shared with neighboring and interacting groups and shared among dispersed groups, that have common historical experiences and similarities, including common origin, common membership in historical civilizations, & languages.

b) Holo-cultural Study “is usually designed by Tylor to summer. It is ‘usually designed to test or develop a proposition through statistical analysis of data on sample of ten or more non-literate societies from three or more geographical regions of the world”. Cross – cultural analysis are used to describe the range and distribution of cultural variation existent in the ethnographies recorded as well to test the hypotheses and theories that are proposed to explain the variation recorded.

“Culture is in “human nature’. Cultural anthropologists focus on symbolic culture whereas archeologists focus on material & tangible culture. The perceptiveness traits are understood out of the context of the in one piece civilization and are compared with discernments traits in different culture to learn patterns of regularities and differences within the comprehensive ground work.

a) The dimensions of Culture :- Power distance – which member of the society accept & how dominion.

b) Individualism :- How citizens face to their close people.

c) Collectivism:- Where empire belong to in-groups (families clans organizations)

Masculinity :- The predominant values engrossment on realization and substance natural event.

Femininity :- Which immersion on protective for others & point of duration.

Uncertainty elusion :- Measures the magnitude to which family have a feeling vulnerable by dawdling & expression & try to turn away Confucian dynamism. The long-term versus short term orientation plumbed linked to the past.

The Indian Jugged in cross – culture :- It is the context of management. It is a sort of out – of the box and network style thinking that could serve us in times of charge, crisis and extreme circumstances.

“It is a unique way of thinking & acting in response to challenges. Theses still a strong cultural stigma to failure in India.

III. Conclusion :-

Pragmatics experienced or observed are real, believe that is constantly chaining, learning applying or experiences thoughts of problems, as they arise. The universe is dynamic and evolving a “becoming” view of world. The thought must produce “Action”, rather than linger in the mind and lead to indecisiveness.

Reference:

- [1]. Aristotle (1926) : Art of Rhetoric. Trans J.H. Freest Cambridge, Harvested University press.
- [2]. Derrida . J (1978a) Writing & difference London : Athlone press.
- [3]. Greetz, Chifford : The Interpretation of culture – Basic books London 1973
- [4]. Raja Rao – Kanthapura New Delhi : Orient Paper facts
- [5]. Mitchell D (2000) “Cultural geography”, Oxford Blackwell.