CULTURAL HERITAGE AND CONTEMPORARY CHANGE
SERIES I, CULTURE AND VALUES, VOLUME 19

PHILOSOPHICAL CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES OF GLOBALIZATION

Volume I

Volume II

Edited by
OLIVA BLANCHETTE
TOMONOBU IMAMICH
GEORGE F. MCLEAN

The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

At this turn of millennia the life of humanity is becoming increasingly global and for a number of important reasons. Physically, we have developed the capacity to transform the environment of the entire earth -- though often for the worse, rather than the better. Indeed, we now have even the nuclear capability to destroy broad species, including humankind as a whole. Economically, with the end of the Cold War the world is no longer divided between two world systems, but now constitutes one economy so that collapse at any point has a ripple effect throughout. Politically, the needs of a particular nation, through alliances and international systems can have determinative impact upon the lives of people everywhere. Culturally, through the communication media the same pervasive power is at work.

Is the overall effect good or bad? Both can be argued -- and indeed were deeply explored at a conference entitled "Philosophical Challenges and Opportunities of Globalization." This was held in Boston on the occasion of The World Congress of Philosophy and was co-sponsored by The International Society for Metaphysics, The World Union of Catholic Philosophical Societies, The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy and Boston College.

This conference responded to the fact that rationalism had long considered philosophy to be an individual endeavor conducted abstractly in the privacy of a closed study or within the confines of a certain national spirit. In certain respects philosophy will retain something of this. But, in the face of globalization understood culturally as well as economically, philosophy must deepen human self-understanding corporately through joint phenomenological reflection and interchange upon the conscious human experiences of all peoples. The conference brought together philosophers from all parts of the world for just such concentrated discussion and critical evaluation of globalization itself.

Globalization is a new phenomenon with economic, political and cultural-philosophical dimensions. Economically, it is in interlocking supra-national system with power to effect the development and underdevelopment of the different parts of the world, rich as well as poor. As a system, it has certain overarching tendencies in relation to such higher human interests and values as personal identity, social justice, national sovereignty and the various conceptions of cultural and religious life. It can marginalize not only people in various parts of the world, but also things, social as well as individual, which are valued by people as human beings.

Politically, it constitutes a system of interchange of power with which peoples in all parts of the world must contend, each in their own ways, in order democratically to maintain their human identities in cooperation with others.

Culturally, globalization allows a new openness of the human spirit which may present opportunity as well as challenge. In retrospect, the last millennium could be interpreted as a great project of human reason, beginning from the high middle ages with the reintroduction of the Aristotelian corpus and the great *Summas*. This focus upon reason was radicalized in the Enlightenment with many undoubted good effects enabling the world to support a burgeoning population through inventions ranging from nutrition, to communication, to law. But this radicalization has remained largely Euro-centric in its thinking, marginalizing other forms of thought and culture and leaving them far from liberated.

Soon after Descartes, J.B. Vico noted that so radical and exclusive a focus upon reason in the laboratory of clear and distinct ideas would not allow for the development of other, properly human dimensions of human awareness, but instead would generate brutes -- intellectual brutes, but brutes nonetheless. Recently, especially with the collapse of the cold war, we have become

more sensitive to the limitations of the abstractive power of this Euro-centric technical reason which channeled social understanding toward the extremes of individualism and communism. Looking back, there appears now to be a fairly universal consensus that we do not want to repeat the last century with its world wars, hot and cold; its pogroms, holocausts and mass -- even atomic -- bombings; and its economic and cultural exploitation.

This philosophical critique now extends across the entire modern project from left to right so that it is common to refer to present times as postmodern, if not post-European. But as life cannot be built upon skepticism, this opens a radically new opportunity, namely to regain and reintegrate other dimensions of reason, deeper reaches of the human personality and a broader range of sensibilities into more complete senses of life, diverse cultures, minorities, women and the environment. Whereas "postmodern" bespeaks criticism of what preceded, "globalization" points forward to a new philosophical agenda, namely, both horizontally to broaden awareness to include all peoples and cultures, and vertically to deepen to the metaphysical and religious dimensions of meaning and values where humanity dwells in the Spirit.

At the turn of the millennia, therefore, this conference explored the expansion of this sphere in which we live, and move, and have our being. This was an exercise of human responsibility for the reflective dimension of civil society. Among others the topics implied in this theme included a critical appreciation of reason and of the new reaches of human awareness; the implications of cultural awareness for the enrichment and extension of philosophy; and the responsibility of philosophy in the evolution from conflictual to peaceful human interchange -- not only economic and political, but especially social, cultural and religious.

Hence the structure of the investigation of globalization in the volume begins with Part I on "Economic and Political Globalization," proceeds to Part II on "Culture and Globalization," and concludes with Part III on "Globalization and Metaphysics, Ethics and Religion."

Part I on "Economic and Political Globalization" contains a variety of contrasting views. It begins with a set of critiques of economic globalization. Some are quite strong; together they reflect views from both North and South.

Chapter I by Oliva Blanchette, "Globalization or Humanization: A Question of Priorities in Human Development," presents a view of the economic order as oligarchic and exploitive of the poor.

Chapter II by Pablo Lopez Lopez, "Old and New Globalization," is equally strong in its critique of globalization as an imposition of the ideology of liberal capitalism upon other parts of the world. In this he presents a vigorous critique of Chapter V below by Gary Madison.

Chapter III by Fredrico Jose Alvarez, "The Deconstruction of the Antilles," describes what the above means concretely, using the example of his own Dominican Republic in the Caribbean.

Chapter IV by Chibueze C. Udeani, "African Cultural Identity in the Context of Globalization: Opportunities and Dangers," confirms the above by describing the effects of this process upon Africa, beginning from the period of political colonization and continuing today by economic means.

The above critical stance is strongly questioned by the positive description of globalization presented in Chapter V by Gary Madison "Globalization: Challenges and Opportunities." He presents globalization not as a process of suppression of differences and of peoples, but as opening new possibilities -- he would think, the only possibilities -- for them to thrive. This explains why participation in the global economic system is so ardently, if begrudgingly sought.

Chapter VI by Mervyn Fernando, "Violence and the Rising Tide of Globalization: A Teilhardian Perspective," would attempt to understand the violence which accompanies this process as a harsh, but passing phase of a generally progressive evolution in terms of the evolutionary of Teilhard de Chardin.

Finally Chapter VII by Nguyen Trong Chuan, "Globalization: Opportunities and Challenges," presents an overview of globalization in its benefits and burdens, which bridges from Part I to Part II.

Part II on "Cultural Globalization" focuses on the deeper cultural issues of globalization. It is true that globalization is shaped by issues of environment, economy and politics. But beneath these, culture operates at a deeper level to shape the responses of peoples to these challenges.

Chapter VIII by Tomonobu Imamichi, "Contraries and Compatibilities in a Time of Cultural Globalization," looks with great wisdom and insight into the character of the cultural interaction entailed by globalization or even the heart of globalization as the profound human phenomenon of our times.

Chapter IX by Vincent Shen, "Construction of a Meaningful World in *I Ching*," looks deeply into the roots of Chinese culture to find potential resources for this work, and even for the possibilities for developing virtual worlds in our future.

Chapter X by R. Balasubramamian, "Traditional Cultural and Modernization," views this from the perspective of classical Hindu thought and the potentialities of Indian cultures for globalization.

If this is to be a humane and creative process realized by humanity rather than imposed thereupon by the blind hand of the market and the profit motive or by the harsh hand of politics grasping for power, then it is necessary to see how the spirit works deeply. The following three chapters take up this challenge.

Chapter XI by Jean Ladrière, "The Aesthetic Dimension of Science," in a veritable *tour de force* faces this on the least promising terrain by looking deeply into science as mathematical to discern even there the role of the aesthetic. On a quite different level this path is followed in Chapter XII by Ghislaine Florival, "Reconstruction of the Subject in View of Contemporary Globalization," where she shows the role of the subject in the contemporary process of globalization, especially as this constitutes a human and hence ethical work. Chapter XIII by Nguyen Van Huyen, "Art and Its Suggestion to Man's Creative Potential," extends this to the aesthetic order.

Chapter XIV by A.T. Dalfovo, "From Global Interests to Cultural Values," looks at this from an African perspective and follows the deepening of insight from global economic interests to the progressive evolution of cultural values.

Chapter XV by Kirti Buchua, "Creation of New Philosophy in the Age of the Global Village," discusses how globalization implies a new approaches to the work of philosophizing itself in order not to suppress or ignore the culture of peoples, but to draw upon them.

Finally, Part III, "Globalization and Metaphysics, Ethics and Religion," takes the discussions deeper still to the level of metaphysics and religion. Samuel Huntington in his now famous *Clash of Civilizations* notes that each great civilization is founded upon a great religion and conversely that each great religion (except Buddhism) has generated a civilization. If there is truth to this analysis then understanding the challenges and opportunities of globalization requires a deeper inspection of the roots of the cultures involved.

Chapter XVI by Margaret Chatterjee, "Religion and Social Harmony," begins this search by pointing out a new and perhaps paradoxical phenomenon in this regard. While the great religions were universal in intent they were strongly transcendent in their orientation to a life above and beyond this globe. Now the horizon shifts so that the emphasis is rather imminent than transcendent, and is experienced phenomenologically as a matter of ultimate concern.

Chapter XVII by Mihaela Pop, "The Promethean Man: Eastward or Westward?," suggests another alternative, namely, that of those who, turning away from the transcendent, fall into the secular humanism of the modern West.

Chapter XVIII by Duan Dezhi, "On the History, Theoretical Difficulties and Prospects of Subjectivity in Western Theory," combats this danger of all becoming merely a matter of human subjectivity in which the reality of the divine as more than human would disappear.

Chapter XIX by Tran Van Doan, "Maritain's Concept of Integral Humanism," attempts to bridge this divide by pointing to a missing link in Maritain's integral humanism. This sees human transcendence as a deification through the Incarnation of Christ as God-man, but it does not carry out the parallel reasoning to show how the human, though not divine, is essentially oriented to transcendence.

Chapter XX by Errol E. Harris, "The Problem of Sovereignty in International Relations," sets globalization in tension with national sovereignty. In fact we do not now have structures for a simple transfer of power from nations to supra-national entities. But this may not be so necessary if life and hence responsibility is conceived in broader terms, along with our sense of responsibility. This can be especially true to the degree that social cooperation is included from within and below, rather than being imposed coercively from without and above.

Chapter XXI by H. Daniel Dei, "Identity and Globalization: The Metaphysical Question for the 21st Century," carries this line of argumentation to its culmination by bringing to light the ontological underpinning of human life. This relates man to God while assuring the ontological distinction of both. In this way he lays the deep metaphysical ground for globalization as not suppressing but enhancing persons in their being and cultural identities.

Chapter XXII by R. Magliola, " Two Models of Trinity -- French Post-Structuralist versus the Historical Critical: Argued in the Form of a Dialogue," goes still further to carry the discussion into the life of the Trinity. He does this in a way that illustrates the potential benefits of globalization. He opens the issue of the Trinity by a positive use of postmodern thought and then engages Buddhist thought to enable the human spirit to relate more fully to the Trinitarian life.

Chapter XXIII by William Sweet, "Globalization, Philosophy and the Model of Ecumenism," considers globalization as a process lived by people and illustrates this by the form of dialogue already emerging between religions.

Chapter XXIV by George F. McLean, "Globalization as Diversity in Unity," draws on the thought of Nicholas of Cusa to model a new way of thinking, now not in analytic terms of the parts but in synthetic terms of the whole.

In sum, the volume itself reaches across boundaries and reflects a global vision, not only through the combined dialectic of the studies, but through the origin of its authors. In both these ways it opens the way for the exploration of human comity upon which we enter in the new millennium.

CHAPTER I

GLOBALIZATION OR HUMANIZATION
A QUESTION OF PRIORITIES IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

OLIVA BLANCHETTE

Economics has become a dominant factor in modern political life. It used to be that the life of a city or a nation could be guided by high moral or spiritual principles and by cultural aspirations of communion. But now it seems that everything we do in modern societies is governed by some economic necessity to which we must sacrifice our other spiritual and social aspirations and values. It seems that political consciousness, or the consciousness of a community, has become totally subordinate to economic consciousness, or the consciousness of commercial interests.

It has not always been this way, In fact, if we go back to the Greeks, who were the first to advance the idea of politics as dedicated to the pursuit of the good life, meaning the higher things of life in accordance with reason and virtue summed up in social justice for a community, we find that economic necessity hardly ever came into the scope of political consideration. In its original meaning the term "economic" itself, as understood by the Greeks, had to do with principles or laws *(nomoi)* for governing a household *(oikos).* These were matters of necessity in Greek society as well as in any other society, but they were dealt with on the level of the family, which included wives and slaves, as well as husbands. Political life had to do with the broader, more liberal pursuits of the *polis* or community.

This is how Plato and Aristotle saw things; they both organized their political thought around the four cardinal virtues of prudence, justice, courage and temperance, following the lead of Socrates in his appeal to the more noble side of Athens that transcended its economic interests, Questions of economic necessity hardly come up in Plato's *Republic,* except with reference to the luxurious life. Aristotle mentions moneymaking at the beginning of the *Nicomachean Ethics,* but only to dismiss it as a matter of means toward the good life and not as an end one might strive for, like pleasure, honor, or contemplation. These three ends he does consider positively in determining what we mean by the good life. The only thing both Plato and Aristotle say about economic necessity in their political philosophy has to do with social justice as it is understood in the light of a community: too great a disparity between the rich and the poor or too great a disproportion among them makes continuing life in a community impossible and hence unjust, no matter how the wealthy have come by their riches.

It is the expansion of economics into the whole of political life in modern times that has revolutionized this ancient view of the relation between the economic and the political. We see this expansion clearly in the title of the book, Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations,* written by the moralist who launched the modern science of political economics. He began to define wealth in political, rather than household terms. Thus we now speak of political economy, instead of just plain economics and of laws of supply and demand in the creation of such wealth through markets. The seeds for this expansion of economics into the whole of political life, however, were sown at the origin of modern political philosophy in social contract theory, where necessity of securing property became the principle or the sole foundation for establishing political life itself under an authority that would hold everyone in awe of its power and where possessive individualism became the only reason for agreeing to live under a government.

Hegel, as a social and political philosopher, had to struggle against this subordination of the good of a community to the good of individuals in isolation. At first he longed for a return to the Greek idea of political life as the life of a people, a*Volk,* which represented for him, not just the highest ideal of human life, but also its best and most beautiful actualization ever achieved on earth. It was the study of modern economics that shook him from this nostalgia for Greece and made him realize that there was no return to this beautiful society in harmony with nature and the gods. From this study of economics came his philosophy of the modern State as the solution to the problem of restoring the priority of the spiritual or the ideal of community life over the necessity of organizing the whole of a people's life around economic contingencies. Hegel's solution consisted in reinstating the political society, now institutionalized as the State, as higher than civil or economic society as organized by corporations and in promoting the spiritual development of a people over and above its economic development.

We all know what Marx came to think of this idealization of the State. He saw it as only an ideology, a means for perpetuating the rule of an economic ruling class. Nevertheless, it was Hegel himself who had first discovered the dimension of economic necessity that is integral to the modern bourgeois State. Marx learned this from Hegel and then used it against him to attack his theory of the State, though without any attempt to promote a more truly spiritual kind of community life beyond economic success or possessive individualism. In trying to bring everything back to the economic dimension of civil society, Marx's idea of the historical economic class struggle was derived from Hegel as well as from the whole of modern bourgeois political philosophy, but without ever taking seriously Hegel's attempt to restore a communal spiritual life in the context of modern economic necessities and possessive individualism.

In line with this effort of Hegel, I reflect here on the dynamics of modern human development. In a way, what Marx had to say early in his life about communism could be understood in the same line as the solution to the riddle of history. However, his way of thinking became focused exclusively on the economic necessities of modern bourgeois society in order to bring out its contradictions and so hasten its downfall, as if there were nothing communal in it that could be salvaged for the human spirit. In other words, Marx pulled the debate right back to its modern bourgeois economic principles of competition in the marketplace and left it there, without allowing for any solution to the problems of society other than that of a monumental class struggle to substitute one economic system for another.

What came of Marx's efforts, thanks to Engels and Lenin, was another economic image that only mirrored that of the bourgeois system, a state capitalism that entered into competition with previously established bourgeois capitalism. This state capitalism eventually lost out in this competition when it collapsed internally through sheer incompetence. Its last remnants in Eastern Europe, Russia, China and Cuba are in the process of disappearing through the leveling effect of globalization in what has now become a single worldwide economy. But the problems of humanization which Marx as well as Hegel were trying to address in such an economy, have not disappeared. In fact, given the actual globalization of this economic system -- a globalization which was anticipated by Hegel and Marx as they viewed and defended the emerging European colonialism at the beginning of the 19th century -- the problems of humanization loom ever larger and more acute for all around the globe. We run the risk of becoming engulfed in a movement that submerges the richness of human values and diversity into the single dimension of economic value or just doing business for its own sake or for the sake of profit.

The question for us here is: How can we reestablish the priority of human, spiritual and communal values in the face of an overwhelming force of economic necessity that now reaches

to the remotest regions of the earth with its monolithic or oligopolistic system, or a universal melting pot condensing everything into one thing, money or financing, regardless of any spiritual diversity? Is there still room for liberation and humanization in this system that now encompasses us all as in a large economic pot kept in a constant stir for its own benefit, no matter what happens to the less advantaged members of any society in the process?

This is the question I would like to explore here. Judging from the way I have framed the question, some might surmise that I tend to be rather negative or pessimistic with regard to the prospects of finding any solution to this problem of humanization in such a massive and overpowering economic system. Actually, however, I do have great faith in the resilience of the human spirit even among the most oppressed people in the world. There are infinite resources for humanization and liberation that remain untapped in the human spirit, especially among the poor and the disadvantaged of the earth, who can appreciate the need for liberation better than anyone else. The problem is to allow or to enable these resources to find their own voice and to start working for their own humanization. It is not for me to say just how this will be done. It is more for me to describe the problems resisting our efforts toward humanization and liberation, for unless we understand the magnitude of the problem we cannot take any appropriate steps to overcome it.

I shall try to describe the problem, or the challenge, in two steps. First I shall describe the phenomenon of economic globalization as it has come about in our time from a center of economic development to a periphery of underdevelopment. Then I shall show how privileged groups or individuals, or large corporations, have come to dominate the world in and through this system, superseding even political authority, in order to turn whatever they touch to their advantage or profit and to perpetuate their world domination under the guise of markets that are purportedly free to everyone. In conclusion, I shall speak about solutions to this problem of humanization and liberation in the face of such an overwhelming economic necessity dictated by an ever-decreasing number of large corporations.

THE PHENOMENON OF ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION

The phenomenon of globalization in the economy is a momentous fact in world history with which we must contend, but one that is largely hidden from the casual observer or the public eye. Its enormous ramifications affect the choices made by millions of people around the world. However, it is largely ignored by most people, especially those who stand closest to the center of the phenomenon and benefit from it without wanting to say or having anything to say about it. Even those who report the news concerning business and the economy seldom advert to this central fact of the economy and how it affects decisions made worldwide. Even though it is called a global system, few people stop to look at how the system works as a whole, which, to borrow a phrase from Hegel and Marx, is generally behind the backs of most people.

If we are to face up to the challenge of globalization in our own decision-making as human beings, and not leave all decision making in the hands of a dominant global economic system, we must understand how the system works in pursuit of its own ends. These ends are perhaps in fact not the same as our ends as human beings and members of the human community. We must examine the system, much as Marx did the 19th century bourgeois economic system, not to get deeper into it and remain there as Marx did in his purely economic analysis of the class struggle, but in order to find ways of escaping from it and finding a more humane way of living the good life.

Partly we tend to ignore the fact of globalization in the economy because it disguises itself in the language of liberal economics about free markets, free trade and global competition. It is a highly centralized planning system, as we shall see, but it gives the semblance of haphazard activities of buying and selling in different markets that appear disconnected from one another even though they are highly integrated by large corporations which oversee the whole. It consists of many markets, commodities, stock, bond, futures, labor, money, foreign exchange. But at the core are the financial markets that have interests in all these markets. Over all these markets there hangs a certain mystique of freedom and competition, although no one knows what is going to happen next, about how fortunes are made and lost or whether there will be work for tomorrow or food to put on the table. At the center of the world economic system there are the large corporations who know better than anyone else which way things can go and who can make things go their way before anyone else gets a chance to do anything.

To understand the function of globalization in the world economy, we must look beyond this mystification of markets to what has actually happened to the economy that affects the lives of people throughout the world. This requires an economic analysis of world history, without going into all the details that occupy financial analysts in their daily interactions. Their concentration on particular deals is usually what obscures the global dimensions of the economy and leaves them in the dark. Let us look at some of the salient features of today's international economy to see how it became globalized compared to earlier times. Let us consider the more prominent components of the economy, such as bringing commodities to market, production, labor, investments, finances and their relation to the environment, in order to see the effects of the economy on us. These components of the economy are the more important ones that directly affect human development.

First we examine the market in commodities, which has now become world trade or simply the world market. Prior to modern economic development, trade was a relatively local phenomenon. Trade used to take place in local markets where self-sufficient households met their economic needs by coming together to exchange their surplus goods for goods they needs. In time, people prospered, especially in Europe, and procured more distant goods, such as spices and silk from the East or gold from newly discovered lands. Thus began globalization in trade which took the form of colonialism, even as it had done in ancient Greece with the economic expansion of Athens and Sparta. But world trade was still only partially globalized. It was a fringe phenomenon around local or national economies in no way approaching the full-fledged globalization of our day. Even in the less developed parts of the world where their colonial status tended to make them much more dependent economically on the colonizing powers, it was impossible for them to remain or to become even relatively autonomous and self- sufficient in their economy.

Now, however, with the advent of total globalization, the days of relative local or national economic autonomy and self-sufficiency are gone, even for the ruling central powers. If we look at the U.S. which has by far the largest economy of the world and which no other economy in the world can afford to ignore, we see that globalization has infected the system to its very core. The U.S. may be the most powerful economy in the world, and it may continue to be so, notwithstanding the challenge of the European Monetary Union. Yet, it is more conscious than any other entity of its dependence on global trade, global competition, global investments, global interest rates, global currency exchange rates and so on. A crisis in any part of the global economy is considered a crisis for the American economy and impacts its national interest. To be sure, in the U.S., Europe, Japan, or other developed economies, there is still room for some local

entrepreneurship in business, more so perhaps in the U.S. than anywhere else. If we look at what happens to the successful entrepreneurs in these countries we find that as they grow bigger, they usually have to compete in a world market fraught with competitors from other parts of the world. If they do not, they will be absorbed or bought out by corporations that do operate in the world market. Well over 90 percent of the business that is carried on in the U.S. or in other highly developed countries is conducted by the relatively few large corporations that operate on a world scale and compete with one another in what is now the world market. Every successful business man is conscious of this fact.

The same globalizing phenomenon can be seen in the realm of production which is at the core of economic activity. Here the point can be made with several examples taken from either highly-developed or less-developed economies. The assembly plant produces a highly sophisticated product, such as the automobile, for developed economies. It is still thought by many that different brands of automobiles are produced mostly within the confines of one national economy or another: American cars in the U.S., German cars in Germany, and Japanese cars in Japan. However, anyone who looks at the phenomenon of how cars are produced will realize that this is far from being the case. Whereas, there may still be a few cars that are produced by manufacturers who make all of their parts themselves, most of the cars that appearing on the world market are world cars, not just in the sense that they are sold in many parts of the world, but also in the sense that they are assembled from parts produced in different parts of the world. Different manufacturers buy parts all over the world, sometimes even from competitors in the world market, and depend on suppliers from many areas of the world for the parts they need to construct their final product. It is nearly impossible to find a modern automobile that has been built in only one country. Most cars are made up of parts from different companies; brand represents nothing more than the name chosen at the assembly plant or in a corporate headquarters. The same thing could be said about electronic goods, clothing, or other mass-produced commodities for markets that spread across borders everywhere.

Another facet of the global dimension in production can be seen on the level of specialized production which often characterizes less or underdeveloped countries. The more developed countries are not relegated to the sort of specialized production found in poor countries. The economic productivity of poorer countries is usually limited to supplying parts or a single crop or raw material which are required in another area of the global system. In this division of production we see how the poor countries are caught up in the world economic system and made to depend on it even more for their livelihood. Usually, one thinks economic activity makes life more prosperous for all concerned. This is not the case for economies that are forced to specialize by the world system. They can prosper only if the price of the commodity they offer on the world market remains high enough, which usually does not happen for very long, or if they are allowed to diversify their production through outside investments. People of poor countries are more severely locked into this world production system for their survival than those in rich countries; they depend on it totally, often despite the lack of decent livelihood or recompense for their labor.

The structure of labor parallels this structure of production in the global system. People seldom have a chance to labor directly to satisfy their basic needs or to better their lives. They are forced to labor in an exchange system which may or may not remunerate them sufficiently to meet their needs or improve their lives. In the developed countries labor has developed an adequate countervailing force to assure the rights of laborers to a just or liveable wage, decent working conditions or other social benefits. This has become a standard in estimating production

costs in certain parts of the global economy. In other parts of the world there are no such standards, and labor remains weak and at the mercy of the organizers of production, who usually show very little mercy or justice in their treatment of workers. The expansion of production to a global dimension has thrown the local labor markets into chaos. Even the countervailing force of labor in the developed countries is being eroded by relocating production facilities across national borders or from one area of the globe to another, from places with standards to places without standards. In this chaos, organizers can take advantage of labor everywhere. They can withdraw or threaten to leave populations without work in one location while they force people in other locations to work for the lowest wages, without benefits and decent working conditions. The global system provides economic advantage through relocating production to various parts of the world, thereby exploiting the weakness of labor everywhere; this is referred to as neo-liberalism in Third World countries. This liberalism is new only in the sense that the global system has given the organizers of production new opportunities to cut their labor costs at the expense of workers and communities, depriving them of a decent standard of living. All this impresses upon us the reality of globalization in our planetary economy. One more component confirms this reality and holds it in place, namely, the financing and investment component. Every economic system has its own banking and monetary system to sustain the circulation of goods and commodities. The global system is no exception, no matter how mysterious that system might appear to the casual observer. Once a society gets a bartering system and begins using money to facilitate the exchange of commodities, there are always people who participate in the economic system by managing money, by creating reserves and credit and by lending or advancing money for those who wish to launch or expand enterprises or to buy up the expensive goods that appear on the market. People in the business of exchanging money rather than goods profit by borrowing at a lower interest rate and lending at a higher rate of interest. Their product is the service of making money available wherever and whenever it is necessary for the other economic activities of producing, buying and selling.

In the Middle Ages all the kings had their bankers and financiers who were concerned only with a particular national system. The first international financiers were the families or individuals who bankrolled the great commercial enterprises that extended from the Far East to the Mediterranean and then around the European continent to the North Sea and the Baltic Sea. They were enriched by lending money to borrowers willing to take risks transporting goods on the high seas. They thereby amassed fortunes over several centuries before the Industrial Revolution. These people were also able to launch the Industrial Revolution by investing their money into the new modes of production as well as in the expanded commerce made possible by new modes of production and transportation. Until the Second World War most industrialized nations had their own banking systems presiding over the national economy, usually clustered around one large central bank charged with keeping the national economy sound and operational. Most banks within any given country seldom looked for business beyond their own boundaries, even the central bank had little to do with what was happening in other parts of the world.

After World War II things began to move toward globalization in the financial component of the economy as well. At that time most of the industrialized nations were in ruins, their economic systems in shambles, except for the U.S. World leaders with their financiers, bankers and economists met at Bretton Woods in New Hampshire to start planning on pulling a new economic system out of the ashes of the War. That is when such large international institutions as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank were established as mechanisms for stabilizing the value of currencies in the network of nations struggling to rebuild their economies

and for making funds available to the different nations in need so that they could restart their industrial machines. Those institutions worked very well for that purpose of rebuilding among the industrialized nations for twenty years. They were very much needed until most of the industrialized nations were back on their economic feet and ready to start competing with one another in an international economic order.

At that time, by the mid-1970s, the original purpose of the IMF and the World Bank had been served, but they remained as institutions on the economic world scene which they had helped to create and in which they would soon start serving purposes other than the one for which they had been created. After the mid-1970s a new phenomenon began to develop on the banking scene due to the emergence of the Euro dollar alongside the dollar backed by the U.S. government. This dollar was a currency, which was still being used as the standard of comparison for other currencies, but was now in the hands of private banks operating outside the pale of any regulated banking system. With large amount of this supra-national currency in hand, these banks now had new opportunities for increasing their profits on money they lent beyond what any regulated system would allow. At first it was only a trickle of money that Russia and China did not want to see captured in any Western national banking system. This soon became a huge flood of money after the energy crises of the 70s. Then the Arab oil-producing nations accepted payment for their oil only in dollars and deposited these dollars in Euro-dollar accounts in large private banks. These operated outside the regulated banking systems because they paid a higher interest on deposits. This is when private banks became international lenders to governments as well as to large multinational corporations, leading up to the enormous debt crisis of Third World countries that emerged in the 80s. Once again large corporations, this time financial institutions, were allowed to spread their influence recklessly across national boundaries and wreak havoc in the economies of poor countries with loans that should never have been made and that did not serve the good of the people for whom they supposedly were made. These were bad loans in every sense of the term from the very beginning, but they were never rescinded and only at the turn of the millennia were they substantively forgiven. They simply became the basis for a new international monetary system which the IMF and the World Bank were now called upon to enforce. Hence the financial crises of the 80s and 90s in Latin America and the more recent ones in East Asia. The ironic thing is that the management of the crisis is placed in the hands of the IMF, which is now in the business of protecting the international monetary system that caused the crisis in the first place and that keeps it as an open wound in the economy of poor, indebted countries.

This is called neo-colonialism in poor countries, in tandem with neo-liberalism in the organization of production. It is new because the colonizing power is no longer another nation as such, but a set of private financial institutions, using the clout of public institutions such as the IMF along with the clout of governments that support the IMF and its now private clients in order to enforce their hold over entire nations. There is no getting away from this phenomenon of globalization which dictates to entire nations what they can and cannot do in euphemistically-called "strategic adjustment programs."

There are other aspects of this phenomenon of economic globalization which we could discuss, such as the threat to the environment, which is especially impoverishing in underdeveloped countries. But we have seen enough to know it is something we have to contend with everywhere in the world, in rich as well as in poor countries. In rich countries it is hidden under a very complex cover of social relations, but it is no less real and problematic when we want to determine our own priorities in human development democratically. But first let me say

a little more about this global phenomenon of the economy and how it is controlled by large corporations who show concern only for their margin of profit and not for the well-being of anyone they deal with, least of all for any common spiritual or political good.

THE DOMINATION OF LARGE CORPORATIONS IN THIS PHENOMENON

We have a global economic network which controls the destiny of billions of people, not just in one nation but in all nations, rich and poor, North and South, West and East. Given this kind of system, it is important to understand who pulls the strings and with what purpose in mind. We are accustomed to think that governments pull the strings in most systems and that they do so in view of some common spiritual good for a community or a nation. But where is the government that can cope with the global economic system that is already in place and functioning for its own ends without the bidding of any single government? It is surely not the United Nations, though as an institution it does try to exercise some authority to establish peace and justice in the world. Nor is it in any other international court of appeals that can oversee the global economic system as a whole. Does this mean that there is no one in control of the system and that it is operating purely as a "free market," as we are told constantly in the press and by certain economists? Or does it mean that the system is in fact being controlled secretly behind closed doors by private institutions which are not open to the public and seeking their own private ends, such as profit making, often at the expense of the public or the common good of peoples around the world?

Everyone more or less suspects that there is someone in control of the global economic system, or controlling parts of it large enough to keep everything else in place whether at the top or the bottom. Not everyone, however, sees clearly who this someone might be and how they manage to keep their control a secret. What I would like to do here is identify who or what this someone is and bring out its purpose in exercising its control over the global economy. I shall speak of this someone as the large corporations which are now organized to operate on a global scale and which can be numbered among three or four hundred at the most. These corporations are often referred to as multinational, even though they are still identified by their national origin, for instance, Sony is Japanese, GM is American, Siemens is German and Lloyds is British. Many of them are thought of as industrial corporations in the business of production, but for the most part they are financial institutions in the business of managing money on a worldwide basis, buying and selling or closing plants and other corporations that actually do produce goods and, of course, selling goods wherever there is money to be made. All this is a matter of just doing business as far as they are concerned, but I would like to argue that it is also a matter of continuing their control over the global economic system they have created for their own private advantage.

We should first recognize that these large corporations are the creators of the global economic system. This system did not happen accidentally, as if by spontaneous generation from the mythical "free market." It came about as a result of planning by corporations, which, though they may have been small in their beginning, kept on expanding their sphere of business in competition with other corporations who were also expanding their spheres across national boundaries. We cannot go into the details of this planning here, but one can see something about how it enlarged to its worldwide dimension if one looks at how some of these large corporations came to be the international corporations that they are. One can do this by looking at any one of

these world corporations, no matter what their national origin, but let us indicate briefly how the phenomenon took place, starting from corporations with relatively humble American origins.

The phenomenon of globalization for American corporations began to take place early in the 20th century before World War I. At that time many American corporations already had successful operations or subsidiaries producing and selling American products in England and other parts of Western Europe. This beginning, however, was cut short by the First World War and the Great Depression; after World War II the phenomenon really took off. During the 1950s and 1960s, large corporations began to move both nationally and internationally in order to assume greater market share at the expense of smaller firms, showing a marked tendency toward monopolizing every sphere of business in which they were interested. If they did not always succeed in monopolizing the system, they did succeed in oligopolizing it, so that in most spheres we were left with even fewer large firms competing amongst themselves in the various markets around the world. The U.S. market itself ceased being wide open for anyone to join according to the untrammeled laws of supply and demand. It was no longer a system of perfect competition, where monopoly was supposed to be excluded and a free play of market forces reigned.

Some economists began talking of the existing system as one of imperfect competition, i.e., one in which some kind of monopoly was coming into play. Since the emergence of such large firms late in the 19th century under the leadership of moguls like Rockefeller, J.P. Morgan and Carnegie, there had always been a certain suspicion of large firms in the U.S. But that had not prevented more and more of them from emerging and coming to dominate most industries. It was noted, for example, by John Kenneth Galbraith, in his book on *American Capitalism*, that wherever a few giant firms dominated a particular industry, competitive market structures did not exist, and that such domination by a few giant firms was found in most segments of industry, as well as finance.

The only way some semblance of free market could be preserved in such circumstances was by developing counteracting forces on the part of consumers and workers in addition to government anti-trust regulation. In spite of these opposing forces, however, it was noted that, as firms grew larger in any particular market, such as oil, automobiles, or beverages, there tended to be fewer of them. There remained only a few, sometimes 6 or even only 2, where previously there had been dozens of firms, if not hundreds. These tended to exert ever greater domination over the markets which they controlled much to their mutual advantage, even though they stopped short of monopolizing and merging into one mega-firm. Even without explicit collusion among these few firms at the head of each industry, which was against the law, they managed to keep prices within a range that was acceptable to all of them and to keep other competitors from entering their market because they might have undercut the prevailing prices or challenged their total control of the market.

These few large corporations were able to keep other competitors out of their markets by the sheer size of their operation. This was made possible by the gigantic size of the American market itself at the time, whether in oil, automobiles, beverages, etc. The size of the American market enabled gigantic firms to develop by eliminating smaller firms. The large firms could then dictate what would be brought to market and at what price in their huge market. In every segment of the American economy, it was always the same phenomenon of concentration of a few large firms at the head of the market and the exclusion of other firms from the competition.

If law suits were brought against the large firms for violating anti-trust and anti-)price-fixing laws, each firm had a powerful legal division to defend it in the courts or to prolong the procedures by wearing down the government lawyers. As a result the charges were either

dropped or reduced to trivial proportions that the firms could easily absorb as part of the cost of doing business. The same thing is happening today in the same way as the three or four large tobacco companies defend themselves against suits charging them with knowingly undermining the health of American citizens.

The largest, fastest-growing market system of the world after World War II was an oligopolistic system where only a few large firms enjoyed any real freedom of competition. These firms were free to decide what to bring to market and what price to charge, and only some small market that the large firms had not yet taken over could enjoy such freedom. There was still room for small entrepreneurs, less than 10 percent of the American market, to start new firms and do business. Over 90 percent of the huge American market was held in the hands or under the control of less than 200 to 300 large firms. The only thing that these large firms did not completely control was the labor market because of the strong independent unions at the time, but the large firms were able to get around this constraint by automatically raising their prices to compensate for the added cost of labor.

During the Cold War, which only fueled the tendency toward globalization among large firms, interesting comparisons were made between the American and the Communist economic systems. Both were described as Centralized Planning Systems. On the one hand, the Communist system was characterized as a Centralized Public Sector Planning System, a form of State Capitalism. Under government control it devised Five-Year Plans both at home and abroad. On the other hand, the American system was seen as a Centralized Private Sector Planning System, much more hidden from the public eye, but no less real. This was much more effective as a form of centralized planning since it was hidden. (Cf. John R. Munkirs, *The Transformation of American Capitalism: From Competitive Market Structures to Centralized Private Sector Planning* [Armonk, N.Y.: Sharpe, 1985].)

I cannot attempt to give even a short description of this private sector planning system, but it consisted mainly of an interlocking system of directors among a few large financial firms and a larger group of industrial firms that could control over 90 percent of what was being produced in the U.S. There were no more than several hundred directors who sat on multiple boards and came into contact with one another regularly at different board meetings of this central core of perhaps a thousand large firms. They were not much more numerous than their counterparts in the inner core of the Communist parties who were devising their own Five-Year Plans on the other side in competition with the leading industrial nation of the world.

We now know who was to win in this competition between two large centralized economic systems, but we must not forget that the planning and domination on both sides was of the same nature. The only reason why the American model won is that the Communist model turned out to be less efficient. It collapsed as a capitalist system from the inside, while the American system has not yet collapsed and shows no sign of losing its totalitarian grip on the world economy.

While America was the supplier of goods to a world ravaged by war under the Bretton Woods's monetary agreement at the end of World War II everyone in America could be kept happy. There was plenty of work for everyone, wages were good, and there was an abundance of goods brought to market at an affordable price. Meanwhile the rest of the world, especially Europe with the exception of the Communist bloc, was digging itself out of its economic hole with the help of financial aid from America and goods bought from American firms with that financial aid. Thus American firms became increasingly involved in the world economy, drawing profit both from financial aid distributed abroad only to be reintegrated into the American oligopolistic system and from the large and prosperous American market itself.

But goods were not the only thing being exported by these large firms, who were the first to enter into the international market which they were in the process of creating. They were also exporting their own way of doing business, according to their model of oligopoly. When Europe and Japan began to emerge as economic powers in their own right in the mid-1970s, they discovered that they could enter into the existing competition only by developing oligopolistic systems of their own. This they were able to do easily enough because they had a model to follow and they were unhampered by anti-trust and anti-price-fixing laws. In fact, for these late-comers to the oligopolistic system, governments became part of the planning system together with the large national firms, yielding a mix of public- and private-sector planning which American firms considered unfair in their competition for markets in these foreign lands.

What arose, then, were a set of new, large oligopolistic firms in Europe and Japan which could and did compete successfully with large American firms in various markets. The net effect was to extend the oligopolistic market system to the entire world and to transform it into a totalitarian system, now capable of totally disposing of the upstart totalitarian Communist system on the other side.

This may seem to exaggerate the totalitarian aspect of this developing global system. Were there not a number of firms large enough to operate freely in this world system, and did these new firms not restore a certain competitiveness to the market? It is true that large American firms began to encounter a kind of competition from the outside which they had never encountered within the American market. Large European and Japanese firms were able to encroach on the market of American firms as had no one else for decades. The large American firms were now experiencing real competition for the first time from these large foreign firms that could undercut their prices and remain in business.

Nevertheless let us keep in mind that these new firms now operating on a world market were still relatively few and also quite large, not only in their own national markets, but more importantly also in comparison to smaller firms and even to the entire economy of smaller nations around the world, which still could be eliminated from competition. The ability of the large European and Japanese firms to remain in competition with the American large firms was conditioned by their being large enough themselves so that they could survive among the shrinking number of players in the market. What we got then was only a slightly larger set of large firms competing with one another on a world-scale and dominating a single world market. If we look at the way the more recent arrivals operate in the world market, we find that they have reinforced an oligopolistic system once dominated by large American firms by adding a few more large firms from other nations. In other words we still have the same oligopolistic model of economy functioning as a supra-national global system, only it is no longer just American or Japanese or European, but simply worldwide, beyond any national boundaries. At the core of this system is still a fairly restricted "Club" of large firms which holds sway, not only over workers, consumers, and smaller firms all over the world, including Post-Communist societies, but also over large and small nations.

I cannot describe this global system here, nor again explain how it functions in detail. Let me just mention *The Money Mandarins: The Making of a Supra-National Economic Order* (New York: Pantheon Books, c1986), by Howard M. Wachtel, a labor economist in the U.S. The book which describes how the system emerged with the collapse of the Bretton Woods agreement in 1974 and 1975, how it has developed since then into an international monetary system vulnerable to all sorts of speculation, and how it survives its own ups and downs with the help of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WE). These quasi-public

institutions, originally set up at Bretton Woods to facilitate bringing relief to countries mired in poverty and rubble, now serve to protect the monetary interests of large firms operating on the international credit markets.

What we have in the world today is a single, interlocking system of large firms in competition with one another that plans economic activity on a worldwide scale. From its centers in New York, London, Tokyo, Frankfurt and Singapore it reaches out in every direction around the globe, North and South, East and West, into formerly Communist countries, as well as into other emerging markets. It exchanges billions of dollars electronically all day and all night, while different parts of the world sleep or carry on their daily activities. A recent estimate has put the figure as high as $12 trillion dollars turning over daily in the foreign exchange market in 1997, as compared to only $190 billion dollars in 1986 (See Yergin and Stanislaw, *The Commanding Heights* [New York: Simon & Shuster, 1998], p. 371). It is difficult to understand what such large sums of money actually mean, but it is clear that there has to be a system to make such enormous amounts of transactions possible daily and that in this system there are winners and losers, as evidenced by the financial crises in the late 90s among East Asian economies. This system is constantly on the watch to implant itself in new places, like Yugoslavia or Africa. This is called investment, but it also becomes a means of dictating what is to be done in countries where it takes hold through so-called structural adjustment programs. Wherever they see a potential market for themselves, whether it be in China, which is still a Communist country, or Korea, or Ghana, the various large firms from different nations are interested in being the first to penetrate. At the same time they remain on the watch to keep themselves in the advantaged position they have developed in the places where they are already implanted, like the U.S., Western Europe and Japan. Moreover, whenever they see some of their number faltering, as in Thailand, Indonesia, or more importantly in Japan, with the risk that the entire system may be brought crashing down, they show a great interest in rescuing these large firms or banks so that the balance of control remains in the system.

These firms preach an ideology of free market and free trade around the world, but in this world market only they are free to operate as they see fit. Thus freedom does not extend to consumers, workers, smaller local firms, or even supposedly sovereign nations caught in their web. This is true from the smallest to the largest, from Haiti, the poorest nation in the Western hemisphere, to the U.S. itself, the largest and richest nation in the world. The mega-firms are really supra-national in the power they exert, though at times, when they are in trouble in some spots, say because of bad investments or loans turned sour, they look for a bailout from the county of their origin or the country of their investment. They can count on being given such loans because they are so large that they have become essential to the economic system of each nation, or more exactly because the economic well-being and survival of every nation depends on its oligopolistic system.

These firms want free trade among nations and are against all barriers. They want whatever advances free trade, like the European Monetary Union and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), because they know that no one else is in as good a position to take advantage of such agreements as are they. Once such agreements are in place, they are the first to take advantage of them on both sides of any border, often at the expense of people on both sides, including workers, consumers, smaller firms, or even nations. This can be seen in the European Union, and with NAFTA in both Mexico and the U.S. If President Clinton was refused "fast track" trade negotiating authority by the American Congress, the most serious legislative defeat of his presidency, it is because the American people no longer trusted him to protect their

interests in his rush to do the bidding of the large multi-national corporations, Japanese and European as well as American. All are equally able to take advantage of the situation by trading from both sides of any border at the same time.

These large firms are now set up as truly multi-national through subsidiaries in many nations, which usually are eager to have them come into their territory. Each multinational firm then does business with itself and for itself, in competition with other large firms, absorbing smaller firms on either side of the border. This they have begun to do with recently privatized firms in former Communist countries, leaving very little operating space for other, more genuinely entrepreneurial firms. They show little concern for the consequences of their operating policy on the social good of local communities. Indeed they locate there expressly to take advantage of low wages and weak environmental protection laws, conditions which they can no longer find in their country of origin.

The story could go on and on. It could include the on-going crisis in international financial markets and the effects which this collapse has had in Third World countries or in what are now called emerging markets, rather than nations. The understanding is that these nations will now have to submit to new strategic adjustment programs imposed by the International Monetary Fund to keep certain large key firms afloat in the global market, while others are let go because of their excesses in lending or borrowing at key moments of their development. This is what we see happening, for example, in the structural adjustment program imposed by the IMF on South Korea. This forced it to give up a large part of its autonomy in the management of its economy to the international financial institutions.

All this is part of an ongoing process that is truly supra-national in the sense that it is something above nations. Nations themselves, large and small, are caught up in the ebb and flow of this monetary system around the globe which dictates who is up and who is down and who is reduced to stagnation in the backwaters of the system. Everywhere the economy prevails over every other aspect of human life. The economy does not benefit the poor as well as the rich, or the common good of nations as well as the private good of large corporations. Rather, the oligopolistic economy grows at the expense of the poor and marginalized for the benefit of an ever-shrinking number of large multinational corporations. Meanwhile nations are losing more and more of their sovereignty and their ability to resist the dictates of large corporations or to act on behalf of their own public good. What we have is a new kind of rule in the world, one that is universal or cosmopolitan, but one under the control of large corporations and financial institutions seeking only their own private advantage and profit. The political and spiritual aspects of human life appear to have been totally absorbed by a supra-national economic power vested in a relatively small number of individuals or corporations who can dictate by a click of the mouse who wins and who loses in the struggle for human development.

THE PROBLEM OF JUSTICE AND LIBERATION, OR HUMANIZATION, IN THE FACE OF GLOBAL ECONOMIC DOMINATION

This is the supreme problem we have to face as human beings in the world today. It is surely the supreme problem for the billions of people who continue to endure poverty and hunger at the hands of a system that has benefitted many economically, but has also excluded or marginalized countless more from those same benefits, no matter what they try to do for themselves. It is no less a problem for those who have benefitted from the system, because it raises serious questions of justice and rights with regard to the good life to which all aspire as human beings and to

which everyone is entitled by his/her labor and participation in the human community, which is our common good.

There is no space here to go deeply into the human side of this problem. I have endeavored mainly to elaborate on the enormity of the problem we have to face as human beings. It is, I might add, a problem of our own making, much as Heidegger endeavored to elaborate on the problem or the challenge of technology in modern society. I have tried to describe the phenomenon or the fact which is for the world the supreme challenge. Each has to face this phenomenon in their own distinct way as a human being. It is important to survey how people are responding to this challenge around the globe and what opportunities for humanization, if any, they are finding therein. It is urgent to know how the priority of the human and the spiritual over the economic is being affirmed and restored in diverse places in the face of such overwhelming economic forces that insinuate themselves secretly into our very way of thinking as an ideology.

It is essential as well to know of some ways of resisting the force of this economic ideology which has been instrumental in creating such large, overpowering corporations. The Federal Government should be dedicated to the promotion of social justice and the common good above all else, but it has done little that is encouraging with regard to the issues described above. If we look at how the political system works in the U.S., we find it largely dominated by the special interests of the large corporations that support it financially through donations to electoral campaigns. These corporations use influence to further their ends in the global market or to resist any regulation of their activities that may be in keeping with the common good. Internally or nationally, the U. S. Government does exercise a certain amount of regulation of business activity, to keep excesses from inordinately damaging social justice and the common good, but these regulations tend to affect smaller corporations more than the large corporations with their means of getting around most regulations. Internationally, the Federal Government does everything to give free reign to large corporations in the pursuit of greater profits, enabling them, not only to get around all regulation, but also to turn the world into a sweat shop with the lowest of wages and the worst of working conditions, without regard for the benefit of those they are exploiting. In fact, as has been pointed out by Ralph Nader, it even sacrifices the rights of its own citizens to the World Trade Organization, which by agreement now has the right to rule on alleged violations of "free trade" behind closed doors without any sort of judicial process.

Where one does find some resistance to the cultural invasion of large corporations in the U.S. is more on the side of consumer advocates like Ralph Nader, who has become a hero of American culture in his fight against large corporations and their constant violations of rights and justice in carrying on their business. To be sure, this is a fight that addresses mainly individual rights of fair play within the American economy, but it has the spiritual effect of freeing us to seek higher and better goods than what large corporations are willing to offer us of their own accord. Environmentalists also carry on the same kind of resistance to the destructive ideology of development fostered by large corporations for the rights of nature, so to speak, or more exactly for the right of people to live in a healthy environment, rather than one sacrificed to the drive for greater profitability. This too is the kind of resistance one finds mainly in countries that are well-off economically, but it has a liberating kind of effect on people. It is unfortunate that underdeveloped countries do not have the same kind of resistance to the invasion of large corporations. Because of the dire necessity in which they find themselves, they are forced to give up their natural patrimony as well as their labor for a pittance.

One could talk also about the American labor movement, which has been mentioned as a countervailing force to large corporations in the American economy. But there the picture of resistance is less clear. Big labor has had a good record in demanding better or more just wages and working conditions for workers in the U.S., but it has closed itself off from the needs of workers in other parts of the world. In this it has been coopted by large American corporations, which learned to integrate them as part of their cost structure. Now that these same corporations have gone multinational American big labor finds itself at a great disadvantage in pursuing its demands. Large corporations can now move their production to other parts of the world, where labor is much cheaper, and they no longer need expensive American labor as much to carry on their business even in the U.S. The American labor movement has been slow to recognize the strategic importance of this globalization for large firms. American labor unions have fallen behind in their resistance to large corporations. Only now are they beginning to realize that they must join forces with workers around the globe in fighting for better wages and better working conditions, instead of acting as if they were only in competition with these other workers who are poorer than they and therefore willing to work for less. We see this in their reaction to the NAFTA agreement, where they are now beginning to struggle for better wages and working conditions on the Mexican side of the border as well as on the American side, since that is a way of maintaining their own position in the face of large corporations as well as bettering that of Mexican workers.

Finally, there is a more subtle kind of resistance to the domination of large corporations, a spiritual kind of resistance which can be found in the U.S. as well as in other parts of the world. This includes all sorts of people, ordinary people around the country, activists of all sorts like former President Carter and many politicians, as well as many Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's) like Qxfam America and the U.S. Network for Global Economic Justice. Many of them are religious, like Bread for the World, a Quaker organization, and the Catholic Relief Agency. They feel invaded and abused by the large corporations' ways of doing business even in their own country. They feel a sense of communion with the poor and the deprived around the world because of this same way of doing business, which tramples over the rights of human beings to a decent life everywhere it goes. These are people who suffer from the reversal of priorities in our political life and from the subordination of everything human to crass and powerful commercial interests. They regret deeply the priorities of our government's foreign policy, which is always and everywhere to protect the interests of the large corporations and the economic system they have built up for themselves globally, whether it be through our State Department, the IMF and the World Bank, or military intervention, usually at the expense of poor people around the world. The policy is always to protect what is euphemistically called the economy of a particular country, meaning keeping intact the investments and the loans of large corporations to poor countries through strategic adjustment programs, no matter how bad these were from the beginning. They leave the people most affected by these programs to shift for themselves and further deprive them of the means for their own economic development by forcing them to produce cash crops for the creditors, rather than food for themselves.

These Americans value more in life than commercial success or falling in with the latest fashions dictated to the public by large corporations. They value social justice for all around the globe and value economic development itself as a minimum requirement for the good life of all, not just the few who control the global economic system. They strive for a reestablishment of such moral and spiritual priorities as justice and friendship in political life, so that everyone can be recognized as a human being entitled to a certain part of the wealth produced by his or her

own labor as well as to an opportunity to begin to think of something beyond merely surviving in the midst of devastation. Economic survival and prosperity are not the only goods we should strive for as human beings, but they are a beginning of something that transcends material and commercial conditions. The people I am speaking of value the spiritual side of human development much more than the commercial or the economic, but they take economic betterment as a condition for every other sort of betterment of the human spirit. That is why they are so concerned about the economic betterment of everyone in a world as the division between the rich and the poor become worse and worse.

The above are the parameters of the problem. We need ways of solving the problem that will reestablish the priority of moral and spiritual values for every human being on earth over a global economic system that benefits so few people with such an excess of wealth amid widespread poverty.

CHAPTER II
OLD AND NEW GLOBALIZATION

PABLO LÓPEZ LÓPEZ

WORDS, PREJUDICES AND COMPLEXITIES

A Hypnotic Word

People are not pure intellects, not even scholars. We have various feelings, interests and experiences which condition our grasp of ideas. Every word may mean much more than might be supposed from definitions given in either dictionaries or academic papers. This is particularly important to remember when confronted with a word like "globalization." The word "globalization" itself, apart from its eventual corresponding reality, has become a social phenomenon. The ideas normally related to the term were already well-known realities before the term "globalization" became a sociological factor with its own life in the mass-media and every manner of scholarly circle. It is a key term indicating that one is acquainted with current world news as well as prepared for the future. Scholars from a broad range of scientific, technological and professional backgrounds produce very many papers and books about the term. It possesses a hypnotizing power, for not only is it politically-correct, but it has also become an unavoidable expression for any social, political, economic and ethical explanation of the present day.

Such frequent usage of the term does not imply a common and clear notion of "globalization," nor of the generally accepted appraisal of reality that it presumes. The continuous usage of the word constitutes a further difficulty for its understanding, as it becomes a buzzword that tends to use its rationalized meaning. The greatest hindrance to its understanding is its assumption as an all-embracing term that can explain all possible facts; such is the hypnotic effect of "globalization." In this regard, the least reliable are those who take for granted that there is only one meaning for the term. They usually use it in the most optimistic sense because of ideological interests or naivete, and try to explain and justify by it every social, political and economic fact. In this case they hardly explain anything well and consequently create marked confusion.

We must be careful when analyzing the meaning of the term lest we, too, accept a prejudicial meaning or too sharp a simplification of "globalization." In doing this analysis we need a proper understanding of the conceptual issue surrounding globalization. Its popularity surpasses that of other currently fashionable terms like "end of history," "new age," "global village" or "postmodernism," all of which appear to be allies of "globalization" in the configuration of a "new world." Besides, the term is being used to come to the rescue of some old terms like "free market," "liberalization" or "progress." "Globalization" is the melting pot of a number of terms that might in the end be more significant, which hide behind the facade of this term for their own marketing purposes.

Pride and Prejudice

The word "globalization" has been successfully introduced in the market of ideas. A part of its success lies in its ambiguity, which lets people easily accommodate the term to their own viewpoint. Hence the ideas that different people have of the term are quite different, especially as regards its

valuation. Such diverse conceptions are based on prejudice and on a certain proud unwillingness to change our outlook. Our previous judgments, "pre-judices," and pride are shaped by our ideology, interests and moral values. It is not my aim here to give long list of ideologies, interests and moral values. Let us consider instead some of the most representative social systems in order to understand the influence of preconceptions in our comprehension and appraisal of globalization.

We can start with a sort of official definition of "globalization," given by the International Monetary Fund: "the economic interdependence of all countries in the world, caused by the increase of the volume and the variety of the international transactions of goods and services, as well as of the international flows of capital, and by the accelerated and generalized diffusion of technology."[1] This definition can be regarded as official not only because it comes from a powerful international organization, but also, and primarily, because it expresses the capitalist viewpoint. In fact, "globalization" is not a global initiative or a kind of spontaneous convergence of the whole world, but a capitalist term for a capitalist reality. From this basic perspective, globalization is not global at all. It is true that almost everyone in the world is involved, but the vast majority is involved only in a passive way.

As is stated in the definition, in the capitalist view, "globalization" is mainly a matter of trade and technology. The quick advance of technology since the Industrial Revolution meant that capitalism and industrial or technical advances amount to one and the same thing. Capitalist investments and capitalist countries have led successive waves of technological revolutions. Probably the main technological sectors are communication and transport precisely the key areas in which the current globalization of markets is taking place. Thus, globalization is not a cause, but rather a consequence of technological development. In other words, we see how technology has been at the service of a form of capitalism which is vaguely termed "globalization." And this capitalist technology, like its Communist counterpart, has had principally a military aim. Much major technology is an adaptation of military machinery, as in the case of the Internet or the tractor. In any event, technology, including its armed branch, is subject to trade, that is, to money, especially today, when finance and speculation make up the main element of trade. Therefore, from the capitalist outlook, money is the central notion of globalization. Any other conclusion, indeed, would be surprising, for capitalism is centered on capital, on money.

More pride and prejudice come from another ideological family: the socialist and communist spheres. Capitalism chooses a material goal, by promising at the same time social justice as an automatic consequence of its market-mechanism, the "invisible hand." Marxism, on the other hand, as the most widespread and influential form of contemporary socialism, heads initially for social justice, while assuming an almighty state. As capitalist globalization is centered on money, Marxist internationalism is centered on statism. They follow quite inverse strategies: whereas capitalism aims at material richness, expecting to achieve human spiritual values indirectly on the way; Marxism's aim is the achievement of human spiritual values while expecting to achieve them through materialistic means and a materialistic "cosmo-vision". Both strategies have proven unrealistic and even contrary to their respective targets. If we really want to achieve an appreciation of authentic human values, we should use humanistic means and from start to finish aim to achieve those values. In the end, even Marxism is a sort of capitalism: state capitalism. In practice both are materialistic and mechanistic systems. Marxism trusts the mechanism of the state as capitalism, the mechanism of the market. However, neither the overpowering "popular" state nor the unlimited "free" market produces the justice which both models propose.

Of course, there also exist interesting mixes of socialism and capitalism, often operating in combination with democratic parliamentary systems. Social-democracy and Keynesian capitalism are

cases in point. After the fall of the Berlin Wall, these models, as representatives of the welfare state, became the main enemies of the supporters of the currently overbearing "globalization." What should be clear is that capitalist "globalization" cannot be "sold" as another form of temperate capitalism, for example as a "responsible capitalism," in the words of G.B. Madison (Globalization: Challenges and Opportunities, 1998), or as a "responsible globality," the motto of the 1999 World Economic Forum in Davos. Instead globalization is a revival of the most strict capitalist postulates in a much more internationalized and massive dimension. From this standpoint, "globalization" does not represent so much a postmodern era, but goes back to premodern times or to early modernity. Nevertheless, the postmodern disenchantment and lack of social militancy in rich countries provides an outstanding ally of globalization.

A third preconception, communitarian personalism, is not based on a material and impersonal good, like money or the state, but on the person himself and his own social constitution and vocation. The dignity of the person rests in his pride. A long time before the present controversy among Anglo-Saxon scholars, between the communitarians and the individualists, personalist thinkers like E. Mounier, J. Maritain and M. Buber avoided both unilateral poles and reconciled individual and social aspects of the person in an active, deep and revolutionary perspective. Unlike capitalism and Marxism, personalism can be regarded as never having been put into practice. There has never been anything like a personalist state or economic system. In spite of this, there have been and still are multiple personalist elements and experiences in many countries, even within capitalist and Marxist systems. This is the case in the social economy and workers' self-management. Communitarian personalism is not so simplistic and mechanic as capitalism and Marxism. Hence, it cannot be carried out swiftly on a large scale as the direct result of concrete legislation. Personalism comes from below, not from a state elite or a managerial class.

One-sided Thinking and the Complexities of Reality

There is a dogmatic fatalism supporting capitalist globalization which asserts that "there is no alternative." This is the "*pensamiento único*," or "one-sided thinking" denounced by Mediterranean thinkers, expressed by TINA as its coined acronym. We have already warned of the widespread tendency to consider "globalization" in one exclusive connotation. Many who share this tendency are political and economic leaders with a supporting chorus of scholars.

Although the description of this thinking can be more subtly or diplomatically expressed, TINA consists basically of:

(1) the triumph of a sort of alleged "free" worldwide market dominated by large corporations;

(2) the consequent strong reduction of the state to a police function;

(3) the ensuing fragmentation of political entities and the emergence of a new regionalism and localism;

(4) the prevalence of a virtual and speculative economy over productive and real economy;

(5) transnational capitalism as the regulative framework of any legitimate democracy;

(6) the submission of social values and education to the demands of a planet-wide competition determined by technology and commercial strategies;

(7) the dissolution of any traditional moral and religious conviction under the arbitrary and light style of the "new age" and "postmodernism;"

(8) the consumerist uniformity or the "McDonalization" of customs and lifestyles.

"Deregulation," "privatization," "competition," "efficiency," "liberalization" or "flexibility," which seemingly justify every economic and political decision,[2] have become popular mantras among reform-minded officials and professional politicians. Other questions are the degree of novelty and the consequences, negative or positive, of such features, that is, the challenges, risks and opportunities involved.

A real globalization ought not to be interpreted merely under such a one-sided mentality for even in this quite lineal way of thinking complexity arises. First, complexity comes up as interdisciplinarity. Economy is much more than the economy, especially in terms of a macroeconomic system. Supporters of globalization hasten to emphasize the cultural, ethical and political aspects of globalization.[3] They are right; it could not be otherwise. Consequently, a series of different disciplines is necessary to obtain a complete picture of globalization: we should at least consider the phenomenon in terms of anthropology, history, ethics, politics, economy, sociology, psychology, theology, pedagogy and communications sciences, etc.

Theoretical as it is, globalization entails in practice a wide problem of governance. J.-F. Rischard, the World Bank's Vice-President for Europe, presents as necessary a "more profound rethinking of planetary governance in the light of the two big forces at the heart of this increasing complexity." The two forces are the demographic growth, provoking environmental and social stresses, and "the radically different world economy," in terms of technological and commercial globalization.[4] Rischard would do well to check more accurate demographic information in order to banish his demographic dread. But he takes the right view in assuming an active role for politics in the control of economic globalization. Globalization is also political and is to be governed through the collaboration of "public, private and civil society players."

Nonetheless, the axis of present globalization still rests on economy, particularly on money. But this expresses a situation of the heart. Money itself is always unimportant. What is meaningful is how money or any other entity is embraced interiorly. The pillars of globalization are, in a broad sense, culture, economy and religion. This is a deeper complexity. Respectively they embody our intelligence, our body and our heart. The three overlap one with another. In a way, on the grounds of a biological constitution every humanly developed action is cultural, a fruit of human intelligence. Likewise everything depends on the economy, on the administration of the tangible goods that our body needs. Most discreetly the bottom of our heart lives on the presence of an absolute. The lack of a true relationship with the real absolute brings about all kinds of idolatry. Idols do not exist outside of ourselves, but in our hearts. We have noticed the hypnotic power surrounding the notion of globalization. Indeed, globalization encompasses, for many, the idol of their ideology.

Globalization is not merely ideological but is a huge, complex reality with profound historical roots. Its current facet is ideological and partisan, though pretending to be purely objective and scientific. The economist J. F. Martín Seco explains the ideological source of the phenomenon: globalization occurs solely in those areas intended by the economic power. Thus, while international liberalization is total in financial flows, it is very restricted for workers.[5] As to the idolatrous connotations, globalization bears a falsifying resemblance to the universalism of the great monotheisms. J. García Roca analyzes how globalization does not keep its promises and constitutes the most powerful idol of our time. In fact, globalization fails to expand development to impoverished countries, creates an enormous mass of redundant workers, imposes superhuman sacrifices on the poor and increases the possibility of killing people off through starvation.[6]

COSMOLOGICAL, ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL BASES

By now, we have overcome the over-simplied conception of globalization. Yet, we need to deepen our awareness of the human context surrounding this recent phenomenon. Globalization is to be understood globally.

By introducing the general preconceptions as underlying beliefs, we can improve our awareness of our peculiar understanding of current globalization. This particular period, significant though it may be, is just another stage of a wider cosmological, anthropological and historical process. It is necessary to be wary and not to deny that there are here some quite clear trends.

Cosmological Unity

Concerning the cosmic evolution we can endorse the intuition of scholars like Teilhard de Chardin, (*The Phenomenon of Man*). The concept has its roots in the most genuine origins of philosophy, as made clear by the pre-Socratics. The world strives to attain its unity. It has an *arche,* or natural ruling principle. What kind of *arche* would be consistent with a true global unity? According to Teilhard, "Unity enlarges itself only through a growth of consciousness, and therefore the history of the living world consists in the elaboration of ever more perfect eyes."[7] The *arche* is consciousness; in Greek terms, "*nous*" or "*logos*." We are entitled to contemplate our contemporary globalization as a part of the universal march towards unity. The question now is to what extent our globalization constitutes a special stage because of its distinctive degree of consciousness. On the one hand, there has never been so much talk about something like this. Today we have technical means available to multiply the spread of any fashionable idea. On the other hand, however, such frequency of the topic and of certain words like "globalization" does not secure the depth and intensity of a worldwide global consciousness. The extraordinarily large gap between the few rich and the many poor is increasing. The gap has never been so scandalous, and it is due to our historical production surplus. Production has been globalized by means of the international division of labor, but distribution of benefits has not been globalized. As things stand, a common planet-consciousness is impossible. A consumerist mentality takes no account of the reality of a life of abject poverty.

Anthropological and Historical Universalism

The one promising aspect of this chaos is its being considered unnatural. It seems as though the Tellurian forces of humanity demand an effective, close union of humanity. This is a joint teaching of anthropology and history. People from very different cultures are meeting and living together on a scale never seen in the 20th century. Cultures are discovering not only their particular identities, but also their own universal values by meeting face to face with other cultures. This happens superficially on the basis of today's phase of globalization: new international markets, new massive emigrations, new planet-wide media. It is a matter of degree and acceleration. But on a deeper level the global meeting of the human race rests on a common human nature, although many cultural anthropologists are still reluctant to use that term.

We need to review at least some of the great milestones of the historical process of globalization, unless we want to fall into a narrow view of the contemporary situation. A proper historical outlook is essential to distinguish what is really new or old in globalization.

The Neolithic Revolution brought agricultural and sedentary cultures together. At that time important groups of human beings were passing from the state of tribe to the state of firmly constituted peoples: that is, from primitive cultures to the first civilizations, including the acquisition of some

permanent values for humanity and a rich exchange with other peoples. This is seen, for example, in ancient Babylon and Egypt.

The Greek contribution can be summarized in the dense term "*logos*." Theirs is the definitive maturation of a wide and deep rationality embracing philosophy, politics, sciences, art and a natural theology. Reason is universal itself. Reason belongs to all humankind and is the common ground for a mutual understanding. Reason is also universal in virtue of its openness to all subjects, to all dimensions of reality, even to that which exceeds the natural power of our mind. Though there had been earlier empires, like the Persian, it is the Hellenistic period and Alexander's empire which represent an ancient paradigm of empire, composed of simple states, and the appearance of cosmopolitan societies.

The introduction of a sound and profound universalism in humanity is at the core of the Judeo-Christian contribution, but as a general human value it has been transmitted to all cultures and subsequent times. Islam reinforced universalism, (*ummah*), in spite of its internal and external divisions, which also are frequent in Judaism and Christianity. The faith in only one God who is Father of all, constitutes an incomparable foundation for universalism. It is the foundation of fraternity, which was invoked even the French Revolution invoked as one of the main values for a new civilized humanity. Thus, we leave nationalist polytheism and arrive at universal monotheism.

Universalism as such is a Christian novelty. Jesus Christ embodies the definitive overcoming of Jewish nationalist spirituality. Paul is his principal collaborator in universalizing the good news of a universal love. Christian revelation is not attached to an untranslatable language or culture, like Islam in relation to the classic Arabic of the *Koran*. Some outstanding early Christian writers knew philosophies like Stoicism, which already had quite a mature sense of universality and cosmopolitanism. Those philosophies turned out to be of interest insofar as they developed and enriched the Christian heritage itself in the peculiar terms of an evangelized culture. At any rate, universalism did not have much future solely through those philosophies and cults. For the rest, Christianity remains a summit of universalism in the sense of depth and extension: there is no other deep union of such magnitude among so many millions of people in so many places of the world.

A good deal of criticism about many practical deviations throughout the millenarian history of the Church is right and sensible. Since the peace of Constantine, the Church has accomplished its universal vocation, too often through compromise with political and economic powers and with Western colonialism. However, even in the worst times the Church has served the poor and preached its universal message of love in purity while suffering persecution.[8]

Imperialism and colonialism are as old as history. They have created bridges between cultures, but with devastating consequences for the weak. In our epoch, Euro- and western-centrism have regrettably been customary in the guise of modernization. A consequence is the crisis of modernity as a particular plan of optimistic progress. Today, the sole possibility lies in opening modernity to a plurality of different cultural projects, interlocking as they may be. Modernity is much more than the Enlightened project. That is why F. Entrena Durán upholds "manifold modernities in an age of globalization."[9] That openness is not to be confused with "postmodernism," inasmuch as pluralism is not reducible to relativism.

The so-called Middle Ages surprisingly resemble our contemporary times in its two general trends: globalization and localism. The typical medieval situation combined the horizon of universal Christianity, represented by the pope and the emperor, together with feudalism. At present we combine a global economic and communicative structure with the revival of regional and local centers.[10]

By virtue of its search for purity and original sources, the Renaissance was in numerous respects even more Christian and universalistic than the former times. Its cosmopolitanism and its exaltation of human dignity are proverbial. Furthermore, many of the main capitalist and banking structures of contemporary globalization came to prominence in the Renaissance. Since then, a continuous series of overseas travels and migrations, whose great precedent had been the excursions of Marco Polo in the 13th century, enabled the world to gain awareness of its unity.

The working-class movement in the 19th and 20th centuries brought a greater consciousness of international social justice. Unfortunately this consciousness has been weakened by means of consumerism. Working-class internationalism has been replaced, or nullified by capitalist transnational interests. H.-P. Martin and H. Schumann see a need for European labor unions in order to tame the supremacy of the managerial lobby.[11] But Europe is quite fortified against other less well-off areas. What even European workers need is an effective worldwide federation of labor unions lest the oppression suffered by "third world" workers be used as a means to the loss of social rights by "first world" workers.[12]

Space travel brings us the opportunity of having a vision of the unity of our planet, of its physical globality, of its small size in the context of the universe. All of this presents a meaningful symbolism of our unity and common destiny.[13]

REALITY AND NOVELTY OF GLOBALIZATION?

By now it should be clear that we face an ambiguous, seductive, ideological and complex use of a word. The nature and the main factual features meant by "globalization," as well as its historical basis, have been described. It is time to specify to what extent the current manifestation of the historical trend of globalization is real and new. For this a sound starting point is found in the comparison between the above eight traits of contemporary capitalistic globalization and the historical landmarks of universalism.

New Dimensions of Old Practices

The idea of a "free market" of supply and demand where a sort of invisible hand, as a substitute for Providence, has each individual seek his own interest while producing the common good, is as old as capitalist theory. It is pure capitalist theory. And the same insurmountable gap of classic capitalism between theory and real practice is fully reproduced in current globalization.

The novelty lies in the increasing domination of an oligarchic network of worldwide corporations. Globalization rests today on "global" corporations. Like the prevailing contemporary economy, many of those firms are for the most part financial and speculative, rather than productive.[14] Only two percent of the world economy is properly linked to real economy. Virtual economy exists in a world that is fond of virtual realities. Thus, globalization turns out to be not much more than a virtual reality. This globalized economy is particularly feeble in the face of financial crises in whatever part of the world,[15] as evidenced by the recent crises of the "Asian dragons." The spread of damages is usually more effective than the spread of benefits; this coincides with our dramatic deficit in distribution. When will we build a globalization in distribution? That would be real globalization, an authentic peak in universalism and a real novelty.

Although technological and work systems are not independent upon the economic system, they have their own historical roots and autonomy. The merit of the huge growth of production pertains to scientific progress and its technological application as well as to a more rational labor structure. The

modern technological revolution, indebted to earlier advances, came before the rise of modern capitalism, which took advantage of that revolution. Science and technology have provided wealth, while capitalism has conferred the majority of the technical advantages on a minority. One of the clearest manifestations of this process of exclusion is the overpowering dominion of a disproportionate, speculative economy.

Present-day global capitalism, the so-called "neoliberalism,"[16] does not prepare for the annihilation of the nation-state, but, rather prepares its reduction to a police function. It may be quite true that the nation-state is too big for meeting the needs of individuals and local communities and too small for solving the problems of a planetwide age. The alternative, however, is not to have the state reduced to the status of a mere servant of large capitalist interests. This is the old and gross mistake of a "politica ancilla oeconomiae?" The problem does not lie in the subjection of politics to economy in generic terms, but in the kind of disruptive economy that stems from such political docility. The whole public activity by which people direct their power in search for the common good must not be limited to the dictates of the particular economic interests of a group, no matter how much this group and its chorus of scholars may promise the community. Nor can the excuse of being "scientific" justify a practical dictatorship or an exclusive, one-way mentality. The title "scientific" was used by Marxists to canonize their doctrine; today the prophets of capitalism use the same *mantra*.

But a worse reductionism is the earlier one consecrated by Machiavelli. His reductionism lay in the subjection of ethics to a peculiar understanding of politics expressed in the time-honored phrase "reasons of state": the surrender of politics to economy followed the capitulation of ethics to politics. Of course some particular ethics and politics always remain. What is at stake is the eclipse of the proper broad and humanistic outlook of ethical reason under a pragmatic version of politics and economy which has scant regard for the weak.

Supporters of capitalist globalization equate economic progress with political and ethical progress. G. B. Madison announces "world peace," "genuine solidarity" and even a "spiritual civilization." In his estimation, "The market economy operating under the rule of law is itself a form of institutionalized ethics;" and capitalist globalization "constitutes the greatest force yet witnessed in the history of the world for promoting democracy" (see Madison, 1998). But we wonder whether the arms race is insignificant to capitalism and its globalization, whether the growing global gap between the rich and the poor is a sign of solidarity, and, overall, whether there can be a "spirituality of money."

The "liberal democracy," intended by the globalist intelligentsia of capitalism is far from being real democracy. The capitalist argument consists, as usual, in creating a forced dilemma whose only sound alternative is, precisely, capitalism. Thus, Madison confronts us with "direct democracy" as the type to be overcome if we want to avoid the "tyranny of the majority." But such direct democracy nowhere exists. All have to work to stave off the danger of demagogy and the coarsening of public attitudes, but today we must be careful, also not to fall into the clutches of the tyranny of a minority. At present, the most threatening minority is the top management of large corporations and financial agents, such as the former Trilateral Commission and the current International Chamber of Commerce, whose chairman is the Nestlé head, Helmut O. Maucher.[17] One cannot accept Madison's identification of "liberal democracies" with a respect for human rights, which, moreover, are not to be interpreted only in individualistic terms.

Critics of capitalist globalization usually propose the recovery either of the union of politics and economy or, from another standpoint, of the primacy of politics.[18] But they need to go beyond politics in their general proposals, just as they do in many other individual spheres. We need the primacy of ethics -- of humanistic, pluralist and solid ethics -- based on dialogue, freedom and justice for all.

There is another reduction to be noted. The heart is the home of whatever absolute value we have, the source of our dearest desires, intentions and convictions. Like the reductions of politics to economy and of ethics to politics, since Spinoza religion has been reduced to a merely immanent ethics. A degree of secularization was a necessary purification for religious experience, but one-sided secularism has brought about fundamentalist or integrist reactions and eroded the roots of moral convictions. The consequence is not only the loss or the manipulation of the main monotheistic identities in many countries, but also the estrangement from the principal lines of our rational Greek heritage, i.e., Plato and Aristotle. As a result of this whole chain of reductions (religion to ethics, ethics to politics, politics to economy, economy to the accumulation of capital), we have come to perceive money as today's global religion in rich countries. This contemporary reality is not at all new, but its dimensions are.

Absolute Relativism: "Moneytheism," "New Age" and Postmodernism

"Moneytheism" is of the utmost importance in order to understand the profound intensity of the general relativism as the normal one-way thinking in which we live and move and have our being. The essence of money is its paradoxical absolute relativity, its ever-changing value, which makes it totally untrustworthy. By following George Simmel, Gary B. Madison (1998) describes it properly: "Money is not something `objective' or `material'; it is in fact a purely `*geistig*' entity whose `value' is constituted solely by the (subjective) `evaluations' of acting human beings . . . the `essence' (value) of money is totally relative." Consequently, what kind of general mentality is to be expected among "moneytheists"? The answer lies in an easy and arbitrary total relativism, disguised as tolerance. All religions are equally valid, as are almost all moral systems except for a few politically-correct customs and capitalist interests. Those who dare to criticize such relativistic dogmas are simply "fanatics." Obviously this is the well-known Enlightened charge against historical religions and moral traditions.

We are under no illusion that money worship is new. For instance, Washington Irving wrote early in the last century of "the almighty dollar, that great object of universal devotion." One or another form of mammonism is as old as human economic activity, but again the dimensions are new. The economy has never been as speculative as it is today. Money has never been so relative and, accordingly, the dominant morality in wealthy countries never so relativistic. As we appreciate mammonism's step forward, we must be careful not to fall into a simplistic, iconoclastic attitude. Money itself is not the problem. We can generalize what Yale law professor, Stephen Carter, stated in 1998 about the US: "The problem in America today is not that we have a market economy; the problem is, we have let that market economy and its values dominate too much of our lives."[19] The idolatrous approach does not start in the legion of consumer, but in their ideologues and policy makers. In this point Dani Rodrik, a professor at Harvard's Kennedy School, is accurate. He questions the dominant religion of increasing economic integration in developing countries, of ever-expanding trade and capital flows. Openness is not necessary to economic development and is likely to widen inequality within countries.[20]

In this relativistic scene the so-called "new age" has its place within consumerist countries. The pseudo-religious "new age" movement is extremely heterogeneous, its main elements being Eastern religious beliefs (Hindu and Buddhist) as well as Western gnostic, esoteric and spiritualist tenets. The combination is up to the consumer, or to the particular leader on whom the consumer may rely. Based on the hope of the new "age of Aquarius," instead of the past Christian "age of Pisces," there is a vague common idea of the arrival of a holistic human consciousness, rich in global harmony. As a universal convergence, relativistic ecumenism, global definitive self-understanding of humanity the

"new age" suits capitalist globalization nicely. Neither this globalization nor this new age is essentially new, though they pretend to be absolutely so. In any event, they are well-suited to each other. In fact, the "new age" is an excellent paralyzing instrument of the critical conscience.

During this "globalizing" "new" age, postmodernism is regarded as the new and most representative philosophical tendency of our times in consumer cultures. There is a strong relation between global capitalism, Western gnostic esotericism and a philosophical trend like postmodernism. While referring to capitalist globalization, Madison speaks of "the new postmodern global age" (1998). Postmodernism mistrusts the great justifying narratives, (*grands récits*), and the nation-state is one of its most vulnerable modern targets. In other respects, postmodernism does not fit in with the model of capitalist globalization, which remains a typically modern and grand narrative, confident in progress and intending to be fully objective. Nevertheless, just as the "new age," postmodernism fosters capitalist globalization by dispelling critical conscience and promoting the fragmentation of the social network. The social inclination to a regionalist and localist fragmentation is favored by the postmodern fragmenting mentality.

Postmodernism embodies a criticism and a denial of "modern" ideals (mainly Enlightened, Hegelian and Marxist ones). This criticism can illuminate some aspects of social emancipation. But postmodernism is rather a refusal than a proposal, merging with capitalist fundamentals into a radical individualism. The dismantling of objectivity and the retreat to an ironic, detached and aesthetic view make an eventual feeling of solidarity arbitrary and weak in the face of the overwhelming objectivity with which transnational capitalism is apparently spreading. The postmodern fragmentary and relativistic mentality is most opposed to true globalization, which is contrary to capitalist globalization insofar as it creates social fragmentation and a greater gap between the rich and the poor. Postmodernism declares the definitive dismissal of any great ideal; transnational capitalism is proclaimed itself the only alternative.

Indeed, global capitalism teaches us that "there is no alternative." This is one of the attributes most repeated by enthusiasts of capitalist globalization: "It is not a matter of human choosing" (Madison, 1998).[21] But for those who really believe in human freedom and are not Hegelians or Stoics, the way we can guide our human trend to globalization or universalism is open. Not only is the possibility of taking more advantage of global economic opportunities available, but all the essentials for humanizing our ever-increasing global coexistence are also within reach. The single civilization with a new spirituality and ethos which we have at hand, as voiced by Václav Havel, is contrary to the exploitation conducted by multinational large corporations and speculative capitalism.

Cultural Asymmetry, "Tittytainment" and Neo-Malthusianism

A world deemed to have no alternative other than capitalism can only move towards a culture with a strongly capitalist homogenization: that is to say, a consumerist uniformity (among those who can afford to consume). Like the growth of economic capitalist homogenization, which is led by the European Union, Japan and above all the United States, cultural and spiritual uniformity (even more significant than the economic capitalist model) is largely Eurocentric (i. e., British, German and French) and especially prone to becoming Americanized. This uniformity is not to be mistaken for "Western" culture any longer by typically Islamic and anti-colonialist criticisms. Genuine and historical "Western" culture is rooted in a Greco-Roman and Christian heritage, which, it must be remembered, have quite Oriental origins. This vigorous heritage has little to do with relativistic moneytheism, variegated "new age" and disenchanted postmodernism. That is not the type of Western culture which should be leading the world. What does "McDonald's" have in common with Plato,

Cicero, or St. Paul, Erasmus or Newton? We should never confuse a global mass culture with a single worldwide civilization. The most influential culture today is the Anglo-Saxon one, and, on a lesser scale, the German, French and Japanese. We mean some intellectual and commercial élites from these cultural areas. Cultural exchange between all different countries in the world is overwhelmingly asymmetric. It does not follow a model of dialogue and harmonization, but of absorption. Instead of promoting a real globalization, it aggravates the distrust and the splits between cultures. The Islamic distrust towards "the West" is an eloquent example.

What McDonalization and the mass entertainment culture represent can more accurately be expressed with the formula coined by a former national security adviser of Jimmy Carter and ideologue of the Trilateral Commission, Zbigniew Brzezinski: "tittytainment." This term results from the combination of "entertainment" and an image of the nourishing milk of a nursing mother. Thus, "tittytainment" envelops a large-scale project aimed at contenting a frustrated unemployed majority of the world population by means of glaring entertainment, sustained by enough feeding. This is the "bread and circus" of the Romans. Such a strategy is designed to meet the situation foreseen of the 21st century when just 20 percent of the world's active population will supposedly be sufficient to keep the world economy in motion.

An interesting manifestation of that ideology took place in a 1995 meeting organized by the American Gorbachev Foundation and held in the Fairmont hotel in San Francisco. Five hundred top-ranking political, economic and scientific leaders from the five continents met for three days, discussed and planned with unanimity the future of humanity. People like George Bush, George Shultz and Margaret Thatcher shared their forecasts and solutions with leaders of transnational corporations, the high priests of economics from Stanford, Harvard and Oxford, the global players of the computer and financial businesses and delegates from Singapore and Beijing. The former leader of the Soviet Communist Party called it the new "Global Brain trust." These brainy pragmatists at the Fairmont established the formula "20 percent -- 80 percent": Twenty percent of the world's active population will be useful, while the rest will just be fed and entertained. Thereupon, as the Sun journalist Scott McNealy declared, the question will be "to have lunch or to be lunch." Even rich countries would lack a significant middle-class. The unanswerable reason is centered on nothing but the pressure of global competition (cf. H.-P. Martin & H. Schuman, idem, p. 7-25). Labor will no longer be a central way of self-realization, but merely a mode of the most competitive production.

The above analysis must not be disregarded or underrated by the usual triumphalist advocates of capitalist globalization, who accept as given that the capitalist model is the only possible form of globalization. It is untenable and uncritical to neglect the huge worldwide problems of starvation, abject poverty and constant violations of human rights. The only capitalist response is to blame every sort of "socialism," including state-directed capitalism. Whatever problem may be raised, the invariable cause is said to be a lack of capitalism. According to such "orthodoxy," capitalism cannot but be pure capitalism. At this point, capitalist globalism fails to differ itself from 19th century "Manchester" capitalism altogether. Capitalist globalism claims to be the only and irreversible successful system for economy and politics. It is ironic that it assumes no responsibility for the scandalous and ongoing injustices in the economic and political fields.

Something to be acknowledged about the leaders of global business is their clarity of ideas which is no longer witnessed in many national governments, fluctuating as they do between an enthusiastic economic liberalism and a threatening protectionism. For instance, President Clinton proposed global trade talks within the powerful World Trade Organization (established as a result of the Uruguay Round) in order to promote the export of US agricultural products. At the same time he threatened Japan with a trade fight over steel exports. While large corporations aim solely at their own private

economic interests and can manufacture wherever they like in the world, wherever they find the weakest governments and labor unions, national governments, especially if they have to represent their communities, waver between the real interest of the public and the pressure of these insatiable corporations.

Those supposedly in charge of the common good weaken in the face of the overwhelming private economic interests of large corporations that provide financial support for electoral campaigns. Political regulation tends to affect smaller corporations more than the dominant ones, which impose on the world the lowest wages and the worst working conditions (cf. Blanchette,*idem*, p. 25). Many political leaders wish to welcome as many multinational firms as possible without realizing that they are only welcoming a Trojan horse. In the long term, it is untrue that large corporations benefit a country. Their interests are too divergent from those of a country. The mirage consists in the fact that "the economic well-being of every nation has been reduced to the survival of its oligopolistic system" of large corporations (*ibid.*, p. 23).

The purely economic interests of capitalist globalism and its transnational agents, with their impressive strategies, are extremely wide and far-reaching. These agents know that their dominion of the world economy will not be total and unquestioned until they control all strata of culture and the human spirit. That is why the support of the "new age" and postmodernism, through the fostering of a radical relativism, is so important for their cause. "Moneytheism" has as its main dogma that everything can be bought and sold, money being the measure of everything. In other words, pure relativity is the measure of everything. Instead of overcoming the old dichotomy between the individual and the society, the relativism of global "moneytheism" implies a mass individualism. Almost everything is left for the individual to decide. Each of us can make his own combination of religions, investments, aesthetics, politics and purchases, but then we live in the midst of constant perplexity, recurrent weariness and worldwide mass fashion. Of course, there is an abundance of constructive and helpful novelties in our contemporary world, but this is despite capitalist globalism where there is only room for the strongest; Nietzsche comes to mind.

In its attempt to dominate everything and to eliminate the weak, the basic policy of global capitalism and its magnates is an unscrupulous control over the world population. This is the Neo-Malthusian ideology. Malthus's prediction about the global incapability of producing enough commodities has proved to be totally groundless. Technology, new work systems and real scientific economy have once again refuted capitalist predictions. This is what capitalism does not want to recognize: the problem is not production, but distribution; the center of economy is not the capital, but the person whom the capital has to serve. Stubborn as nobody else, capitalist leaders and scholars try to justify their policies by creating an enemy. The Soviet enemy is knocked out; Islamic integrism is under control. Hence, the enemy is now proclaimed to be the growth of population in poor countries. The problem is not to eliminate poverty, but the poor. The last world conferences in Cairo and Beijing showed the paramount interest of rich countries and many powerful international organizations and corporations in changing the mentality of the people. They attempted to justify a drastic demographic control in poor countries by whatever means, including abortion on a massive scale, wholesale sterilization and other virtually genocidal means.

The United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) reported in 1999 that demographic growth was lower than expected and that the feared demographic explosion will not take place. Nevertheless, a large number of wealthy multinational organizations keep working to make abortion and sterilization common methods of population control throughout the world, especially in impoverished areas. Global abortionism and Neo-Malthusianism are represented by organizations like Planned Parenthood, the Alan Guttmacher Institute, Family Health International, the Ford

Foundation, the Pathfinder Fund, The Population Council (John Rockefeller III) and The Rockefeller Foundation.[22] Millionaires of different types seem to have a common, intense interest in the control of population. Instead of helping the poor to find ways to overcome their destitution, they are devoted to financing programs euphemistically termed as "reproductive health." Some of the Neo-Malthusian magnates giving millions of dollars to those organizations are, for instance: Ted Turner, founder of CNN and one of the participants in the Fairmont meeting; Bill Gates, founder of Microsoft; George Soros, a successful financial speculator and founder of the Open Society Fund, paradoxically critical of capitalism; Warren Buffet, the second wealthiest man in the US; David Packard, founder of Hewlett-Packard and another participant at the Fairmont meeting.

Neo-Malthusianism rests on Social Darwinism, as presented by Herbert Spencer in *Man versus the State*, in which he coins the principle of "survival of the fittest." Spencer had a remarkable influence on magnates of his times, like John Rockefeller, Sr. Other scholars followed Spencer's track: W. G. Sumner; F. Galton, founder of eugenics; K. Pearson. Generally speaking, social Darwinism possesses a eugenic perspective, being ultimately racist and marginalizing. In 1912 the First International Conference on Eugenics took place at London University. Among its vice-presidents were Winston Churchill and the presidents of Harvard and Stanford Universities.

Perhaps an analysis of current globalization which associates this phenomenon with other contemporary social phenomena like the "new age," postmodernism and Neo-Malthusianism, does not seem to some stereotyped thinkers to be focused on this idea. Hence, a section on Neo-Malthusianism, in an article such as this, may seem to disrupt, rather than develop, the thought process. First of all, Neo-Malthusianism is a policy implemented worldwide and, therefore, cannot remain apart from capitalist globalization. Secondly, the rulers of capitalist globalization and of Neo-Malthusianism are for the most part the same. Thirdly, the sources and the contribution of Neo-Malthusianism are also couched in relativist terms, for they see human life as having a totally relative value.

The problem is far more serious than is usually thought. Every year there are at least fifty million abortions the world over.[23] Is this not a "global event?" Unfortunately, there have always been abortions. But in the last decades, as a result of that global policy, the number of abortions has escalated. The followers of Social Darwinism may regret such action, but coldly defend it by the principle that "there is no alternative." This is as if abortion were a natural phenomenon that nobody has strategically promoted or imposed and that nobody can stop. Some scholars accept abortion even in the last months of pregnancy, even on this massive scale. What is most striking is the silence of many scholars who recognize abortion as the killing of innocent and defenseless human beings. We should not descend into apocalypticism; however, to be honest in the face of mass starvation and abortion, we have to say that current capitalist globalization involves global killing. This is not new, but the dimensions certainly are.

FIRST STEPS OF A NEW HUMANISTIC UNIVERSALISM

A Real Globalization against Capitalist Globalism

The term globalization has spread from the dominating Anglo-Saxon culture that serves today as the main center of capitalism. Many Mediterranean and other Latin scholars prefer to speak of *mundialización* ("mondialisation," "*mondializzazione*"). Some authors like Alain Touraine distinguish between "globalization," meaning the pernicious aspects of the current international relations, and "mondialisation," indicating the historical trend which is to be accomplished. The

dispute between the editorialists of *The Financial Times* of London and *Le Monde diplomatique* of Paris (1997) was illustrative of respective positions regarding "globalization" enthusiastic and critical.

From the outset of our paper we have tried to reflect more acutely on the different ways of understanding and fostering that event recently called "globalization" and "mondialisation."[24] Whatever term we use, we have to contemplate the convergence of humanity towards living together ever more closely which involves more justice and humanism throughout the world. Such a profound convergence, simultaneously a heritage and a challenge, cannot be reduced to the expansion of capitalist international trade. Ultimately, the current mode of capitalism, as it recovers its capitalist purity, is quite harmful for true globalization. Likewise and paradoxically, capitalism has a noxious effect on a truly free market. Real freedom in capitalism is a privilege of the large capitalists. Hence, we can distinguish between the transnational expansion of capitalism and a real, deep globalization or universalism; and between what we have been calling "capitalist globalization" or "globalism" and an authentic free market. Freedom, in every field and particularly in markets, is not so straightforward as to be able to work in accordance with a simple mechanism. What is still working in our markets are remnants of some elements of a free market, despite the oligopolistic tendency of capitalism. As things stand, a genuine and new globalization is a real possibility rather than a well-established reality.[25] In order to realize such a possibility, some steps should be taken; let us consider them briefly.

Steps, Hopes and Achievements Centered on the Person

According to J. M. Keynes, talking about the crisis of 1929, when financial capital obtained so predominant a position, the only way to save economic and political democracy was the eradication of financial capital. So radical a solution may never be possible, but at the very least, a political and ethical control of finances should be deemed necessary. We need freedom from the withering financial speculation orchestrated by a few international agents. It is unwise to sign a blank check to central banks pretending to embody a scientific economic orthodoxy unpolluted by politics. This is the worrysome scenario surrounding certain activities of the European Central Bank. In any case, central banks themselves are feeble in the face of stock market flows or "casino capitalism." The Quantum Fund, led by G. Soros, made the pound sterling remain outside the European Monetary System in 1992. The crash of long-term capital management in the US brought to the public eye the clandestine maneuvers of privileged hedge funds. A concrete measure which is planned is the Tobin Tax, a moderate tax on all financial transactions. Just 0.1 percent would be double what is needed in one year for eradicating extreme poverty in the world .[26]

But taxes like this one or the wellknown 0.7 percent are not the definitive and fundamental solution. An entirely new system centered on the person and not on capital has to be built. That is why generic proposals like " participative capitalism" (e. g., J. Pérez Iriarte, *idem*, p. 31) or "responsible capitalism" (G. B. Madison), though attractive, are contradictions in terms. Participation and responsibility cannot be found in money, but in the person as the main author of development. All the same, let us be clear. What an expression like "participative capitalism" may mean is the synthesis of the ideas of free market and of popular participation or democracy. However, this is not capitalism. Capitalism has been partly corrected in its symptoms, but not cured. It is incurable.

Beside Keynes's surgical solution and other initiatives already mentioned, many scholars are asking for a new world social contract.[27] These proposals are still completely generic. They do not appear to imply the academic opposition between contractarian and natural law theories. As we can envisage them, they just aim at the need of a worldwide egalitarian dialogue, leading to a universal

agreement to assure and to generalize social conquests of the welfare state -- presumably not on a traditional state basis. In fact, all those who face both the dangers and the opportunities of the new international situation unanimously agree about the incapacity of any single nation to cope with the new global order on its own. One by one, every more-or-less isolated nation is going to be the "lunch" of capitalist globalism. On the contrary, grouped together in a sincere close collaboration, nations may have a better "lunch" than ever.

For this purpose one of the logical first steps is integration within international cultural families. If cultures are to integrate themselves with each other, they need to start cultivating a sense of great community within their cultural families. Until now, the only successful cultural family, as proposed here, is the Anglo-Saxon one. This partnership is one of the reasons behind British-American predominance in the world. Other communities are trying to share their historical ties more consciously, for example, the Ibero-American (better known in English as "Latin-American," but including Portugal and Spain), and the Arabic communities. But now, they have difficulties overcoming their differences.

Some interesting proposals have been put forward by O. Blanchette (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 25-26). He finds that some are resisting the cultural invasion of large corporations in the US. Consumer advocates like Ralph Nader set us free from depending simply on the assurances of the huge firms of their own accord. Environmentalists are also carrying a nucleus of resistance against the destruction of nature carried out by the same corporations. The efforts of the labor movement around the world have to be unified. Finally, Blanchette appraises all sorts of activists, individuals as well as the famous nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

Much hope is being placed on the ambiguously termed "nongovernmental organizations."[28] Their valuation cannot be uniform because they are too different from each other. Generally speaking, the recent movement of NGOs represents the official recognition of the figure of the volunteer as the established ethical conscience within consumerist societies. The typical figure of the volunteer is to be understood in contrast to that of the militant. While the volunteer is predominantly oriented to assistance and to a definite problematic area, the militant prioritizes radical transformation of unjust structures in a broad outlook. To assist people in need is a duty. Mere palliative aid (let us say "palliativism," *asistencialismo* in Spanish) reinforces unjust structures by mitigating and massaging a number of their symptoms or aftermaths. Volunteering can be a preliminary way of social commitment, but we need to be militant. Our generosity should make us offer not only some free time, but all our heart and genuine efforts.

Some of these organizations are experiencing important renewal in their areas and adopt a certain form of critical approach. Many others are not even financially independent from government or lobbies. By and large, NGOs are well integrated into the capitalist system. Though they may be critical of some aspects of capitalism, they willingly accept the basic rules of the game. What is more, they have absorbed and domesticated almost all militant and revolutionary energies in consumerist societies. To be honest, we have to admit that a particular use of terms like "revolution" has increased a demagogic culture. In a way, capitalist globalization is being proclaimed as the new and definitive revolution. Rather, it embodies an extinction of the revolutionary spirit, and for this purpose most NGOs support it.

Nonetheless, some achievements give us encouragement. The end of the negotiations on the Multilateral Agreement on Investments shows the efficacy of new strategies of social commitment. The coordinated mobilization of numerous groups of different associations and skillful usage of the Internet have proved to work on this occasion (cf. C. de Brie, ibid.).

Economic freedom does lie not only in trade freedom or the free market. It comprises the entire economic life, production, distribution and consumption. In this regard the successful and consolidated experiences of employee-shared ownership are a sign of hope.[29] Here we can recall the general principle that "the poor have to be the main agents of their own emancipation."

In the international arena this principle is a key for a real relief of the implacable external debt of impoverished countries. We cannot expect any relief from international agencies like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank or the World Trade Organization. They operate under criteria such as: "Relief will remain linked to good policy and performance" ("Relieving Debt," in *The Financial Times*, 22nd-Jan., 1999, p. 23). These capitalist organizations attempt to impose what they consider to be an orthodox policy in exchange for some loan which will increase indebtedness.[30] The only viable and right solution for so many millions of people rests on the cancellation of the debt, as proposed by the campaign "Jubilee 2000". Sometimes the primary help is just to let them live.

Employee-ownership, as well as liberation from an oppressive debt, point to the social economy as the fulfillment of economic democracy. A. C. Morales Gutiérrez (*ibid.*, p. 363-366) chooses six principles for an alternative system to the unilateral dominion of the state or of the market: (1) a modified but not eliminated welfare state, intended to free us from economic arbitrariness and insecurity; (2) less state in return for more participation and more market in return for more opportunities; (3) a complete juridical framework, regulating limits and conditions of the market; (4) exemplarity of the state in observing the law; (5) the importance of beliefs, values and customs with constant reference to human rights and to civic solidarity; (6) the efficacy of economic democracy, of hybrid and alternative ways. J. Rifkin focuses economic and even political democracy on social economy. Economy can no longer be reduced to market and state. Market, state and social economy are to be in perfect balance, social economy being the oldest and most important. A new political force will be required as the support of social economy. Such a force is designed to demand proper investments of a part of the benefits from the market and the public sector and is expected to consist of the millions of people volunteering for social service.[31]

On the horizon there are steps to be taken, hopes to encourage us and achievements to serve as practical examples. From these we must learn historical globalization and build relatively a new humanistic universalism.

NOTES

1. *Fond Monetaire International, Les Perspectives de l'economie mondiale*, May 1997, quoted by J. Pérez Iriarte, "*Globales, locales y perdidos*," in *Claves de razón práctica*, n. 85, 1998, p. 24.

2. On this narrow and exclusive way of thinking called TINA see A. C. Morales Gutiérrez, "Pensamiento único y sistema económico alternativo," in *Revista de Fomento Socia*l, 52, 1997, p. 345-368.

3. See for instance G. B. Madison (idem) and U. Nieto De Alba, "Globalización, Regionalización y Caos," in *ABC*, 23 Dec., 1998, p. 56.

4. J.-F. Rischard, "A Crisis of Complexity and Global Governance," in *International Herald Tribune*, 2 Oct., 1998, p. 8.

5. Confer J. F. Martín Seco, "El fin del Estado," in *El Mundo*, 10 Nov., 1998, p. 4.

6. Confer J. García Roca, "La globalización entre el ídolo y la promesa," in *Éxodo*, n. 39, 1989, p. 35-42.

7. P. Teilhard de Chardin, *El fenómeno humano*, 1974, p. 43.

8. The theologian Giulio Girardi makes a keen criticism of those deviations, but seems to recall only the misbehavior of the Church, except for the theology of liberation, which he appraises as a paradigm of cultural alternatives to the exploitation within globalization (cf. "Globalización cultural educativa y su alternativa popular," in *Éxodo*, *idem*, p. 26-34). There has always been theology of liberation in the Church, since the Apostles and the Fathers, though sometimes in the minority.

9. F. Entrena Durán, "La modernización: del etnocentrismo occidentalista a la globalización," in *Revista de Fomento Social*, 53, 1998, p. 195.

10. The emergence of the new localism is accurately surveyed by C. J. Navarro Yáñez, "Globalización y localismo: nuevas oportunidades para el desarrollo," in *Revista de Fomento Social*, 53, 1998, p. 31-46. Here there is patent a very desirable opportunity for a more participatory democracy thanks to the growing relevance of the local sphere in the framework of globalization.

11. Cf. H.-P. Martin and H. Schumann, *La trampa de la globalización*, 1998, p. 300.

12. See a wider explanation in Oliva Blanchette, "Globalization or Humanization: A Question of Priorities in Human Development," in *Philosophical Challenges and Opportunities of Globalization* (Washington, D.C.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 2001).

13. See the useful commentary in G. F. McLean, ed., "Globalization as Diversity in Unity," in *idem*, p. 255.

14. See O. Blanchette, *idem*, p. 19 and G. B. Madison, *idem*, p. 28.

15. See a more accurate explanation in Guillermo de la Dehesa, "La globalización económica y el futuro del estado," in*Claves de razón práctica*, 1998, n. 87, p. 26.

16. As a result of our analysis, we may well have reservations about the substantial innovation of this stage of capitalism: it is not really new ("neo-"). The oft-repeated term "liberalism" depends on the idea of a free market, but the capitalist market is not free -- today less than ever -- but oligopolistic. Capitalism is neither liberal nor neoliberal. This is just propagandist terminology for capitalism.

17. See Christian De Brie, "Cómo se hizo añicos el AMI," in *Le Monde diplomatique*, 14 Dec., 1998, p. 14. Maucher also takes the chair of the European Round Table of Industrialists and of the World Economic Forum of Davos.

18. See J. Pérez Iriarte, *idem*, p. 28; H.-P. Martin and H. Schumann, *idem*, p. 19.; G. Salvini, "Globalizzazione e Paesi in via di sviluppo," in *Civiltà Cattolica*, n. 3550, 1998, p. 353.

19. Cf. G. Overholster, "Champions of Reckoning Ought to Stop and Think," in *Intern. Herald Tribune*, 21 Jan., 1999, p. 9.

20. Cf. Fred Hiatt, "Too Much Blind Faith in Openness," *idem*, p. 8.

21. However, some voices point out the acute danger for the continuity of globalization. For instance, the diplomat C. A. Zaldivar claims that a unilateral leadership of the US, the European Union or Japan could bring about a recession and the end of globalization. A failure of financial integration in producing growth could block the free flow of capitals and give rise to protectionism (cf. "La globalización en crisis," in *El País*, 29 Sept., 1998).

22. I follow here an excellent book on the matter, *The War against Population* (San Francisc: Ignatius Press, 1988) by Jacqueline Kasun. My only reservations concern her excessive enthusiasm for the market, in opposition to any imposed central population planning.

23. Cf. B. Manier, "*Terra terá seis bilhôes de pessoas*," in *A Tarde*, 9 July, 1998, p.13.

24. Until now we have used "globalization," as we are writing in English. While using an adapted form of "globalization" (with a Latin root) is very easy in Latin languages, English has not assumed something like "mondialization." It should not be that difficult. Another word we use and available both to English and Latin languages is "universalism." There is no point in insisting here on the

convenience of the term "universalism," but let us remember that it is independent of the controversy between "globalization" and "*mondialisation*," especially in its rich etymology: "uni-verse," i.e., turned into one or combined into one whole.

25. See Adela Cortina, "Entrevista sobre la globalización," in *Éxodo*, *idem*, p. 13.

26. Cf. about hedge funds and the Tobin Tax: F. A. Garza, "`El final de la historia'. Es necesario un control sobre los mercados de capitales," in *Acontecimiento*, n. 49, 1998, p. 14-15. Even at the 1999 Davos conference capitalist leaders from Japan, Germany, France and Britain were pressing ahead quickly with measures that would toughen regulation, monitoring and oversight of international flows of money through vehicles such as hedge funds. But American officials kept to the orthodoxy, being its first beneficiaries, and rejected the creation of new regulatory structures (cf. *International Herald Tribune*, 30-31 Jan., 1999, p. 1).

27. See, e. g., J. Pérez Iriarte, idem, p. 31; G. Salvini, idem, p. 353; I. Ramonet, "Nuevo siglo," in *Le Monde diplomatique*," n. 39, Jan. 1999, p. 1.

28. E.g., J. Joblin considers "the NGOs to be the laboratories where the future is being prepared" ("Chiesa e mondializzazione," in *Civiltà Cattolica*, n. 3542, Jan. 1998, p. 137).

29. A present-day example is reported by R. Donkin ("La dolce cooperativa," in *The Financial Times*, 22 Jan., 1999, p. 9). David Erdal did a careful comparative analysis of a large number of cooperative ventures, many of which were over 100 years old, in Imola, Italy. His conclusion is that *"egalitarian communities are better than others in important ways."* Interesting aspects are that Imola makes no great divide between rich and poor, and promotes greater voluntary work and more employee training. Life in general is of a higher standard. Erdal's finding was well received by delegates at the annual *International Employee Ownership Conference*. Another significant case comes from the research of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare of the US in 1973 about the effects of a greater participation of workers. The result was that *the participation of workers in management and benefits, together with guaranteed labor rights, brings about a higher productivity* (cf. A. C. Morales Gutiérrez, *idem*, p. 353).

30. All the same, organizations like the IMF pretend to be very charitable, as we read the self-apology of its vice-president, S. Fisher, at the 1999 conference of business leaders in Davos. Being optimistically fixed on their capitalist interests, in this meeting Senator John Kerry and the former vice-governor of the Bank of England, Howard Davis, presented their conclusion that "globalization" is irreversible and most beneficial for humanity. They see only some financial problems; talk of massive starvation was taboo.

31. Cf. J. Rifkin, *The End of Work: the Decline of the Global Labor Force and the Dawn of the Post-Market Era*, 1994, p. 337-338 in the Spanish edition.

CHAPTER III

THE DECONSTRUCTION OF THE ANTILLES

FEDERICO JOSÉ ALVAREZ

The future is created by transcending the present and where reality and dreams open the door of liberty, which is the sphere of the possible.

Life justifies itself by transcending a given "state-of-things".

The future remains a "project" until it claims a place in present reality. To transcend the present, humanity must struggle for all ideals that would become realities; that struggle both bridges and separates dreaming and doing.

What is the sense of our task?

What are the aims of our efforts?

What does it mean for us to be Antillean?

The archipelago of The Antilles is the axis from which Europe, 500 years ago, initiated the globalization of the culture of the West. Santo Domingo became the springboard of the New World, the vehicle through which Europe would make herself, for the first time, the center of the world. Afterwards, Spain, Portugal, France, Holland and Britain distributed the islands and the rest of America among themselves.

The European powers used The Antilles as common ground for their plans of domination; and the ethno-cultural mixture of races grew exuberantly. The Antilles, crucible of many histories, are the place where Western culture replanted itself. It founded there a new language which both offers and imposes Europe as the paradigm of history and culture, initiating the expansion of the West as a planetary culture.

The West as paradigm has taken root throughout the planet as the technical realization of metaphysics and simulation of the ideal. Bereft of horizons other than those of a mass-culture, man acquiesces to the anonymous and impersonal by submitting to a relentless process of depersonalization. Occidental and planetary postmodernity, in shedding all projects from a "post-historical" perspective, poses the threat, as Guadarrama asserts, of a new marginalization of Latin America, with its unfulfilled modernity and its utopian humanism.

Post-modern nihilism discards all the spiritual ties and values that related man to the Absolute. In so doing, humanity completes the overthrow of values which began with claim of the *homo sapiens* to absolute knowledge. From Aristotle to Leibniz this process was ruled by the principle of identity. Hegel and his principle of historical contradiction singled out alienation as the ontological foundation of existence. The process culminated with Marx's conception of *homo faber* who approaches all reality in terms of work as an object of work.

More than half a century ago, Johan Huizinga warned about this state of affairs and attributed it to the diminution or the absence in the culture of homo faber of the ludic element. This is play as free activity, pleasure-giving and a-rational; man is*homo ludens*. In the act of play the man-child sheds his ordinary life and enters a dimension "with no purpose but full of sense." "Modern culture," says Huizinga, "scarcely plays at all, and when it seems to be playing, its game is false." Breaking with the "ordinary" world is for Huizinga an indispensable condition for attaining the condition of play. This function is as essential to man as thought or work and is present in the forming and developing of a culture.

The Antilles, with their beauty and magic, provide an ideal setting for putting the world in parentheses (Husserl) and for unleashing, in the meantime, the playful element in human existence. This experience reconciles man and the natural world, Psyche with Eros.

The fact that Cuba, our elder sister, is on the verge of entering a market economy by way of tourism creates a sudden common ground. The other islands or island-states of The Antilles ought to capitalize on this opportunity by organizing programs of regional economic integration to deal with the growing flow of capital from the First World through the concept of mass vacations, a therapeutic means of preserving societies affected by stress and lack of meaning.

In a global society ruled by a free-market economy, each one of our islands or island-states must rediscover itself and see itself as forming part of a single region, the Antillean archipelago. For all the islands of the Antillean archipelago share a diversity that stems from the ethnographic accident that has shaped us. With that in mind, we must achieve the necessary solidarity for this region to claim an honorable and worthy place in the world market.

For The Antilles to participate in the world community, it must make the best and most intelligent use of its resources. The historical exploitation of the Antilles brought no benefit to the neediest; what we produce must allow our respective states to establish a genuine distributive economy.

We are integral parts of a geopolitical body known as The Antilles. We are related by our territories, our histories, and our living rhythms. We must be fully aware that the whole historical task of becoming a region is in our hands, particularly to develop a social structure that can take its place alongside other societies in a world community.

To call ourselves Antilleans is to identify a common denominator that strings together these pearls scattered through the Caribbean, giving them both meaning and potency (*energeia*).

To give new impetus to our history we must take on the conditions required by today's planetary horizons. To participate and survive, the name of The Antilles must be registered in the "global directory." It could well become the name of the leading world power in seaside tourism.

CHAPTER IV

AFRICAN CULTURAL IDENTITY IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALIZATION: OPPORTUNITIES AND DANGERS

CHIBUEZE C. UDEANI

INTRODUCTION

Two decades ago capitalism was confined largely to North America, Western Europe and a handful of developing countries, principally in East Asia. Collectively these nations entailed approximately 20 percent of the world's population. Today the world is faced with a new phenomenon -- globalization. This polysyllabic phenomenon consists of economic, political and social, as well as cultural and philosophical dimensions. The world today is now on the threshold of a new global capitalism, one which constitutes not only opportunities, but deep risks for development. This phenomenon is spreading to almost 90 percent of the world's population.

The opportunities for development and great risks are found in all dimensions of globalization. What this phenomenon means for a group of people depends principally on its role in the process of globalization. For the global players the positive side seems to outweigh the negative. The reverse is the case for the global non-players. Looking over Africa one becomes aware that Africa is not a global player within this phenomenon. A closer look indicates that the threats confronting her are greater than the obvious opportunities found within this phenomenon. Hence it is necessary to take a critical look at the situation of Africa in the face of globalization.

This paper will focus on the cultural-philosophical dimension of globalization. Specifically, we shall treat the issue of African cultural identity and the globalization process. First, we will attempt to trace the development of the African cultural identity to the present day. Secondly, we will look at the cultural challenges and threats that confront Africa, and the cultural opportunities for Africa.

AFRICA AND HER CULTURAL IDENTITY

Only one who can say "I" to himself or herself can say "you" to the others. In a sense, identity is that which makes a person or a thing, in contrast to others, who or what one is. Identity is an essential existential constituent of the reality of existents.

For Africans, the issue of cultural identity is of vital importance, especially in this phase of their development and in the face of presentday globalization. The marginalization of Africa in today's world calls also for such a reflection. Though negative, this marginalization offers here an excellent vantage position for self-reflection. In this process one comes to see the need to address such question as where we stand in relation to our history and what is our cultural identity in the face of globalization. How can Africans strive toward a healthy balance between the positive elements of their own culture and those of other non-African cultures without losing a healthy attitude towards their own culture?

"Id" and "Entity"

An etymological-analytical examination of the term "identity" shows it to consist of two words: "id" and "entity". The word "id" has two origins -- the Latin origin, which points to

(psyche) "id" and the Greek origin, which points to the Greek word "*idios*." Standing alone, this word means one's "own", "private". This as a suffix takes the forms "*ides*" -- "son of" and "*idos*" or "*idios*" -- "daughter." The word "entity" comes from "*ens*," the present participle of "*esse*" -- "to be." It points to an entity as opposite to an attribute and as having objective reality.

In this sense then identity means something with its own/private (*idios*) objective reality. In general parlance, it points to the individuality of a thing or person -- that is, to what a thing or who a person is. Reflecting on identity, we have seen the emphasis put on "own/private" and "the objective reality" of a thing in contrast to the attributes. Hence, identity points to a relation: thinking of "own" or "private" or "objective reality" presupposes the existence of another.

Here we are confronted with what could be called the "paradox of identity": Identity points to the separating, distinguishing and differentiating aspects of a reality in contrast to other realities; it also indicates the belongingness and similarity of the realities of a class in contrast to those of other classes. So in a sense, identity in itself points not only to a thing or all members of its class, but also to the class-complements of this reality and to their classes.

Culture

"Culture" could be defined as the sum total of the answers people give to the questions of life. One can talk of answers because it is known that human beings pose questions regarding life. It is not only human beings, however, for life itself poses questions to human beings. The search for meaning or purpose in life is a question posed by human beings. The challenges of life can be seen as the questions that life poses. The answers to these are found in life (e.g., in the natural laws), but human beings must respond also to questions whose answers are not found in nature.

The answers give by groups of people depend on various factors, for example, time, space, history etc. Considering the issue of time, the particular time when a question is posed contributes a lot to the answer. Hence, what is valid for one moment may not be suitable some moments later.

The place of the questioning, i.e, the context in which it is posed, is another decisive factor. This helps to explain why various answers are found for the same question in different regions of the world.

When time and space (location) are put together in the search for an answer, the results are bound by time and space, which imply changes and differences. These notwithstanding, one finds not only a certain continuity in the answers given at different times, but also similarities in the answers found in different locations. All these similarities point to the role of history as a factor in the search for and the giving of answers to the different questions of life. Human beings continuously collect, evaluate, develop, practice and transfer these answers from one generation to the next and from one region to the other. This is the way with the different cultures of the world: cultures are developed under different circumstances of time and space. They grow, and as with any other living thing, death and birth mark the lives of cultures. Cultural growth should be seen also from a regional perspective, for one may speak of the spread of culture only from a regional perspective.

African Cultural Identities and Identity

Speaking about African cultural "identity" and "identities" should not provoke a reaction against unnecessary repetition or playing with words. African cultural identity, with the emphasis on the singular form, points to all traits that distinguish Africa and African from the rest of the

world. In this case it includes all those attributes, which when considered together, make all the rest in relation to Africa a logical class complement, i.e., non-Africa, non-African.

On the other hand, reflecting on African cultural identity, the plural form highlights the variety of traits or features that distinguish the different groups or communities of Africans in Africa or elsewhere from one another. Traits that distinguish not only Africans and Africa from the rest of the world, but also Africans among themselves are manifest in such areas as worldview, politics, language, religion, economy, education, arts, music, literature, etc. History is also a vital point. As the title of this reflection suggests, we will focus more on attention on traits that distinguish Africa from the rest, than on those that demarcate the respective African groups. In other words, we are more concerned with the African cultural identity than the African cultural identities. Clearly these two branches are in a sense interwoven, so apparent deviations from the central line of this reflection will only be made when necessary.

AFRICAN CULTURAL IDENTITIES WITHIN AFRICAN HISTORY

We shall consider the different cultural identities of Africa mainly in distinction to the rest of the world in the different epochs of African history. In other words, we will consider Africa in her cultural identity, as she saw her cultural self, and Africa with reference to the world, i.e., as she understood her cultural self, and as the world perceived this cultural self. It is not easy for an African to speak of Africa in terms of the pre-colonial Africa, colonial Africa and the neo-colonial Africa. Colonialism was an unfortunate development in the history of humanity of which Africa has been one of the victims. Hence it is all the more painful to categorize her and her history mainly from this negative aspect. But even though this is unfortunate, it is a reality of history, even though the truth may not have been sweet.

Pre-Colonial Africa

African cultural identity of this phase of history has been differently portrayed. This difference often indicates the standpoint of the presenters towards Africa. One can speak of standpoint, rather than view, because this similarity in views crosses boundaries. Among Africans and non-Africans one finds those who share similar standpoints, while having different views. But because of the truths of history-as-it-took-place -- which is often different from the history-as-it-has-been-documented -- such points of agreement abound for all, irrespective of their differences of opinion.

What the African cultural identity of this epoch is for different groups is more or less an historical matter. Such images of Africa testify to the goals and methods which those concerned have used in the presentation of Africa in and through their writings on African history.

Most of what is known today about the African cultural identity of this period is based on archeological discoveries and history. Those who sympathize with Africa emphasize the positive aspect of this African cultural identity, while those that are of the contrary view stress the negative side. Even in the study of archeological findings and their interpretation -- without denying their objectivity -- these factors play some important roles. The crucial aspect of history, especially when the historographical dimension is to be considered as it is the case here, is to recognize the importance of ideology in the study and teaching of history in general and African history in particular. The core of history, after all, is not just the bare facts of what happened, but what is going on behind the events. This is why even historians and archeologists are not just chroniclers or antiquarians.[1]

When we consider what is going on behind the events, we can imagine the agents behind these events -- the pre-colonial Africans. Considering such events as the footprints of their agents, it becomes obvious that the identity of Africa in this period lies in such events. Hence African history plays a crucial role in the issue of African cultural identity. African cultural identity in this time may be found in the respective cultural identities of the different African communities, in their world-views, social arrangements, politics, religions, economies, education, arts, music, literature and languages.

Reflecting on African cultural identity in terms of the rest of the world as class-complement at this stage, it is obvious that for Africa for most of the world did not exist. So one may not even speak accurately of a collective African cultural identity. If we may speak of it at all, it is the cultural identity in reference to those non-African with whom she had contacts through trade, etc. Even then, there were only the identities of particular kingdoms, dynasties, and the like.

Africa got her collective cultural identity from outside. Such collective cultural identity, or the consciousness or awareness of it, comes mostly in the presence of the other, from whom one has to be distinguished or brought into relationship. A class presupposes a class-complement, and vice versa. So in a sense, individuation presumes the existence of another. In a way there is a dependency: identity dependents upon awareness of the fact of individuation. Since Africa as a whole was not aware of itself as a whole, there is no "African cultural identity" as such in the pre-colonial period.

The Colonial Africa

What began with the arrival of the first Europeans on the Africa soil, and developed into the slave trade with aid in Africa, reached its peak in the enslavement of Africa itself through colonialism.

It is not that Africa saw herself as standing next to another, but the essence of African cultural identity was attacked and to a large extent destroyed. Missionary activities in Africa must be mentioned here. What colonialism accomplished mainly physically and partly psychologically was fully sealed psychologically and spiritually through missionary activities. What both achieved, irrespective of the protests of the several African communities, was the erosion of the foundation of the African cultural identity. The result of this erosion is the alienation of Africans from themselves and their world. Every constitutive element of African cultural identity was attacked and almost completely destroyed. Such elements include the worldviews, politics, social arrangements, religions, economies, educational systems, arts, music, literature and languages of the different African communities.

The African individual, himself or herself, was also negatively affected. The African was attacked, oppressed, exploited, robbed of his/bar self-worth, reduced to a nobody and hence deformed by an inferiority complex. The consequences of colonialism and missionary activities include diseases of the mind and consciousness. If what happens to a person, happens in the mind, the conclusion here should be obvious.

Colonialism lasted so long in its original form, and continues today in its divergent forms, because it possessed an overpowering psychological hold on the minds of the Africans. For centuries Africans were led to believe that they were an inferior people incapable of development, and that non-Africans, especially Europeans, intrinsically possessed all that was good and superior. On the one hand, following generations of exploitation, Europeans actually believed in the inferiority of Africans. On the other hand, Africans had developed an ingrained dependence

fostered by European/foreign domination.[2] As a result the Africans, being an historically, politically, socially and economically disinherited and dispossessed group, were forced to develop a negative self-image.

As a result, in this period of colonialism there developed a self-understood African cultural identity with two dimensions: One related the African to his/her fellows, the other to Europeans.

With the traumatic breakdown of the institutions of native culture, things fell apart. From this period the African understood himself/herself differently in relation to the Europeans and in relation to fellow Africans. They also behaves differently towards Europeans and fellow Africans. The other who stands opposite to oneself is no longer just the other, but the other whose presence determines who one (the African) is. The values for one's self-image or identity are now explicitly dependent on who this other is in relation to the African's perception of the other -- hence the turn difference in relation to this other, this self-bifurcation, is a direct result of colonialist subjugation.[3]

This colonialist subjugation and consequent cultural identity crisis for the African are manifest in the issues of language and religion. Basic importance should be ascribed to the phenomenon of language. Language is an elements in the African's comprehension of the other and of himself/herself in relation with this other, for to speak is to exist absolutely for the ether.[4]

"To speak means to be in a position to use a certain syntax, to grasp the morphology of this or that language, but it means above all to assume a culture and to support the weight of a civilization."[5] Africans like every other colonized people, were confronted with the language of the colonizer. In the process of colonization the colonized is then made is elevated above his/her miserable status in proportion to his adoption of the colonizer's cultural standards. The possession of different languages does not just mean the possession of different tools; but it means the participation in different psychological and cultural worlds.

The colonized Africans' use of the language of the colonizer is regrettable because this required them to subject themselves to the languages of the colonizers. In this situation, which is under the control of the colonizer, the mother tongue of the colonized is humiliated and enslaved, without his/her being conscious of it. In the end, the colonized ends up internalizing it. As with other such groups this internalization of the standards of judgment of their colonizers is the most serious affliction suffered by the colonized Africans.

One of the negative effects of colonialism in Africa is that it precluded the Africans from participating objectively in their own culture. They were excluded from social, economic and political decision that deeply affected them and their environment. In every way they were forced to live isolated from their time and circumstance. They suffered alienation.

Foreign cultures and identities were impressed upon the Africans. Recalling our working definition of culture as the sum total of answers a group gives to the question of life, this means that Africans were forced into a situation of trying to fit a square peg into a round hole. They were forced to give foreign, inadequate and (in most cases) wrong answers to the indigenous questions of their life.

Neo-Colonial Africa

The period since the paper-independence of African countries, which is often referred to as the post-colonial Africa, may be better termed neo-colonial Africa. This is the period when the colonial seeds sown in Africa began to yield fruit.

The first generation of Africans in this period had the goal of shaking off what they had come to see as their inferior, original cultural identity but found themselves frustrated in their efforts. The

sole aim of this generation was to become European. The only pitiable destiny was to become another -- the European -- so as to reach a "human level". Having lost their cultural identity, or having run away from worthless in their eyes. The next aspiration for them was to become somebody, but not just anybody it was to become human.

For these Africans, to become human was to become European. But they could not become that at wish because the European had to dictate and sanction it. In their inferiority they believed it was better to accept the lowest levels of being human. Of course, they forgot that the Europeans are sealed in their Europeanness just as the Africans were in their Africanness. This illusion accompanied many who had to interact with the Europeans -- their servants, maids, interpreters, luggage carriers, court messengers, converts of the different missionary groups, and so on. For them, even a low position was a privilege, a way to a new identity.

Education is an area where the situation shows itself clearly. Many young Africans believed that acquiring the language and some of the behavioral patterns of the colonizers would give them not only the benefit of being European, and hence human, but also of equality with the colonizers. This was also the case with religious converts -- most joined the different groups just for this purpose and those who rose higher began to see themselves as pure European. After all, within such groups they all were addressed as brothers and sisters. Every new convert had to turn his or her back not only on his/her former religion but also on his/her world, environment, everything, and accept a new foreign name.

It was not long, however, before it dawned on them what illusions they were pursuing. Some had the chance of seeing the Europeans as they really were within the cultural milieu. But mainly due to the fruitlessness of their efforts to metamorphose into Europeans and be accorded equality, another phase in the whole process began.

This contributed, among other things, to the birth of class-consciousness among those colonized. They were made to realize that even if they have been accepted as human beings, there existed a hierarchy of classes of human being, and that their place was in the lowest of all these classes.

This new class-consciousness became the alternative consciousness. It has now a new identity: an antinomial, collective cultural identity that became a uniting force for these colonized Africans and with which they stood against the systems of the colonizers. This class-consciousness manifested itself in the new antinomial, collective cultural identity, an identity of opposition, constituted gradually the all-encompassing liberation movements in Africa against the colonizer. Just as in other such cases, the antinomial, collective cultural identity -- identity of opposition -- had its own seed of destruction. It grew and was nurtured from outside circumstance -- in this case the oppressor. It is an identity whose existence is intrinsically dependent on the other. Once the other -- the oppressor -- disappears, the oppressed disappear as well.

One of the intentions of these Africans with this collective cultural identity of opposition was to prove to the other, i.e., non-Africans that Africans are equal to them. But was that true? It was not an effort geared towards rediscovering of Africa's own cultural identity, but of imbibing the standards of the colonizer and using them as a yardstick in their protest.

This antinomial, collective cultural identity of Africa goes a long way to help us understand the fate of Africa since the apparent disappearance of the oppressors, or since they disguised themselves and changed their method. The problem is that the lost child, the African, can no longer find the way home. This is Africa at crossroads.

This is where the foundation of the next phase of the issue of African cultural identity was consolidated. This is an important phase in the African cultural identity crisis. Now that the

oppressor apparently had been chased away, the next question was: how should Africans define their individual selves in the face of other Africans and non-Africans?

One needs to think thus: as individuals saw themselves unconsciously in reference to their affiliation with oppressors, class consciousness based on this principle arose. This became manifest in the demarcation that could be drawn between those who had to interact with the oppressors and those who remained distant. Those who dealt with the colonists adopted a language different from that of their native group. This shows a dislocation, a separation that is particularly intensified among some groups of Africans. It is evident in cultural choices. Those who adopt colonial culture wear colonizers' clothes; they use colonizers' furniture and forms of social intercourse. They adorn their native language (if they can still speak it) with the colonizers' expressions. These and other behaviors contribute to a feeling of being different from those who were distant from colonizers' influence and avoided equality with the colonizers and their achievements.[6]

On a collective level the African groups began to see themselves in relation to other African groups on the basis of the identity of the colonizer, hence we find such forms of group self-identity as anglophone and franco-phone Africa. It is not just a matter of description. The bond of affiliation among them is built in this way. This reflects itself, as already indicated, in the way most Africans understand their cultural identity in the presence of non-Africans.

AFRICAN CULTURAL IDENTITY AND GLOBALIZATION

There is a difference between Africans and other colonized groups with respect to the problem of identity. Arabs came Africa as imperialists from another continent. They succeeded in integrating the African people who occupied the area up to the equator into Islam. Even today these so-called "African-Arabs" are confronted with the problem of cultural identity in the face of today's western cultural onslaught.

In other parts of Africa the problem of cultural identity seems much more complex. Before colonialism, African cultural identity was primarily based on ethnicity. This identity was regionally rooted. As a result of colonialism, which succeeded in disorganizing this ethnic set-up and all that belongs to it, there was nothing left on which to found ethnic identity.

From this time up to the present, the different black African groups took different ways to address themselves to this issue of cultural identity. Most of the ways sought and applied where those either directly instituted by the colonizers or indirectly derived from the products of colonization. Efforts geared towards the total destruction of ethnic attachments and cultural identity was also made through centralist program directed toward the building of nations.

Africa is confronted with a dilemma rooted in the dualism of the purpose of most Africans today. Many would like to modernize Africa or see her made relevant to the mainstream of the universal culture of human race. For some, especially the African intellectuals and other elites, the state apparatus and the incipient "nation" are elevated to sacred symbols, once imported to Africa by the colonial situation. The same people also wish or strive to affirm and develop the dignity of their indigenous African tradition symbolized by language, among other things.

Clearly these new nation-states cannot assume the position of authentic symbolic referents to African civilization without first embodying values and insights that are originally and typically African and must be expressed in African language. Concurrently, African culture cannot be considered authentically modern unless it embodies the values and insights of the today's world. In a sense, it must be able to be African and yet non-African.

> Globalization is principally all about creating an economic environment where competition, efficiency and profit can set the tone for economic activity, rather than facilitate full lives and life-styles. . . . Even though . . . the process of globalization is . . . natural, the manner in which it is being carried out is not. Indeed, rather than seeing globalization, we are actually seeing Americanization of the world economy (and consequently an effort towards Americanization of global culture).[7]

This is where the problem or the threat lies for the rest of the world cultures, especially those that counted among the non-global players. This is Africa's fate.

One of the threats is that this process will increasingly preclude Africans from participating objectively, not only in the political decisions that deeply affect them, but also in their own culture. The imposition of another foreign culture is inevitable. If a working definition of "culture" is the sum total of answers which people give to the questions of life, under globalization, Africans are finding themselves in a situation that forces them to accept foreigner's answers to their own questions of life.

Although the main visible trends of globalization are principally economic, it does not even respect the different economic traditions and cultures of the world. Globalization is the other way around: it is the "forceful" implementation of the wisdom of Adam Smith's invisible hand.

All this has to do with world cultures. Economy, broadly defined, is shaping global culture. That means that economic leaders in this process have a much broader set of responsibilities than just the bottom line. But because of the way economic leaders understand economy within the process of Globalization, they have not been able to think beyond shareholder values.

Much depends on these economic leaders, for without the right consciousness the opportunities that abound for the different world cultures -- especially those of global non-players like Africa -- will not easily available. The economic leaders need to develop a consciousness of global culture.

For her part, Africa must be more committed. Africa needs to realize that such things as collective, authentic, cultural identity will not be given to her on a platter from anywhere. The revival of Africa's cultural heritage and its honest, authentic and functional spirit and institutions must become a practical goal. Without stopping at this, an honest appraisal and forward movement towards dialogue with the rest of the world should equally follow. This is a call to reverse years of negative self-image and replace it with an honest, real, positive and dynamic cultural identity.[8]

The areas worth our consideration include both social and the economic realities. The psychological aspect is also important but should not be seen alone. This is because effective desalination of the African entails an immediate recognition of social and economically based. The case of alienation is the outcome of -- among others things -- a double process: primarily economic and subsequently the internalization of this state of existence.[9]

NOTES

1. O.U. Kalu, (Ed.) *The History of Christianity in West Africa* (London: Longman, 1980), p. 2.
2. S. Biko, *The Testimony of Steve Biko* (London: Granada Publishing, 1978), p. xvii.
3. Fanon Frantz, *Black Skin White Masks* (New York: Gerove Weidenfeld, 1967), p. 17.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.*, p. 17f.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 25.

7. J. Bonfante, et al., "One World Divided. in: *Time*, July 7, 1997, 38.
8. Biko, p. xviii.
9. Frantz, *ibid.*, p. 11.

CHAPTER V

GLOBALIZATION: CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

G.B. MADISON

We live non -- for the first time in human history -- in a new era when our planet is enveloped by a single civilization. Václav Havel

INTRODUCTION

One doesn't have to be a Marxist to realize that economic factors play a crucial role in the development of human civilization. The very term "civilization" has a dual material/spiritual significance, and in the advance of civilization the material and the spiritual are always conjoined. The history of humanity is the history of its progressive liberation from material deprivation, i.e., of economic development, as well as the history of the growth of freedom in the realm of the spirit (see Madison 1996). We now have a name for the dynamics at work in our present stage in the development of civilization, namely, globalization. In this paper I will highlight the multi-faceted phenomenon of globalization in an attempt to discern some of the challenges it poses as well as some opportunities it offers.

I hasten to add that I speak neither as an advocate nor as a critic of globalization; I neither applaud it, nor do I condemn it. What purpose would either of these stances serve? Like it or not, globalization is a fact (a fact-in-the-making); it is irrelevant whether one "approves" or "disapproves" of it. As a phenomenologist, I seek only to discern the significance of what historically is; like Hegel, I believe that the task of philosophy is not that of "issuing instructions on how the world ought to be"; it is simply that of describing what actually or effectively is -- and what, given the logic or dynamics of the processes at work, is likely to be (see Hegel 1991, p. 21, and Madison 1994).[1] Globalization has become the overarching fact with which all the various countries (and cultures) of the world must contend; it is a challenge which none of them can avoid. Like all profound transmutations in history (such as the earlier, and still on-going, phenomenon of modernization), globalization is something that is not a matter of human choosing. We cannot choose the historical situations with which we must contend, but we can do our best to make the best of the opportunities they present to us. Why indeed can we not hope that the emerging global civilization will turn out to be one imbued, in the words of Václav Havel, with "a new spirituality, a new ethos, and a new ethics, values that should be adopted today by all cultures, all nations, as a condition of their very survival"? (Havel 1998, p. 24)

THE PHENOMENON OF GLOBALIZATION

The phenomenon of globalization is itself global, that is to say, all-encompassing. It is, of course, in the first instance a material or economic phenomenon, but, like all significant civilizational developments, it also has profound cultural or spiritual significance. (Nothing in human affairs is ever "merely" economic.) I would like to reflect on some of the cultural and political consequences of globalization, but before doing so let me focus on some of its more strictly economic aspects.

Many of the basic features of the new economic reality being brought about by globalization are now a matter of common knowledge or awareness, and, accordingly, I shall not dwell on them. What globalization above all signals is a fundamental transformation in the primary arena of human economic activity, i.e., the "marketplace." Whereas in former times it made sense for economists to take the "national economy" (*Nationalökonomie*) as their chief point of reference, this is no longer the case. Markets (the chief object of economic science in those countries deemed to be "capitalist") are rapidly being "denationalized," as it were. National markets are increasingly mere subsets of a worldwide international or, perhaps better said, transnational marketplace. And this marketplace, though it is multifaceted and varied, is truly global, encompassing as it does markets not only for an unlimited range of goods and services, but also for capital and finance, and to a lesser degree labor. For instance, capital is no longer restricted to financing projects in domestic markets with poor returns, but can be shifted instantaneously to any country that offers more productive investment opportunities (much to the chagrin of illiberal governments). Financial and currency markets have also become global, with over a trillion dollars moving about the world every day with the speed of electricity (far outstripping the value of trade in goods and services -- and subjecting national fiscal and monetary policies to the merciless verdict of the market). Even the manufactured goods that are traded in the global marketplace often no longer "originate" in any particular country but are the composite products of "an elaborate international web of suppliers and assemblers."[2]

All these developments are the consequences of developments in the material infrastructure of human existence. I am referring in particular to the new electronic technology of information and telecommunications. By greatly increasing the power, scope, and ease of communication while at the same time dramatically lowering its costs, technology has pretty much abolished the natural barriers that hitherto separated national markets.[3] Communication is now global, and the consequences are not only economic, but social and political as well.

From a social point of view, the demands of the global economy are bringing about profound changes in the work habits and lifestyles of people in their own native countries. In order to meet the challenge of global competition, national economies are obliged, if they are not to fall behind, to "retool" themselves, which often entails widespread social transformation and dislocation. This is naturally disruptive of established social practices, and is thus often viewed negatively by both citizens and governments. People do have a deep-seated craving for stability, a human susceptibility to which socialists know well how to play. Unlike the static world of blissful contentment projected by socialist utopianism, the world of actual "capitalism" is one of ever-increasing wealth. It never achieves, or even aims at, a state of equilibrium (contrary to what mainstream neoclassical economists would have us believe); but is rather a world of ever-reoccurring disruption and dislocation.[4] As Joseph Schumpeter famously remarked, the capitalist "order" is one of perpetual "creative destruction" (see Schumpeter 1994).

On the political side, globalization poses a serious challenge to the old idea of "national sovereignty."[5] By reason of its own internal logic, the new global economic order both requires and calls forth the ever-increasing liberalization of trade and investment. In turn, multilateral trade agreements such as those institutionalized in the new WTO necessarily restrict the ability of national governments to act unilaterally in their own parochial interests when trade disputes arise. As a result they have a decidedly "negative" impact on any individual nation's "sovereignty" (a development greatly bemoaned by nationalists and socialists alike).[6] My own view is that the "withering away" of national sovereignty is a positive development which has the possibility of promoting democracy on a global scale, a point to which I shall return. For the moment, I would

like to concentrate on one highly noteworthy economic -- or, to be more precise, political-economic -- consequence of globalization.

THE NEW GLOBAL ECONOMIC ORDER

We often hear it said that the recent economic crisis in Southeast and East Asia, precipitated by the collapse of the Thai baht in July of 1997, demonstrates the "downside" of globalization. When national economies are increasingly interlinked and when capital is free to move about, a crisis in one country can rapidly spillover into other countries, creating a kind of global domino effect of an extremely disruptive sort. There can be no denying that this is exactly what happened. But what exactly does the Asian crisis demonstrate: That globalization is inherently destabilizing and something to be resisted; that nations should adhere instead to what Indian nationalists call *swadeshi*, self-reliance? I don't think so. I suggest that what the Asian crisis really demonstrates is not a failure of global capitalism but rather, a failure of capitalism hitherto to be truly global. What I mean is that the Asian crisis can be viewed as stemming from the fact that the economies in question were not sufficiently "capitalist," i.e., free-market oriented, in the first place. Thus, as happened in the aftermath of the Mexican crisis of 1994-95, which had spillover effects throughout Latin America ("the tequila effect"), there is every reason to hope that the current Asian crisis may actually turn out to have long-term beneficial results, the disruptions and hardships it has produced in the short term notwithstanding. This is to say that analysis of its underlying causes can serve the very useful purpose of improving the workings of the global economic order that is coming into being. In other words, it can serve to make this order more free market oriented and, thus, more efficient -- which is also to say, more conducive to the promotion of the general welfare of everyone, everywhere. In any event, it would, in my estimation, amount to a gross error in judgment to view the crisis as being somehow the nefarious result of Western "economic imperialism." If blame is to be assigned anywhere, it should be placed squarely on the shoulders of the primary political and economic actors of the countries in question; it should be attributed to the structural defects of the economic systems for which they themselves were responsible.[7]

The existence of a global economy -- specifically, of a free market in currency trading -- may have been the proximate cause of the Asian crisis; it was most definitely not, however, its underlying *raison d'être*. It was, for instance, pure self-serving demagoguery designed for a domestic audience when Malaysia's prime minister, Mahathir Mohamad, blamed the precipitous drop in value of his country's currency on international Jewish speculators and stated at the 1997 annual meeting of the IMF and the World Bank in Hong Kong that unrestricted currency trading was "unnecessary, unproductive and immoral."[8]By divesting themselves of the Malaysian ringgit and other regional currencies, managers of hedge funds and speculators, like George Soros, were not, behaving like "highway men of the global economy" but were actually performing a valuable service to the countries in question. They were sending a much needed wake-up call that the fundamentals of those economies were not in good shape and that their currencies were not worth what they would have liked them to be worth.[9] One thing that can be attributed to the phenomenon of globalization is a change in understanding of what constitutes the nature and "value" of money.[10] As Georg Simmel pointed out at the beginning of this century, money is not something "objective" or "material"; it is in fact a purely *geistig* entity whose "value" is constituted solely by the (subjective) evaluations of acting human beings (see Simmel 1990). In general, the "essence" (value) of money is totally relative and expresses nothing other than the trust and confidence that people feel warranted in placing in the workings of a national economy. When this confidence is,

for whatever reason, called into question, it is inevitable (given the existence of free markets) that a country's currency will drop in value.[11]It is precisely this confidence-measuring function that free markets are designed to serve. Don't blame the market if the message it sends you is that you're doing something wrong, though unfortunately, the inclination to kill the messenger bearing bad news seems to be an ineradicable feature of human nature. Mr. Mahathir currency trading, whatever its defects may be, most definitely does have economic value.[12]

What the Asian crisis has made us realize is that the much-touted Asian "economic miracle" was, to a not altogether insignificant extent, a matter of smoke-and-mirrors with the possible exception of Taiwan.[13] In 1995 a Japanese institute raised the question, "How long will Asia's economic miracle last?" (Fukukawa 1995, p. 2). Well, as we now know (and Japan could have known several years ago) not very long. Like Hong Kong's wildly overpriced real estate market (a result of official policy[14]), the East Asian economic bubble was destined to burst at some point or other. That point was reached in July 1997. This is when the real message of economic globalization began to hit home.

What exactly was wrong with the East Asian economies that the challenges of globalization have now exposed? Certainly, there was no lack of competitive spirit, a solid work ethic, and entrepreneurial talent. In some countries, the failure can be attributed in part to the lack of energetic government support for universal public education (the creation, as Peter Drucker would say, of "knowledge workers" [see, for instance, Drucker 1993a]). On the whole this was certainly not a major factor.[15] A failure to provide for general public education would signal as in the case of India a systemic defect of the economy in question; it would not be such as to promote an immediate crisis. If, as it so happened, a serious crisis occurred in short order, it was because investors realized that the fundamentals of the economies in question were untrustworthy, even in the short term. A list of the foundational defects in these economies might include the following (this is a general list, the items cited applying much more to some countries than to others):[16] poor regulation of the economy and a woeful lack of transparency in government bookkeeping; a corporate culture that valued neither financial transparency nor stockholder accountability; insider trading; low productivity and an inefficient use of capital and labor; industries run less for the sake of turning a profit than for enhancing the power of their directors; an over-reliance on export in relation to domestic consumer spending; over-guaranteed and under-regulated banks; soft bank lending practices and a dysfunctional relation to capital, even outright fraud on the part of major banks and financial institutions; opaque systems of cross-ownership; an incestuous relation between governments, banks, and highly indebted companies (as in the case of South Korean *chaebol*s such as Samsung and Hyundai); nepotism, cronyism, influence-peddling, and general corruption; a reluctance on the part of governments to let large floundering companies go bankrupt; a failure, even, to have properly designed bankruptcy laws; labor market rigidity; a lack of democratic openness and an over-reliance on technocratic elites; and a lack of social safety nets.

This very schematic list indicates that the structural problems of the Asian economies that have now become apparent were both economic and political in nature. That is to say, they were a matter of political economy, having to do with defects in the way the "capitalist" system was politically-economically institutionalized in these countries. "Capitalism," i.e., free-market economics, is, after all, a more or less recent arrival in this part of the world, and thus it is not surprising that it should require some time for the logic of this way of organizing human affairs to work itself out and for it to take root in new cultural settings. Advocates of "Asian values" notwithstanding, there is no justification for believing that authoritarian governance is superior to capitalist or "bourgeois" democracy -- the institutionalized respect for individual rights and

freedoms -- in promoting economic development. More fundamentally, there is no justification for thinking that there is, or could ever be, something like an "Asian" capitalism differing in essential ways from "Western" capitalism. To the degree that there was such a thing as "Asian capitalism," the term was simply a euphemism for corrupt capitalism. Indonesia, for instance, was not so much a free-market, capitalist tiger on the rise, as in the words of one writer, "a vast patronage racket that finally fell apart."[17]

As in the case of other human disciplines, economics is a science, and one of the chief functions of this science, hermeneutically speaking is ideal-type analysis, i.e., delineating the essential features of this or that possible type of economic organization of human affairs.[18] The ideal-type capitalism or market economics, for instance, possesses certain eidetic or essential features, ones which in one cultural form or another are to be found everywhere that this type of economy can be said properly to exist. The laws of economics, e.g., "supply and demand," do not vary in any essential way from one culture to another; they are universal, i.e., transcultural. It was a failure to realize this -- an attempt, in the words of Lester Thurow, "to defy economic gravity" -- that was the underlying cause of the Asian crisis; this was the lesson delivered to these nations with stunning swiftness by the global economy.[19] In dramatic contrast to what was commonly proclaimed a decade or so ago, we now know that "Japanese capitalism" was never a logical alternative to the somewhat more orthodox versions of capitalism as practiced in the West, America in particular, and did not pose a threat to them.[20] From the point of view of basic economic theory, what the Asian crisis has demonstrated is that Asia's "managed capitalism" did not constitute a third category of political economy -- that of "capitalist developmental states" (CDSs).[21] It is not a kind of third way in relation to the socialist command economy, on the one hand, and the free-market, entrepreneurial economy, on the other. The success for a time of the "Japanese model," we are now in a position to see, did not amount to a refutation of the Hayekean argument against economic planning in general, i.e., against the very possibility of any such attempt ever being successful. After decades during which it was thought that the economy could be "steered" -- by means either of central planning or some form or other of the "Keynesian" macro-management -- socialist and "mixed" economies have both run up against what the Austrian-school economists calls the Knowledge Problem: No government is capable of mustering the knowledge that it would need to possess in an explicit form in order effectively to coordinate the economy. Only the spontaneous ordering, free-pricing function of the market is capable of achieving this (altogether remarkable) result.[22]

I want to emphasize that these remarks are in no way intended to hold up for every particular instanciation of the market economy, a model such as the American or British. It is the same in economics as it is in politics: there are certain essential features that market economies necessarily all have in common, just as there are certain essential features that all political regimes must possess if they are properly said to be democratic ones. But it is equally the case that differing national histories, cultural traditions, and societal values will influence the way universal economic laws and democratic values are applied or institutionalized in any particular country, at any particular time.

Thus, for instance, while one essential requirement of democracy is the existence of free, regularly scheduled elections, there are any number of ways in which electoral laws providing for such elections may be drafted. A country may opt for the "Westminster," district-based, first-past-the-post model, for proportional representation or for any convoluted combination of the two.[23] In terms of ideal types, however, there is no more such a thing as "Asian capitalism" than there is such a thing as "African democracy."[24] "Capitalism" -- to the degree that it exists -- is essentially

the same the world over, just as is democracy. Cultural factors will -- and, indeed, should -- influence the way universal laws, principles, or values are applied in this or that instance and will inevitably produce different mixtures of policies and structures in different countries. There is no universal formula for the implementation of universal values. However, this cannot alter the fact that certain normative principles have genuine universal validity. In this regard, the liberal-democratic revolution in world politics ("democratization"), and world economics ("liberalization") that the phenomenon of globalization signifies necessarily entails a certain degree of what some social commentators somewhat misleadingly refer to as cultural "homogenization." It is, accordingly, to a consideration of some of the cultural consequences of globalization that I now turn.[25]

GLOBALIZATION AND CULTURE

As I mentioned at the outset, there is always a dual material/spiritual aspect to developments in human civilization. This is today no more evident than in the realm of culture. Thanks, precisely, to material developments in the technology of communication as well as transportation, whose effect has been to bring ever-increasing numbers of people from all quarters of the globe into direct face-to-face contact,[26] we are currently witnessing the emergence of a global mass culture -- indeed, as Havel would say, a single worldwide civilization. This fact may be bemoaned by cultural elites in the West as well as by cultural autarkists in some of the more backward parts of the world, but it is a fact of world history nonetheless, and thus merits hermeneutic scrutiny.

At roughly the same time in the last century when Marx issued his backhanded paean to capitalist dynamism, praising capitalism for having abolished national barriers and created something altogether new, namely, an early form of the global economy,[27] John Stuart Mill, that great spokesperson for liberal individualism and human individuality,[28] publicly bemoaned what he took to be the trend of the times: "[T]he general tendency of things throughout the world is to render mediocrity the ascendant power among mankind. . . . Europe . . . is decidedly advancing toward the Chinese ideal of making all people alike."[29] A present-day Mill who watched TV would no doubt have even more reason for saying much the same. Increasing "homogenization" is a worldwide cultural fact -- and a direct consequence of globalization. Is "homogenization" such a bad thing, though? The fact of the matter is that the "homogenization" which is coming about is anything but Chinese. Even in China, traditionally the land of oppressive social conformity, as Mill well recognized, the cultural ideal of "group-think" (or "groupism," as the Chinese have now appropriately labeled it), is in full retreat.[30] The stifling, ant-hill-like, socialist uniformity of the Mao era is out, and, in terms of dress, fashion, social mores, and intellectual practices, the Chinese are fast becoming, as are other Asian peoples, indistinguishable from Westerners. All of this came about thanks to the capitalist reforms initiated by Deng in 1978 and his altogether revolutionary policy. It was revolutionary in terms of China's long history of self-imposed isolation and of "opening up" the country to the outside world and to the global economy. In China, Western-style individualism is on a spectacular rise. A fact which, incidentally, bodes well for the prospects for full-fledged democracy in that country.[31] The situation is much the same in Japan: The age-old cultural value of social conformism, i.e., *nakama-ishiki*or group-consciousness, is no longer held in high esteem by increasing numbers of globally-influenced, independently-minded people. The Japanese, who prided themselves on their "difference" from other peoples, are beginning to speak up for their rights and are becoming a bit less "different." Universalism, by which I mean the belief in the universal validity of the notion of human rights, is in today's world the single most important

factor serving to promote "individualism," i.e., the rights and liberties of individual human beings.[32]

While individualism is on the rise in China and other non-Western countries, the culturalists are of course right in pointing out that cultural differences overall are declining at a rapid rate. While individuality may be on the rise in, say, China, many of the "cultural" features which have hitherto served to account for its "difference" from other countries are fast eroding. Some refer to this as the "McDonaldization" or "Coca-Colazation" of the world and view it as one of the supposedly pernicious effects of global capitalism (an issue to which I shall return). Frankly, I do not consider it such a bad thing if many of the "cultural" factors which have hitherto served in an impressive fashion to constitute the "difference" between non-Western and Western countries were to disappear altogether, even if this disappearance were to result in greater cultural "homogenization."[33] Can anyone seriously maintain, for instance, that primitive cultural practices, often defended by religious fundamentalists, that amount to blatant violations of human rights are aspects of cultural "difference" that ought to be cherished and preserved?

Globalization may have as its effect a certain leveling of cultural differences and, owing to the consumerism it promotes, may make for increasing similarity in lifestyles around the world, but it is difficult to see how this consequence of globalization may not actually have decidedly beneficial effects. If it is anything, globalization is a potent counterforce (the only really effective one?) to the destructive forces unleashed by the end of the Cold War. I am referring to the new tribalism, the ethno-nationalism triggered by the demise of Socialism and the end of the balance of terror between hostile superpowers which served to keep conflicts between their client states more or less in check. If there is anything that threatens to turn the emerging new world order into a world dis-order (see Hoffmann 1992) and to turn the world itself into the arena for a global "clash of civilizations,"[34] a veritable cultural war of all against all, it is the culturalist obsession with "difference" on the part of both national elites and the spiritually down-trodden, materially-deprived masses in their countries. When people are bereft of economic freedom, i.e., the opportunity, as Adam Smith would say, "to better their condition," it is natural that they should focus their attention (or, as in the case of the former Yugoslavia, be made to focus their attention) on petty ways of aggrandizing their self-esteem, which, as in the case of India's aggressive militarism, work directly against their own material self-interest. It is natural that they should fall prey to what, borrowing an expression from Freud, that outstanding critic of ethnic nationalism, Michael Ignatieff, calls the "narcissism of minor differences" (see Ignatieff 1998).

The logical consequence of ethno-centric nationalism is ethnic rivalry, internecine warfare, and, ultimately, genocide. Global "homogenization" or, perhaps better said, global cosmopolitanism tends to promote an altogether more desirable state of affairs. Economic globalization is, in the 18th century Enlightenment sense of the term, civilizing. One totally unanticipated consequence of, for instance, the "McDonaldization" of the world is a certain increase in civility in some of the countries McDonald's has successfully colonized and in which it has become a genuinely local cultural institution. McDonald's has helped to raise overall standards of cleanliness in public rest rooms in a place such as Hong Kong, and disabused people of their environmentally-unfriendly habit of spitting and throwing garbage on the floor and the street.[35] It has also improved people's table manners and promoted courtesy and improved public manners in general by encouraging people to speak in lower tones in public places and accustoming unruly crowds to politely wait their turn in line.[36] This is, admittedly, an example of rather limited scope and pertinence, but it does suggest that the spread of multinational corporations throughout the world can have -- and in fact does have -- some civilizing effects. Writing during an earlier wave

of globalization, that great advocate of liberal internationalism, Montesquieu, was undoubtedly right when he said, "*Le commerce adoucit les moeurs*" (Montesquieu 1989, xx, 2).

Globalization poses immense challenges, but one thing it does not challenge us with is the need to choose between "Jihad" and "McWorld," to allude to a recent book by Rutgers political scientist Benjamin R. Barber. The choice we are confronted with is not between intercivilizational warfare, on the one hand, and American cultural imperialism, on the other, i.e., an insipid and spirit-deadening uniformity, a kind of global dumbing in the realm of culture.[37] The supposed "Americanization" of world culture is, moreover, more a matter of a decline in particularity in general and a globalization of culture overall: particularity is increasingly out, and eclecticism is increasingly in. The real challenge of globalization is that of exploiting the undeniable opportunities it offers for increasing the general level of civility throughout the world. Civility -- as defended by such outstanding individuals as Václav Havel -- is the necessary condition for "spiritual civilization," as the Chinese call it, as well as being, along with democracy, a necessary condition for genuine world peace. Global competition produces global cooperation. It is just possible that the new wave of globalization might be such as to enable us finally to realize Kant's cosmopolitan dream of "perpetual peace" (see Kant 1963). Moreover, globalization may actually serve to enhance the prospects for democracy in the world, an issue that I would now like to take up.

GLOBALIZATION AND DEMOCRACY

To the degree that it comes about, globalization must necessarily result in a more cosmopolitan world situation. Perhaps the most salient consequence of this from a political point of view -- a consequence of what the Japanese call *kokousaika*, "internationalization" -- is, as I have already noted, a significant erosion of national sovereignty. Indeed, the very idea of the nation-state is fast becoming outmoded. The idea of the nation-state was perhaps the most significant conceptual and practical innovation of modernity, but, in the new postmodern global age, it is becoming increasingly irrelevant.[38] This is not, by any stretch of the imagination, to say that we are about to witness the demise of the nation-state; far from it. A World Government -- a kind of glorified UN with all the corruption, economic and political, that that would entail -- is simply not in the cards. Leading nation-states will continue in the postmodern age to wield great power, but this power will consist to a largely extent in their ability to wreak havoc on the emerging global economy -- by, for instance, reinstituting protectionist measures of one sort or another in reaction to popular domestic pressure. Although protectionism, i.e., anti-free-trade, is not in the real self-interest of workers, who are also consumers, it is, given human nature or what earlier liberal writers referred to as "the disposition of mankind," namely, the lamentable tendency of humans to remain oblivious to their real self-interests.[39]Protectionism is a bill of goods that is readily marketable in democratic countries by populist demagogues such as Pat Buchanan. There is a bit of irony in this situation. While democracy -- populist democracy, that is -- constitutes, potentially at least, a threat to the on-going march of history, i.e., to globalization, globalization itself, in my estimation, constitutes the greatest force yet witnessed in the history of the world for promoting democracy. Why is this?

The reasons are simple and are generally known. They all center around the fact that globalization, i.e., the spread of free-market economics, is a major force in calling forth the development of civil society -- witness China. When, thanks to the pressures exerted by the global economy, countries adopt free-market practices, the result, invariably, is the emergence of civil,

pluralist societies. The emergence of civil society is, in turn, the necessary structural condition for the creation of democracy (see in this regard Madison 1998a). Democracy that is sustainable can be built only slowly, from the ground up, which is to say, by permitting the autonomous formations of civil society to flourish.

What, thanks to globalization, we have in fact already witnessed in various countries in East and Southeast Asia is a steady erosion of "bureaucratic authoritarianism" and the once very fashionable belief in the efficacy of managed capitalism. As their economies have grown in complexity and as the demands of regional and global competition have increased, governments have, *par la force des choses*, become less *dirigiste* and have relied to an ever greater extent on private initiative and the forces of the market.[40] In doing so, they have been responding to demands on the part of their increasingly middle class citizens to see economic development translate into an improved quality of life as well as for a greater say in how their country is run, i.e., according to the forces of civil society. This general tendency towards market economics is nowhere more striking than in so-called communist China, which, ever since Deng proclaimed "It's glorious to get rich," has embraced capitalism with a vengeance: "China's rulers have overseen the formation of a capitalist society, where wealth is created at the bottom by individual entrepreneurs. A middle class of tens of millions is beginning to emerge, and along with that, personal freedoms have expanded."[41]

It should come as no surprise if, due to the "rising expectations" called into play by the emergence of civil society in numerous countries, the prospects for democracy have been significantly enhanced -- the fall of the Suharto government in the May 1998 being but the latest episode in this ongoing saga of democracy. In contrast to advocates of "Asian values," Vincent Siew, Prime Minister of the Republic of China (Taiwan), has stated: "I know of no Chinese values that clash with democracy or respect for human rights." Responding to arguments often heard in mainland China in defense of bureaucratic authoritarianism and to the effect that political democratization can be divorced from economic liberalization, Siew also declared: "Our experience on the other side of the Taiwan Strait is that economic success can be an excellent foundation for democratization, but that a democratic form of government is essential for sustaining prosperity."[42] Similarly, Martin Lee, leader of Hong Kong's Democratic Party, stated, subsequent to Asia's financial crisis:

> Let's hope that the region's economic reckoning and Indonesia's disastrous path will help put to rest the myth of "Asian values": that democracy and human rights are "Western" concepts inimical both to Asia and to economic growth. Now across Asia, people increasingly see the advantages of having open and accountable government and are beginning to demand it.
>
> The countries that have weathered the Asian financial storm best are democracies -- Taiwan, the Philippines and Japan. And those nations that are in the process of recovering, including South Korea and Thailand, have done so only after jettisoning their corrupt former regimes through a democratic process.
>
> The first lesson from the Asian crisis is that a government that is not answerable to its people will not be likely to have open markets or the institutions required to impose discipline to overcome a financial crisis.
>
> A second lesson is that *guanxi*, or connections, are never a substitute for the rule of law. A failure to diagnose the need for democratic and accountable government will bring only more economic misery (Lee 1998, p. wk 17).

It is true that the more countries are tied into the global economy, the more they are vulnerable to financial or economic upsets when their practices turn out to be market-unfriendly. However, the more these structural deficiencies are corrected, the more dynamic and prosperous they can expect their economies to become. The disciplining force in this regard is globalization itself: When individual nations submit to the demands of regional or global free-trade agreements surrendering to that very degree some of their national sovereignty, global economic order becomes more stable with more possibility for longterm, stable growth. Global free-trade allows people the world over to exploit their own comparative advantages and to concentrate on doing what they do best, thereby helping to raise the overall level of well-being.

Curiously enough, there are those who view the stability brought about by globalization as a threat to democracy. You might think that anything that promotes world peace and prosperity could hardly be a threat to democracy. Yet the objectors do have a point, in a way. The loss of national sovereignty entailed by globalization means, they say, that in many instances individual nation-states will no longer have the independence to act in accordance with the democratically expressed wishes of their citizens; the "will of the people" will inevitably be curtailed or frustrated, by a nation's international commitments and obligations to the world community. That is undeniably true. Multilateral accords and transnational ties -- designed to promote international cooperation and stability -- reduce the scope for unilateral action and national self-determination. In a global world, no nation can go it alone. That notwithstanding, this particular objection to globalization, as I see it, misses the mark.

Everything depends, of course, on what one means by "democracy," i.e., "rule of the people." The objection to globalization that I have just alluded to carries weight only if one equates "democracy" with some form or other of direct democracy, i.e., the unfettered expression of the "will of the people." In practice, this means the unfettered expression of the will of the majority of the people. However, as Aristotle long ago recognized, democracy so conceived is probably the worst form of government imaginable. The most serious defect of unmitigated, direct democracy is that it provides no built-in safeguard against one of the most insidious forms of tyranny, what James Madison, and, later, J.S. Mill, called the "tyranny of the majority." In a "pure" democracy, in which the "will of the people" is not constrained by various constitutional checks and balances which set limits on the general will, the rights and freedoms of both individuals and minorities would in no way be secure. As Montesquieu well knew, without security there can be no real freedom. The only acceptable form of democracy is one based on an entrenched, constitutional respect for human rights, i.e., the rights and liberties of individuals. This is what is called liberal democracy.[43]

Perhaps the single most important element in liberal democracy is the rule of law. As Chiang Ching-kuo, who as President of the Republic of China on Taiwan set his country on the path towards democratization, stated: "The concept of rule by law is the core entity of democratic politics."[44] It is the presence or absence of the rule of law that determines whether a society can be said to be free or not. A highly interesting thing to note in this regard is the connection that exists between the rule of law and global free-market economics, i.e., "capitalism." As Martin Lee rightly observes, *guanxi* is no substitute for the rule of law. That is to say, it is in the bottom-line self-interest of multi- or transnational corporations to see the rule of law advanced in those countries in which they operate. Not only does the rule of law reduce the operating costs of doing business by eliminating the need to pay out bribes or offer kickbacks to corrupt officials, but also it greatly enhances the longterm security of investment. The private interests of business are not incompatible with the public democratic interest; indeed, the situation is just the opposite. As the

case of Taiwan demonstrates, capitalism works best in countries that are democratic, namely, those characterized by the rule of law, openness, and responsible government. Thus, by a kind of "ruse of reason," as Hegel would say, the pursuit of self-interest on the part of business corporations, investors, and entrepreneurs works to promote the common good. In a global economy, what is good for business is good for democracy. As one social commentator remarks: "For those who would promote democracy, the globalization process is, in the long view, the great facilitator" (Means 1996, p. 116). Thus, to the degree that free-market economics is globalized, to that degree it is permissible to hope that democracy will become a universal system of government.

CONCLUSION

As everyone knows, the Chinese have a saying for just about every conceivable occasion. One of their sayings making the rounds these days is: "In a crisis lies opportunity." In this paper I have attempted to focus on of some of the opportunities latent in the Asian financial and economic crisis of the late 90s. As this crisis has shown, the challenges that globalization poses can be daunting; there can be no doubt that globalization will force people the world over to make far-reaching, sometimes even painful, changes in their accustomed ways of doing things.[45] But if the challenges are great, so also are the opportunities.

The opportunity that globalization affords in the economic realm is that of achieving a kind of global common prosperity, *gongtong fuyu*, as the Chinese modernizers call it. An opportunity for greatly raising the living standards of untold millions of people around the world when their national economies are opened up to the dynamics of the global economy.[46]These same economic forces also hold out the promise, in the cultural realm, of promoting greater civility, both within and between nations -- what Montesquieu called *les moeurs douces* -- and thus of providing an unprecedented opportunity for securing a global peace. In the political realm, the dynamics of globalization are such as to encourage the development of the rule of law and the demise of bureaucratic authoritarianism; never before has there existed as great an opportunity for promoting democratic governance.

To be sure, historical opportunities can be missed, chances squandered. Nothing guarantees that peoples and nations will come out on the right side of history. Human short-sightedness being what it is, people can readily be persuaded that their self-interest is best served by walling themselves up in their own national cocoons and isolating themselves from the winds of change blowing over the surface of the globe. The sentiments of nationalism and the Cold War mentality are still with us. There are, for instance, those who would have us believe that China's military buildup, which is fully in line with its defense needs, poses a threat to stability in the Asia-Pacific region and that the country therefore needs to be contained (see Bernstein and Munro 1997), just as there are those who insist that America must build a protectionist wall around itself if it is to defend its interests (see Buchanan 1998). There is, however, no reason to think that China has replaced the old Soviet Union as a new threat to world peace; having set its sights on membership in the WTO, it has every reason to behave like a normal country.[47]More generally, the great opportunity that globalization offers is the opportunity for nations and peoples finally to realize that their own self-interests are best advanced when they respect the self-interests of all others and, accordingly, interact in the global economy in a spirit of mutuality and reciprocity. Economic globalization may just possibly have the effect of forcing nations to be civil in their dealings with one another and may in this way help to forge a global solidarity, for, as the current Asian crisis

well demonstrates, in a genuinely global economy the interests of each are inseparably linked with the interests of all.

One last point in regard to a basic issue in political economy, as I have indicated, one thing that global economic liberalization signals, along with the demise of socialism, is the end of the legitimacy of the belief in managed, state-directed capitalism. The demise of both socialism and managed capitalism should not, however, be taken to mean that we are returning to an earlier, 19th century form of unfettered, amoral, *laissez-faire* ("Manchester") capitalism. Even though one finds a great many commentators on both the right and the left saying that, in my estimation it amounts to a misreading of the historical dynamics at work at the present time. History never quite repeats itself, or its errors. The form of managed capitalism -- a state-controlled and regulated capitalism which was often, for all practical purposes, indiscernible from socialism -- that emerged from the Great Depression and persisted until recently was an altogether logical response, at the time, to the perceived shortcomings of *laissez-faire* capitalism, and, indeed, its failure. The shortcomings and failure of managed capitalism and the idea that the state not only can, but should assume ultimate responsibility for people's lives (state-welfarism) have themselves, in turn, become fully apparent. Managed capitalism is no substitute for *laissez-faire* capitalism. The great opportunity that globalization provides us with in this regard, some 200 years after Adam Smith's original "capitalist manifesto," is the opportunity to work out yet another form of capitalism, one which would be in conformity with what Hegel would call the "objective spirit" of the age, with, in other words, the demands of a postmodern global civilization. This new form of capitalism -- "capitalism 3," so to speak -- might appropriately be termed "responsible capitalism."

Unlike *laissez-faire* capitalism which was based, philosophically or theoretically speaking, on the notion of the atomistic, asocial individual (the famous "Robinson Crusoes" of mainline neoclassical economics), and unlike managed, state-welfarist capitalism which subordinated the individual to society, responsible capitalism overcomes the traditional dichotomy between the individual and society. Responsible capitalism cannot exist in a governmental vacuum, but the appropriate role of government or the state is not that of defending the "public good" against "private interest."[48] Not only does this way of viewing the role of the state inevitably give rise to some form or other of bureaucratic elitism (and is thus anything but democratic), it is also based on a false dichotomy. There is no reason for opposing, as socialist ways of thinking always did, the "collectivity" to the "individual." Except in times of war in democratic societies the "public good" does take precedence over "private interest"; (whenever the "public good" prevails over "private interest" untold numbers of individuals will, as a general rule, be condemned to spend their lives in *gulags* of one sort or another). In a liberal, civil society, what serves the "private" interest of all citizens is in the public interest. What we are now in a position to see is that in a free-market economy based on the rule of law and a democratic respect for human rights the public interest is best served when the state limits itself to providing the political-economic framework wherein individuals, secure in their rights, are free and able to pursue their own interests. As even the Chinese communist government has come to realize, this is the only governmental formula that can generate sustained growth and the well-being of all. This is a fact of history, of postmodern global, economic civilization. In a system of responsible capitalism, the good of society and the good of individuals are inseparable and mutually reinforcing; they work together in a synergetic fashion to bring about genuine solidarity, based on an ethic of mutual recognition of rights. A global economy produces a global division of labor, and, as Emile Durkheim pointed out, a rational division of labor produces solidarity: A non-mechanical, organic form of solidarity based not on similarity, but on individuality and difference wherein the unique contribution of each contributes

to the life of all (see Durkheim 1960). Moreover, as Durkheim also recognized, whatever serves to promote solidarity is intrinsically moral. The economic order of democratic capitalism is a social order infused with moral purpose.

In order to function in a stable and productive fashion, the global capitalist order simply has to be responsible; individual corporations, for instance, must not only be concerned about making a profit, they must also have an eye to their longterm interests. These interests include, not just making a fast buck, but, above all, servicing the interests of their customers as best they can, merging when this proves necessary, manufacture with service and thus blurring the traditional distinction between the two -- witness in this regard the renaissance of IBM. If they are to be capitalistically successful, companies must not only be consumer-friendly, they must also provide assurance that the jobs of their qualified workers are valued and protected, as are the interests of their stakeholders. This is the formula for good, profitable business in the postmodern, global age. No company which is not consumer-, worker-, and community-friendly will long survive in the age of the global economy.[49]

Because, as I have argued above, the new form of capitalism we see emerging reconciles public and private interest, it is itself fully moral. True freedom is not anarchistic or libertarian; freedom entails sociality and responsibility because to will freedom for oneself is, necessarily, to will it for all (see Madison 1998a, p. 74). The same is true of economic freedom. Just as businesses have come increasingly to realize that it "pays" to avoid unethical business practices, so, more generally, we are coming to realize that there is an ethical element that is intrinsic to market economics. Indeed, it could genuinely be said that the market economy operating under the rule of law, what I call a civil market economy, is itself a form of institutionalized ethics. This, as Hegel had already realized, is an ethics of reciprocity and mutual respect (see Hegel 1991, #199 and #255). Unlike socialist societies which are supposedly based on altruism and benevolence but which in reality are animated by envy and resentment, the capitalist order is based squarely on the freedom of everyone to pursue their own interests. It would however -- and this is a most important point -- be a gross error to equate self-interest with greed or selfishness.[50] Indeed, any defense of capitalism which equates self-interest with greed is counterproductive and does a great disservice to the cause it purports to defend. As Peter Drucker has quite correctly noted: "Capitalism is being attacked not because it is inefficient or misgoverned, but because it is cynical. And indeed a society based on the assertion that private vices become public benefits cannot endure, no matter how impeccable its logic, no matter how great its benefits" (Drucker 1993b, p. 392).[51]

What is most important to note is that far from being immoral, or even amoral, the pursuit of self-interest in the context of a civil market economy generates a distinct social ethics and serves to promote a genuinely "spiritual civilization" (see Madison 1998b and Madison 1996). The reason for this is that a free-market economy possesses built-in mechanisms or incentives which call forth civility and socially ethical behavior on the part of individuals. This particular spinoff of the enterprise economy occurs, moreover, in a thoroughly spontaneous fashion, in contrast to religious or moral exhortation --*kyoka*, as the Japanese call it -- which can only affect economic behavior from the outside and, as it were, coercively. In a market economy operating under the rule of law, it is in people's own interest to respect the interests of others, i.e., to be good. As the Catholic advocate of democratic capitalism, Michael Novak, has pointed out, not only does a business corporation operating within the context of a civil market economy have moral responsibilities, these responsibilities are "internal to it, which must be met simply for it to be a success in doing what it is founded to do" (Novak 1996, p.138; emphasis mine). Alexander Yakovlev, one-time

advisor to Mikhail Gorbachev, put it succinctly: "Morality is an integral part of the culture of the commodity society" (Yakovlev 1993, p. 88).

The remarkable successes of the Asian dragons and tigers over the last few decades demonstrates the indisputable superiority of capitalism (the market) over socialism (the state) in combating poverty.[52] What, in turn, the recent Asian setback demonstrates is the need to develop an even more sophisticated form of capitalism -- responsible capitalism. There is every reason to think that the new global order will indeed be one imbued, as Havel would say, with "a new spirituality, a new ethos, and a new ethics and values should be adopted today by all cultures and all nations as a condition of their very survival."

NOTES

1. The mode of description in question is, of course, interpretive, i.e., a matter of hermeneutics.

2. The expression is that of Iain Carson writing in *The Economist* (1998); he states: [T]oday manufacturing is becoming a genuinely international affair. The fancy work gets done in rich countries by skilled workers, the simpler parts elsewhere in the global supply chain. More and more of the process is handled by multinational companies, quick to see what is best done where. There is nothing to fear in this. Any country that is willing to use the skills it possesses will gain from joining in" (p. 5).

3. Conversely, it has, thanks to these very same technological advances, become increasingly costly, for nations which would like to do so, to keep information out -- costly not only in terms of the censorship and jamming involved, but, more importantly, in terms of foregone economic development.

4. For a critique of the core, neoclassical notion of "general equilibrium," see Madison 1998, chap. 5.

5. See in this regard Wriston 1992.

6. Witness, in this regard, the moral frenzy provoked among nationalists and socialists of all stripes by the so far unsuccessful attempt on the part of the OECD to work out a Multinational Agreement on Investment (MAI).

7. "Southeast Asia's challenge has been not to protect itself from global finance, but to deal with its insolvent banks, shaky domestic markets and overstimulated economies. The region's politicians, with their cronyism, corruption and reluctance to take awkward decisions, were far more to blame for the currency-market turmoil and its aftermath than are international speculators." *The Economist* (September 27, 1997), p. 17.

8. See *The Economist*, September 27, 1997, p. 87. Maharhir is quoted as saying: "We are Muslims, and the Jews are not happy to see Muslims progress. The Jews robbed the Palestinians of everything, but in Malaysia they could not do so, hence they do this, depress the *ringgit*" (see Kristof 1997, p. wk 4).

9. "The IMF estimates that hedge funds can mobilize between $600 billion and $1 trillion to bet against currencies and other assets -- for example, selling a currency forward in the hope that they can buy it back later as a cheaper rate. . . . It is . . . worth noting that speculators do not attack currencies that are backed by credible economic policies." *The Economist*(September 27, 1997), p. 87. "As a new study by economists at the International Monetary Fund [IMF 1998] shows, many of the charges laid against [hedge funds] are incorrect. In general, the IMF reports, hedge funds make financial markets more stable, not less so." *The Economist* (June 13, 1998), p. 76.

10. Cf. Stevenson 1997, p. wk 5: "The owners of capital now judge the strength of currencies based on the soundness of the monetary and fiscal policies in the countries that issue them. Money, the experts say, flows readily into currencies that are judged sound by the market, and flows even more rapidly out of currencies seen to be undermined by weak policies. When turmoil hit the Asian financial markets, panicky investors funneled their money not into gold, once their investment of choice during times of crisis, but into American Treasury bonds."

11. For a detailed discussion of the non-material, intersubjective, and communicative function of money. (See Madison 1998, chap. 5).

12. What could be said to constitute the fallacy underlying the self-defensive strategy resorted to by government officials such as Mr. Mahathir is the belief, widely held in many East Asian countries (Japan being a good case in point), that "government knows best." While judicious government regulation and oversight is absolutely indispensable to the efficient functioning of a market economy, it has now become generally recognized that government can never have better economic sense than does the market itself (the market being nothing other than the aggregate voice of free, wealth-producing citizens). The fascination with "managed capitalism" is now -- or ought to be -- a thing of the past (see in this regard Yergin and Stanislaw 1998). That is one of the most important political-economic lessons to be learned from the phenomenon of globalization.

In regard to currency trading, it may be noted that there are a number of market-friendly policies governments can adopt to counteract the potentially disruptive effects of a global free-market in currency without having to have recourse to illiberal attempts at controlling capital flows. See in this regard *The Economist* (January 24, 1998), p. 70.

13. Two main factors which help to explain Taiwan's relative immunity to the Asian financial flu are that Taiwanese companies were prevented by strict capital controls from taking on cheap foreign-currency loans for speculative purposes, as well as the absence from that country of giant (and debt-ridden) conglomerates such as Korea's *chaebol* and Japan's *keiretsu* -- making it easy for new companies to start up, as well as for older ones to go bankrupt, thereby making the overall economy responsive to the exigencies and opportunities of the international market. See *The Economist* (January 3, 1998), p. 73 and (January 24, 1998), p. 35.

14. See *The Economist* (June 6, 1998), p. 70: "The bubble was inflated by an alliance of its British colonial rulers, the Chinese Communists and Hong Kong's cartel of billionaire developers." See also *The Economist (*June 27, 1998).

15. Indeed, on the whole, Asian countries, the Chinese ones in particular, often place, in actual fact, a greater emphasis on education than do such Western industrialized countries as the United States and Canada. (It is another question as to whether or not the *mode* of education provided by leading Asian countries -- Japan being a good example -- is the best sort of education for producing citizens who are best enabled to make productive use of their political and economic rights -- currently a matter of much debate in Japan.)

16. For instance, on its 1997 scale of corruption which lists 52 countries (1 being the least corrupt, 52 the most corrupt), Transparency International (Berlin) lists Indonesia as one of the more corrupt countries of the world (46), while Singapore ranks as one of the least corrupt (9) (Malaysia and Thailand were ranked 32 and 39, respectively).

17. Margaret Scott, a former editor of the *Far Eastern Economic Review*; see Scott 1998, p. 46.

18. For an outstanding study of this sort (focusing on the socialist mode of economic organization), see the work of the Hungarian economist János Kornai (1992). A former Marxist

and believer in the possibility of a "socialist market economy," Kornai demonstrates why a "third way" is not a real possibility.

19. Speaking of the Asian crisis, Thurow writes: "[W]hen countries have had a string of boom years, megalomania sets in and their governments and large investors come to feel that ordinary economic rules that apply to others do not apply to them" (Thurow 1998, p. 22). As Thurow also observes: "What is clear by now is that crashes are not set off by outside speculators who see the internal weaknesses and attack. The first investors to leave the local market are always the local investors who have the best information. . . . The impressive abilities of international fund managers to move large sums of money across borders vastly accelerate the forces pushing prices down; but contrary to some facile generalizations about `globalization,' they are never the triggering mechanism" (p. 23).

20. As examples of Decline-of-the-West literature, see Kennedy 1987 and Schlosstein 1989. When at the same time in 1989 Karel van Wolferen, a Dutch journalist, published his no-holds-barred analysis of the corruption endemic to Japan in both the market and the political system (an over-reliance on bureaucratic planning elites combined with an impotent form of political governance), he was widely accused of "Japan bashing." We now know that his analysis was basically on the mark. As Thurow remarks: "Japan's government has demonstrated its incompetence, and its problems are getting worse" (Thurow 1998, p. 23); Thurow refers to Japan as the "sickest economy in the developed world, the economy with a government that has demonstrated that it cannot deal with shocks" (p. 24).

21. The expression is that of Chalmers Johnson (see Johnson 1982).

22. Speaking of "the price system as . . . a mechanism for communicating information," Hayek says: "The marvel is that in a case like that of a scarcity of one raw material, without an order being issued, without more than perhaps a handful of people knowing the cause, tens of thousands of people whose identity could not be ascertained by months of investigation, are made to use the material or its products more sparingly; that is, they move in the right direction" (Hayek 1949, pp. 86-87).

23. On this, as well as on the underlying hermeneutical notion of "application," see Madison 1995.

24. On the latter point, see Madison 1998, Appendix.

25. One lesson of globalization is that there are truths or values whose validity is universal. One might be tempted to relate the economic issues discussed in this section to a prominent feature of Japanese culture. Karl van Wolferen has observed that "the most crucial factor determining Japan's socio-political reality, a factor bred into Japanese intellectual life over centuries of political oppression" is "the near absence of any idea that there can be truths, rules, principles or morals that always apply, no matter what the circumstances" -- the absence of any belief in universal truths (see Wolferen 1989, p. 11). This "ultimate determinant of Japanese public behavior" may be a factor helping to explain Japan's woeful inability for a number of years now to take the broad-based, structural reforms necessary for dealing with its serious economic downturn. In contrast with the situation of political gridlock in Japan, China under the leadership of its new prime minister, Zhu Rongi, has shown great determination in its commitment to taking the bold steps necessary to modernize its economy -- and China is a country which very definitely does believe in universal values and truths.

26. When, as if it were the most natural thing in the world to do, members of a primitive Amazon Indian tribe (outfitted for the occasion in full native regalia) fly up to New York on a 747

to make a public relations pitch to Wall Street bankers and investors on the ecological threats to the Amazon rain forest, we know that we have definitely entered an age of global civilization.

27. See Marx 1946. Marx (and Engels) wrote: "In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal interdependence of all nations. And as in material, so also in intellectual production, the intellectual creations of individual nations become common property" (pp. 34-5).

28. Cf. Mill 1947, p. 63: "Individuality is the same thing with development, and . . . it is only the cultivation of individuality which produces, or can produce, well-developed human beings."

29. See Mill 1947, pp. 65, 73 (chap. 3, lines 340-43, 695-96).

30. Since "groupism" is inimical to capitalist, entrepreneurial practices (and thus to the flourishing of a free-market economy), it is natural that the Communist Party of China should have declared it to be an "ism," and thus something to be combated.

31. On the rise of individualism in China, see Pye 1996.

32. For an analysis of Japanese "groupism" which raises the question "Is it being altered as internationalization progresses in an age of information?" see *Human Studies*, no. 6 (1991). In a subsequent issue of this publication, Yuji Fukuda, reporting on a survey conducted in Japan, South Korea, and China, stated that it indicated "a strong desire for European and American-style individualism" in these countries and stated as well: "there . . . undoubtedly is a universal aspect to the individualism fostered in the modern, Western societies. Asians, as I have indicated, have a penchant for such European- and American-style individualism." *Human Studies*, no. 15 [1995], pp. 9, 11.

33. It should nevertheless be noted that developments in the technology of digital television have now made it possible for a broadcaster in, say, Taiwan to connect directly with Chinese audiences in America or Europe, helping them thereby to preserve in a foreign land some of the unique features of their native culture. The "homogenization" that globalism is bringing about need not be one of insipid "Americanism."

34. See Huntington 1997. Huntington's pessimism regarding universal values (a relic, according to him, of Western imperialism), his gloom over a supposed Decline of the West, his advocacy of a dispirited and relativistic multiculturalism, and his dour prognostics as to the possibility of "a major intercivilizational war" contrast sharply with the earlier, extremely optimistic scenario (the global triumph of liberalism) put forward by Francis Fukuyama (see Fukuyama 1992). Against Huntington, it could be argued that the threat posed by "Islamism" in a country such as Egypt is not so much a result of "culture" as it is of government ineptitude as regards liberalization and democratization (see in this regard Ibrahim 1996).

35. One thing that struck me on my first visit to mainland China (contrasting in this regard with Taiwan, a more economically and politically developed country -- but equally Chinese nonetheless) was the apparent near-total absence of public concern for public (i.e., non-private) places, discarded trash of all sorts being strewn about anywhere you cared to look. A phenomenon such as this demonstrates a notable lack of civic spirit (the absence of which is of course understandable in socialist countries which are always hostile to the autonomous forces of civil society and which encourage in their subjects the debilitating belief that government is the only legitimate guardian of public well-being ["Let the municipal garbage collectors take care of the mess."]).

36. See Watson 1998 for a study of McDonald's in five Asian countries: Hong Kong, China, Taiwan, South Korea, and Japan. In regard to the beneficent effects of Coca-Cola, I was once surprised at an international conference of economists to hear a Polish economist heap praise

on the "Coca-Colazation" of Poland (by which I gathered he was referring to American-style fast food restaurants in general), two of its more noteworthy effects being a sharp drop in alcohol consumption and, implausible though it might sound, adoption of more healthy dietary habits.

37. See Barber 1995. Barber writes:

> The first scenario rooted in race holds out the grim prospect of a retribalization of large swaths of humankind by war and bloodshed: a threatened balkanization of nation-states in which culture is pitted against culture, people against people, tribe against tribe, a Jihad in the name of a hundred narrowly conceived faiths against every kind of interdependence, every kind of artificial social cooperation and mutuality: against technology; against pop culture, and against integrated markets; against modernity itself as well as the future in which modernity issues. The second paints that future in shimmering pastels, a busy portrait of onrushing economic, technological, and ecological forces that demand integration and uniformity and that mesmerize peoples everywhere with fast music, fasts computers, and fast food -- MTV, Macintosh, and McDonald's -- pressing nations into one homogenous global theme park, one McWorld tied together by communications, information, entertainment, and commerce. Caught between Babel and Disneyland, the planet is falling precipitously apart and coming reluctantly together at the very same moment (p. 4).

Barber's main thesis is that "Jihad and McWorld . . . conspire to undermine our hard-won (if only half-won) civil liberties and the possibility of a global democratic future" (p. 19).

38. On the notion of the nation-state and modernity, see Albrow 1997. Traditionally, one of the most important aspects of "sovereignty" was control over money. That aspect of sovereignty has now vanished.

39. For an argument to the effect that self-interest, "rightly understood," is one of the major factors in promoting human well-being, both material and moral, see Madison 1998b. For a historical account of the emergence of the idea of self-interest in the Age of the Enlightenment, see Holmes 1995.

40. For a historical account of this process, see Yergen and Stanislaw 1998, chap. 6; who state: "All across Southeast Asia, the economic model is changing as governments, to one degree or another, pull back from an interventionist role in the economy. . . . It becomes more difficult to deploy government knowledge and to exert the guiding hand, for the span of economic activity -- investment, alliances, trade, market development -- extends beyond the borders of national sovereignty, and thus beyond the ability of governments to manage and intervene as they did in earlier and, by comparison, simpler times" (pp. 188-89).

41. See Kaplan 1998, p. wk 17. In his article Kaplan contrasts in this regard China's "dictatorship" with Russia's "democracy": "In Russia, parliamentary democracy has led to neo-Communism, in the form of a new oligarchic class with its own media outlets and security apparatuses, as well as crime syndicates that have plundered state assets through cronyism, bribery and intimidation. More so than China's new wealth, Russia's belongs to a corrupt, political elite in a few cities."

42. See *The Economist* (January 24, 1998), p. 36. In response, as it were (and no doubt was), to authoritarian defenders of "Asian values" such as Singapore's "senior minister," Lee Kuan Yew, the well-known Chinese scholar, Tu Weiming, writes: "There is no theoretical reason why

Confucian social structures could not coexist perfectly will with democratic political institutions" (Tu Weiming 1984, p. 90).

43. Not only is the notion of the "will of the people" or the "general will" a potentially dangerous notion from a liberal point of view, it is also, from a basic philosophical point of view, a notion that is largely devoid of meaning. The key role that this notion has played in democratic theory to date notwithstanding, it is for all practical purposes meaningless to speak of "the people" willing this or that, of knowing what in fact it is that they want, and what their own interests are -- until, that is, this "will" has been articulated in a communicatively rational way by having passed through the various institutions of representative government and the various forums of civil society. See in this regard, Madison 1998a, pp. 79-82; see also Holmes 1995, p. 148: "It is not obvious that `the people' can have anything like a coherent `will' prior to and apart from all constitutional procedures."

44. Cited in Nathan and Ho 1997, p. 108.

45. At the top of the list of challenges is the challenge to the environment posed, thanks to globalization, by rapidly developing countries like China, a point emphasized by President Clinton in his televised address to the students of Peking University, June 29, 1998.

46. It is well worth noting in this regard that in China, thanks to Deng's liberalizing reforms and his opening-up of China to the global economy, "Per capita income doubled between 1978 and 1987 and doubled again between 1987 and 1996 -- a rate almost unheard of in modern history. It took Britain sixty years to double its per capita income; the United States, fifty years. In instituting reforms with such effect, Deng did something that no one else in history has ever accomplished -- he lifted upward of 200 million people out of poverty in just two decades" (Yergin and Stanislaw 1998, p. 212).

47. The responsible way China has handled the Hong Kong take-over suggests that it understands quite well wherein its real self-interests lie.

48. This outdated view, typical of socialistic, managed capitalism, animates Barber's critique of global capitalism: "The modern democratic state is legitimated by the priority of the public over the private, where public goods trump private interests and the commonweal takes precedence over individual fortunes" (Barber 1995, p. 31). That, of course, is a recipe not for democracy but for tyranny.

49. See in this regard John Paul II 1991, sec. 35, p. 64.

50. This is nevertheless how, with a horrendous amount of philosophical naivete, ABC-TV correspondent John Stossel portrayed "the capitalist system" in his 1998 TV documentary *Greed* (see Stossel 1998). The unfortunate thing about reducing self-interest to selfishness or greed is that it totally obscures the properly ethical elements of the market, ones which must be developed even more in the global economy that is now coming into being. While the free-market system is the best one yet devised for enhancing the general welfare, no one in their right mind would ever want to see it appropriated, for their own selfish ends, by "greedy capitalists."

51. As Drucker has argued at length, capitalism is not just about making money, it is also about "values, integrity, character, knowledge, vision, responsibility, self-control, social integration, teamwork, community, competence, social responsibility, the quality of life, self-fulfillment, leadership, duty, purpose, dignity, meaning" (see Beatty1998, p. 176).

52. In 1960 per capita income in South Korea was at the same level as in India: by the late 1980s it was ten times that of socialist India (see Yergin and Stanislaw 1998, p. 222).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albrow, Martin. 1997. *The Global Age: State and Society beyond Modernity.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Barber, Benjamin R. 1995, *Jihad vs. McWorld*. New York: Random House.

Beatty, Jack. 1998. *The World according to Peter Drucker.* New York: The Free Press.

Bernstein, R. and Munro R.H. 1997. *The Coming Conflict with China.* New York: Knopf.

Buchanan, Patrick J. 1998. *The Great Betrayal: How American Sovereignty and Social Justice Are Being Sacrificed to the Gods of the Global Economy.* New York: Little Brown & Co.

Carson, Iain. 1998. "Survey on Manufacturing." *The Economist* (January 20).

Drucker, Peter. 1993a. *Post-Capitalist Society.* New York: Harper Business.

_. 1993b. *The Practice of Management.* New York:Harper-Collins.

Durkheim, Emile. 1960 [1893]. *De la division du travail social.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Economist September 27, 1997; January 3, January 6, January 24, June 13, June 27, 1998.

Fukuda, Yuji. 1995. "Can Asia Achieve a "Greater Harmony"? *Human Studies* no. 15 (September). Tokyo: Dentsu Institute for Human Studies.

Fukukawa, Shinji. 1995. "The Need for Analysis on Values and Characteristics Shared by Asians." *Human Studies* no. 15 (September). Tokyo: Dentsu Institute for Human Studies.

Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man.* New York: The Free Press.

Havel, Václav. 1998. "The Charms of NATO." *New York Review of Books* 45, no. 1 (January 15).

Hayek, Friedrich A. 1949. "The Use of Knowledge in Society." In *Individualism and Economic Order.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hegel, G.W.F. 1991 [1821]. *Elements of the Philosophy of Right.* Allen W. Wood, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffmann, Stanley. 1992. "Delusions of World Order." *New York Review of Books* (April 9).

Holmes, Stephen. 1995. *Passions and Constraints: On the Theory of Liberal Democracy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Human Studies. 1991. No. 6. Tokyo: DIHS (Dentsu Institute for Human Studies).

Huntington, Samuel P. 1997. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ibrahim, Saad Eddin. 1996. "Reform and Frustration in Egypt." *Journal of Democracy* 7, no. 4. (October).

Ignatieff, Michael. 1998. *The Warrior's Honor: Ethnic War and the Modern Conscience.* New York: Henry Holt.

International Monetary Fund. 1998. "Hedge Funds and Financial Market Dynamics." Occasional paper 166 (May).

John Paul II. 1991. *Centesimus Annus.* Montréal: Editions Paulines.

Johnson, Chalmers. 1982. *MITI and the Japanese Miracle.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Kaplan, Robert D. 1998. "Sometimes, Autocracy Breeds Freedom." *New York Times* (June 28).

Kant, Immanuel. 1963 [1795]. "Perpetual Peace." In Lewis White Beck, ed., *On History*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Kennedy, Paul. 1987. "The (Relative) Decline of America." *Atlantic*. (June).

Kornai, Janos. 1992. *The Socialist System: The Political Economy of Communism.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Kristof, Nicholas D. 1997. "Asian Democracy Has Two Masters." *New York Times* (December 21).

Lee, Martin. 1998. "Testing Asian Values." *New York Times* (January 18).

Madison, G.B. 1994. "Visages de la postmodernité." *Etudes littéraires* 27, no. 1. (Eté).

. 1995. "Hermeneutics, the Lifeworld, and the Universality of Reason." *Dialogue and Universalism* (Polish Academy of Sciences) 7: 79-106.

. 1996. "The Spirit of Civilization." Paper presented to the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences, Wuxi, PRC.

. 1998a. *The Political Economy of Civil Society and Human Rights.* London: Routledge.

.1998b. "Self-Interest, Communalism, Welfarism." In H. Giersch, ed., *Merits and Limits of Markets*. Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Marx, Karl (and Engels, Friedrich). 1946 [1848]. "The Communist Manifesto." In *Essentials of Marx*, rev. 2nd ed., ed. Algernon Lee. New York: Rand School Press.

Means, Gordon P. 1996. "Soft Authoritarianism in Malaysia and Singapore." *Journal of Democracy* 7, no. 4 (October).

Mill, John Stuart. 1947 [1859]. *On Liberty.* Northbrook, Ill.: AHM Publishing.

Montesquieu. 1949 [1734]. *De l'esprit des lois.* In *Oeuvres complètes.* Paris: Editions de la Pléiade.

Nathan, Andrew J. and Ho, Helena V.S. 1997. "The Decision for Reform in Taiwan." In Nathan, *China's Transition.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Novak, Michael. 1996. *Business as a Calling: Work and the Examined Life.* New York: Free Press.

Pye, L.W. 1996. "The State and the Individual: An Overview Interpretation." In B. Hook, ed., *The Individual and the State in China.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Schlossstein, Steven. 1989. *The End of the American Century.* New York: Congdon and Weed.

Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1994 [1942].*Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy.* London: Routledge.

Scott, Margaret. 1998. "Indonesia Reborn?" *New York Review of Books* 45, no. 13 (August 13).

Simmel, Georg. 1990 [1900]. *The Philosophy of Money.* Trans. Tom Bottomore and David Frisby. London: Routledge.

Stevenson, Richard W. 1997. "Spinning Gold Into Dross." *New York Times.* (December 28).

Stossel, John. 1998. *Greed.* ABC-TV documentary.

Thurow, Lester. 1998. "Asia: The Collapse and the Cure." *New York Review of Books* 45. No. 2 (February 5).

Tu Weiming. 1984. *Confucian Ethics Today: The Singapore Challenge*. Singapore: Curriculum Development Institute of Singapore.

Watson, James L., ed. 1998. *Golden Arches East: McDonald's in East Asia.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

Wolferen, Karel van. 1989. *The Enigma of Japanese Power: People and Politics in a Stateless Nation.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Wriston, Walter B. 1992. *The Twilight of Sovereignty: How the Information Revolution Is Transforming Our World.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Yakovlev, Alexander N. 1988. "The Political Philosophy of Perestroika." In Abel Aganbegyan, ed., *Perestroika 1989.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Yergin, Daniel and Stanislaw, Joseph. 1998. *The Commanding Heights: The Battle between Government and the Marketplace That Is Remaking the Modern World.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

CHAPTER VI

VIOLENCE AND THE RISING TIDE OF GLOBALIZATION A TEILHARDIAN PERSPECTIVE

MERVYN FERNANDO

Violence lies heavily upon the conscience and consciousness of man today. Not that violence had been absent from any epoch in human history. It seems that even more than physical nature, human nature is "red in tooth and claw". But undeniably violence seems to have struck a new pitch in both extent and intensity in our times. This is no doubt due partly to the sheer fact of great the increase in population within the last few decades, partly due again, as a consequence, to the opportunities and occasions of violence, and partly also due to the more powerful and deadly means of violence and destruction that science and technology have put into our hands.

My own country Sri Lanka has been in the grip of violence for the past three or four decades. Earlier, this was sporadic, but it has been severe and ongoing during the past fourteen years. Neighboring India is wrecked by racial/ethnic and religious conflicts; so are a number of countries in Asia -- Pakistan, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Burma, and Indonesia (Timor) -- in varying degrees of scale and intensity. India has waged war with Pakistan three times and with China once during the past four decades. The Arab-Israeli conflict was long and continuing. Iraq and Kuwait were at war just five years ago with the involvement of the U.S., Europe, Russia and the Middle East. Iran and Iraq attacked each other for seven years in the 80s. The former republic of Yugoslavia is hardly out of the bloody mess it was in two to three years ago, as are Rwanda and Burundi. Strong separatist movements are active in some countries of the first world too, for example, Great Britain, Canada and Spain. And we are only 52 years away from the horrible violence of the second World War and the holocaust.

Why all this violence in a day and age which is supposed to be enlightened in many ways? Today there is much more literacy, education, social communication, travel, etc., than 50 years ago, not to speak of the bewildering advances in all branches of knowledge. We have come a long way from the Stone Age and the Dark Ages of ignorance and superstition. But peace, harmony, concord and brotherhood seem to be inversely proportional to the progress of civilization.

There has been no dearth of explanations and theories regarding all this racial and ethnic violence. A number of models have been constructed -- economic, political, socio-cultural -- to get a handle on this problem. To quote from a recent study by Jalaii and Lipset:

> Most theories of ethnic mobilization assume that modernization played an important role in stimulating the ethnic movements of recent times. They diverge in the factors they identify as causally more significant in the development and persistence of ethnically based movements. . . . A model of ethnic mobilization which has enjoyed much popularity in recent years is economic competition. The basic arguments are derived from the ecological theories of Frederick Barth and his associates. The economic model is, however, not without its weaknesses.[1]

All these explanations and models deal with the immediate and what I might term "physical' causes of ethnic conflict. What is special and distinctive about the thesis of Teilhard de Chardin is that it takes a long distance, total, or rather, "ultra-physical" view of the phenomenon of violence,

in order to give it some constructive meaning. As Viktor Frankl has shown so poignantly, man cannot live without meaning: we are human because we ask questions about meaning. Does the widespread violence in the world today have any meaning? Is it just a meaningless episode in the total meaninglessness of human existence, as some Existentialists believe. Or does it play some role in the progressive evolution of man into another stage of his future. These are not mere speculative questions; they touch our minds and hearts, our blood and bones. Our standpoint and motivation for action will depend on our viewpoint. I cannot think of a more dynamically challenging viewpoint on this question than that offered by Teilhard.

For him the whole of reality is evolutionary; in other words, the whole cosmos has always been, is, and will be in a process of ascent or progress from the simple to the complex in increasing degree. In a gross way, we can see that the living world of plants is more complex than the non-living world of minerals, the world of animals is more complex than that of plants, and, finally, the human world is more complex than the animal world. Each of these represents a higher degree of complexity. This is certainly not an original, world-shattering observation. What is original in Teilhard is that he co-related complexity to consciousness and discovered the link between the two -- that one is a function of the other.

We can understand this idea better if we start from the wrong end, so to speak, from the process rather than at the beginning. As stated earlier, man is at the end of the evolutionary line of complexity, the most complex being that which arrived last on the scene. Here may I tarry a moment to let Teilhard explain what he means by complexity. It is, "the quality things possess of being composed, (a) of a large number of elements, (b) more tightly organized among themselves. . . . It is not therefore a matter of simple multiplicity, not simple complication, but concentrated complication."[2] Returning now to the main line of the argument, man is also at the same time the most conscious of all beings, at the end of the evolutionary line of consciousness. The human is the only being that is conscious that he is conscious: consciousness doubles back upon itself to become reflex consciousness. Going backwards we are corresponding relationships at the animal level where lesser degrees of complexity (compared to man) are coupled with lesser degrees of consciousness and so on.

This is Teilhard's famous Law of Complexity/Consciousness. He points in the whole evolutionary process to the strict correspondence between complexity and consciousness: the measure of complexity is the measure of consciousness, or consciousness is a function of complexity. The consciousness aspect of a being is its "within" which is the result of its structural complexity, the "without". Going downwards from man, we see decreasing degrees of consciousness with decreasing degrees of complexity, right down to the level of inert matter — molecules and atoms. At that low level the consciousness element is so weak that it is undetectable. Between simple inorganic matter at one end and man at the other, we have a wide, continuous spectrum of complexity/consciousness.

Now the crucial question is: what of evolution and man? Does the evolutionary process stop with man or are there further stages ahead? This was indeed Teilhard's main pre-occupation, to peer into the future of humankind, taking a cue from its origins. No wonder Teilhard appeals to modem man who is anxious about the future which seems both fascinating and frightening.

To understand Teilhard's thinking on the future of man, we must first realize the full consequences of the difference between man and what went before him in the evolutionary process, the difference that reflex consciousness made. A reflexively conscious being becomes by that very fact a free center of action and reception, with the ability to discern, to analyze and control those activities. As Teilhard says,

> The being who is the object of his own reflection, in consequence of that very doubling back upon itself becomes in a flash able to raise itself into a new sphere. In reality another world is born. Abstraction, logic, reasoned choice and inventions, mathematics, art, calculations of space and time, anxieties and dreams of love -- all these activities of inner life are nothing else than the effervescence of the newly-formed center as it explodes on to itself. . . . Because we are reflective, we are not only different (from animals) but quite another. It is not merely a change of degree, but a change of nature, resulting from a change of state.[3]

Because of this crucial difference the evolution of consciousness in man, in the Noosphere (sphere of the mind), cannot occur in the same way as it did in the biosphere. There is a radically new element which has entered the scene to play a decisive role in further development. Teilhard points out that during the million or so years of man's existence on earth, the human species has not spread out into widely divergent groups, as happened in the stage below, among animal species. The human species has preserved somehow a certain biological homogeneity. In Teilhard's own words, "Under conditions of distribution which in any other initial phylum would have led long ago to break up into different species, the human verticil as it spreads out remains entire, like a gigantic leaf whose veins however distinct remain always joined to a common tissue."[4] So, the species Man, while admitting diversity of races, cultures etc., has covered the earth with an unbroken membrane of human stuff. Zoologically sneaking, mankind is the only species that has proved itself capable of achieving this unity.

Contact and interaction between individual units of consciousness (i.e. individual persons) and between collectivities and socio-cultural groups is bringing about that psychic infiltration and interpenetration which expand and deepen the psycho-social aspect. Increasing external arrangements among persons and peoples are creating richer concentrations of inner energy. Curiously, the roundness of the earth plays a vital role in this process. This geometrical fact forces proximity and convergence on the human mass upon the planet, making closer and more frequent interaction among persons and groups inevitable with an expanding population. "Originally and for centuries there was no serious obstacle to the human waves expanding over the surface of the globe; probably this is one of the reasons explaining the slowness of their social evolution. Then, from the Neolithic onwards, these waves began (as we have seen) to recoil upon themselves. All available space being occupied the occupiers had to pack in tighter. That is how, step by step, through the simple multiplying effect of generations we have come to constitute as we do at present an almost solid mass of hominized substance."[5]

Here we come to the crux of our question. If the evolutionary process has taken a psycho-social turn, the law of complexity/consciousness must also operate on that plane. What is increasing in complexity now is not the somatic structure of the individual, but the "soma" of humankind. We see this happening before our very eyes through the rapid links and bonds that keep forming every moment between person and person, family and family, group and group, culture and culture, nation and nation. This spreads across the face of the globe over enormous distances, through the vast network of criss-crossing communications at work in the modem world -- from the simple postal system to the sophisticated high-tech systems of satellite broadcasting, the mass media and the internet. This has been augmented by correspondingly rapid travel and transport. The fantastic development of travel and communication systems this century has literally shrunk the globe, jostling persons and peoples, compressing an ever-increasing population into

"uncomfortable" closeness. The web or network of travel/transport and communication is to humankind what the nervous system is to the body of the individual.

According to Teilhard's principle this increase in complexification in the external social order must give rise to an increase of the consciousness "within". Is it possible to deny that the "compression" of the human mass mentioned above has thrown peoples and cultures, hitherto relatively isolated, into an inextricable mesh of interactions of all kinds -- social, commercial, cultural, political -- raising the psychic temperature or the intensity of corporate consciousness. There is a psycho-social infolding humankind upon itself -- the emergence of a kind of planetary collectivization. understood positively. In Teilhard's own words: "We are faced with a harmonized collectivity of consciousness, the equivalent of a sort of super-consciousness. The idea is that of the earth becoming enclosed in a single thinking envelope, so as to form, functionally, no more than a single vast grain of thought on the cosmic scale.[6]

As noted earlier, the incredible developments in the technology of travel and communication are creating the external conditions and pressures for convergence and international, intercultural community. But, unlike in the pre-human phase of evolution, in the human phase or in the Noosphere, it will have to operate in a human mode. It must set in the mode of reflex consciousness, with the awareness and collaboration of man himself, now the subject of the evolutionary process. In a very striking expression which Teilhard borrowed from Julian Huxley, Man is `evolution become conscious of itself'. He, therefore, has to evolve himself discerning the goal of his progressive journey. Though human consciousness was liberated from the constraints of matter at the first instance of its emergence into the state of *Homo Sapiens,* it has required the slow corporate reflection of the human species over millennia, first in isolated groups, then in larger aggregates, and now with greater intensity on a global scale, for man to recognize himself and his destiny. Greater psycho-social complexification is generating a correspondingly richer collective consciousness. Man is now being called upon to let himself go freely and consciously into his evolutionary "vocation", which is a vocation of unity and convergence at every level from the personal to the global.

Given this situation, Teilhard is not surprised that the initial outcome of, or the reaction to, convergence is one of suspicion, hesitation and even hostility. Behind this reaction lies the deep-seated fear of loss of identity. Just as two strangers beginning to form a bond of friendship cannot escape the initial anxiety of opening out and trusting the other, so also nations and ethnic groups confronted with close relationships and interaction for the first time must necessarily experience the fear of losing their respective identities. These fears are either aggravated or attenuated by a number of such other factors as relative population strength, resource possessions, perceptions of economic and military power, etc. Self-preservation is the primordial instinct of an ethnic group or nation as much as of an individual. The threat to self-preservation or survival brings out the strongest defensive mechanisms, one of which is attack or aggression.

Teilhard takes great pains to emphasize that in the Noosphere, in the sphere of mind and spirit, union does not obliterate but differentiates: "Man avoids communication with another because he is afraid that by sharing he will diminish his personality. He seeks to grow by isolating himself . . . but the very opposite is true. The gift we make of our being, far from threatening our ego, must have the effect of completing it."[7] This principle is as valid groups as for the individual. To quote Teilhard again: "The important thing to note is that if union truly super-personalizes, the collective entities whose birth and successive growth alarm us, are forming in the foreseen direction of evolution. . . . One thing is certain: despite our fears it is in the direction of groupings that we must advance."[8]

One very remarkable fact that has been overlooked in the wars and conflicts of today is that almost without exception they are claimed to be defensive, namely, defensive of rights to human dignity, freedom, property and land, justice, or conversely, liberation from oppression, exploitation, etc. In the past, most wars were wars of aggression and declaredly so; for example, the waves of colonial expansion of Western powers subjugating innumerable countries, cultures and tribes in Asia and Africa in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. The stronger made no bones about subduing the weaker. But today peoples are fighting not so much to conquer and subdue others as to liberate themselves from servitude or defend themselves from aggression.

This certainly does not mean that motives of greed, self-interest and expansionism are altogether absent in the wars and conflicts of today. The primordial sin of selfishness and egoism still bedevils the human condition, resulting in unrestrained drives for power and wealth, at the expense of human rights, social justice and peace. Still I believe these are more readily recognized for what they are, and resistance to them, in both violent and non-violent forms, is readily forthcoming. The rising cry for a collective affirmation of personalistic and communitarian values on a global scale is meeting with strong reactive resistance from the existing "non-liberated" power structures, be they political, social or economic.

Granted this premise, violence is the price that humankind has to pay to rise to a higher level of consciousness and convergence. The meeting of minds in a spiritual unity is a battle against the existing plurality. Ascending organization is a process which has to cope with lower levels of organization and their necessary disorganization. The growth of any entity comprises periods of relative "sameness" and transitions to new higher states. At the point of transition, a reconstitution of the elements takes place, usually with agitation and turmoil, like water boiling to become steam at 100^{o}C.

A personalistic universe on the way to super-personalization through aggregations of groupings cannot escape the turmoil of reconstructive transitions. As Teilhard says: "In order to unify in ourselves or unite with others, we must change, renounce, give up ourselves, and this violence to ourselves partakes of pain Every advance in personalization must be paid for; so much union, so much suffering. This rule of equivalence governs all transformations of spirit-matter."[9]

From a psycho-moral point of view, violence is man's "refusal" to respond positively to his evolutionary destiny. As stated earlier, it is only at this point of historical time that the evolution of the human species is taking a turn from divergence to convergence, from isolation to communication. The change is naturally experienced as a threat, a threat to the accustomed security of the familiar. Hence reactions of distrust and suspicion are understandable. But man has to learn that what he is called upon to do, is not to give up security, which is psychologically impossible, but to trade in the old security of fences. boundaries, guns and bombs, for the new security of openness and trust in bonds of relationship, mutual support, brotherhood and love. This kind of security is precisely the opposite of the other -- a security found in and with the other, and not in oneself, shutting out the other. This is the security which corresponds to convergence, unity and fellowship. But as Hourani says:

> Teilhard recognized the present difficultiesAs the forces of convergence increase they are countered by strong tendencies which try to fortify the old sovereignties of a disjointed cosmos, infused with the familiar worldviews based on competition. . . . Such efforts are, for Teilhard, impossible to sustain much longer and will soon give way to new sensible arrangements of an eventual union which preserves the identity and authenticity of each.[10]

We must, therefore, realize that if violence seems inevitable at this stage, it is so only as long as we fail to recognize the signs of the times. Teilhard opens his *opus magnum The Phenomenon.*

of Man, by saying that it could be summed up "as an attempt to see and to make others see what is happening to man". The real tragedy is that we fail to see beyond our noses; our myopic sight blinds us to the larger vision. Unfortunately the penalty for this blindness is very heavy. We are all appalled by the enormity of human suffering caused by violence in our times.

And so Teilhard makes bold to declare: "The age of nations has passed; Now, unless we wish to perish, we must shake off our old prejudices and build the earth. . . . The more scientifically I regard the world, the less can I see any possible biological future for it except in the active consciousness of its unity. Life cannot henceforth advance on our planet (and nothing will prevent it advancing -- not even its inner servitudes) except by breaking down the partitions which still divide human activity, and entrusting itself unhesitatingly to faith in the future."[11]

I shall try to substantiate this crucial statement with reference to contemporary socio-political phenomena. Despite the evils of conflict and war in today's world, we cannot fail to notice the growing movements of convergence and unification. Major political disintegrations on a global scale have resulted in new integrations/associations of the same order in this century; for example, the League of Nations after World War I and the United Nations after World War II. The complex UN system, despite its shortcomings is a vast network of subsystems bringing nations together in major areas of human concern--children, food, health, labor, education, culture, etc. Teiihard rejoiced wholeheartedly at the creation of the UN and its agencies which he saw as harbingers of noospheric structures. During the last few decades, a number of regional associations have come into being to deal with issues of common interest, such as the Organization of African Unity, the Organization of American States (OAS), the non-aligned movement, ASEAN and our own SAARC. And there are innumerable world bodies, both governmental and non-governmental, which bring professionals and interest groups together across national boundaries for dialogue and common action. A tissue of human interaction is growing and spreading in the Noosphere. Literacy and education, coupled with the electronic media, have made the transmission and exchange of ideas and information -- the stuff of the Noosphere -- rapid and all pervasive. They have made it possible for thought to envelope the earth. This tide is rising perceptibly.

A word of caution is in order regarding other apparently uniting forces operating at the global level, but which in reality are inimical to the kind of unity in diversity we are talking about. I refer to such phenomena as transnational organizations/corporations and the neo-colonialism of Western, first world culture bearing down on the rest of the world, ably supported by the secularist ethos of science and technology. Though they incorporate elements of unification, they tend to generate strong pressure to conform to a single mind-set, to fit all peoples into a single socio-cultural strait-jacket. The message seems to be: conform or perish. This is almost exactly the opposite of what the rising tide of a higher over-arching consciousness of Teilhard points to; namely, a free coming together of diverse peoples in such wise that it not only preserves their particular and special identities, but also enhances them in, paradoxically, a maximum unity in maximum diversity. We, therefore, have to be very discriminating about the phenomena we choose to support or oppose at the global level. Those of us in the East will have to be specially alert and vigilant in this regard.

Teilhard's thesis can also shed much light on the political disruptions, divisions and reconstructions in eastern and western Europe toward the end of the 20th century. The USSR as a State came into existence only around the beginning of that century. Previously independent ethnic and national entities were brought together in an artificial polity by enforced ideology and State dictatorship. The same could be said of eastern Europe as a political entity. Its principle of unity was entirely external, held together as a satellite bloc of the Soviet Union. The break-up of eastern

Europe and the Soviet Union caught political analysts by great surprise. Marxist theory held that socialism would put an end to ethnic tension because ethnicity reflected the conditions of pre-socialist, traditional societies. Assimilation of minorities into the majority whole was seen as inevitable. But events have disproved such assumptions. From a Teilhardian perspective it is clear that pressures of growing personalization in the human mass as a whole, impinging on internally cohesive groupings, would in the course of time disrupt artificial and externally constrained political entities of which they were a part. On the other hand, we see the same personalizing spirit of the earth bringing about new, free associations and aggregations of a political nature. The most obvious examples are the unification of Germany and the European Community. Now emerging in line with what we could expect, those socio-cultural entities which feel secure in their cultural/national identity are able to come closer to each other to form voluntary groupings. Conversely, those ethnic entities, often minority groups. which feel insecure or repressed are struggling to free themselves to be themselves, as manifested by separatist movements the world over. The component States of the emergent P.C. feel secure enough in their individual identities to come together without feeling threatened by the whole. Still we see what a struggle it has been over many years--and it is still not over--to overcome resistances of all kinds. But once accomplished, the larger whole will not only not threaten the identity of component members, but even enhance them. Union differentiates.

In other words, what is called for is an enlightenment of mind and a conversion of heart. The present organization of the world, in its economic, social and political structures, born of an earlier level of consciousness, is revealing its discordance with the new and rising spirit of the earth by the violence those structures generate. Just as pain reveals pathology in the body, so violence manifests the pathology of the body of humankind, vis-a-vis its destiny. It is in need of healing; but healing of the spirit comprises both enlightenment and conversion -- enlightenment about the truth of man's ascent to a more free and personalized, communitarian level of "being human," and conversion of heart from the petty ego of the self (individual and group) to universal personhood. Teilhard is very clear on this: "But let there be no mistake. He who wishes to share in this spirit must die and be re-born, to himself and to others. To reach this higher plane of humanity, he must not only reflect and see a particular situation intellectually, but make a complete change in his fundamental way of valuation and action. In him a new plane (individual, social and religious) must eliminate another. This entails inner tortures and persecution. The earth will only become conscious of itself through the crisis of conversion."[12]

If so, the transition of humanity to a higher plane is a religious endeavor -- a happening in the realm of spirituality. Then, a very pertinent question would be, are the religions playing their part in enabling (making able) and facilitating the conversion required on the part of the people to rise to a higher level of spirituality. Before attempting an answer, a word about spirit and spirituality is in order. The word "spirit" has often been used in religious language as the opposite of matter, with the implication that spirituality is a movement away from matter and materiality. For Teilhard, matter and spirit are not two different things; everything in the cosmos is a composite of spirit and matter. The matter end of the continuous matter-spirit scale is characterized by lower levels of consciousness, multiplicity and lesser complexity, while the higher end manifests greater complexity/consciousness and unity, culminating in the level of the human.

My submission is that the religions themselves are being challenged by the evolutionary rise of consciousness to conversion, to die to religion as traditionally understood in terms of rite and ritual, precept and doctrine, church and temple, to one of spirit and freedom, life and love. This is, after all, what the religions themselves have claimed to be central and fundamental. But in reality

the spirit has been stifled by the shell of rite, doctrine and law, by which they acquired their distinct identities. As such, they will be a hindrance rather than a help to the ascent of the spirit. The time has come when, in biblical language, God will be worshiped "neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth", namely, in the mind and heart.

It should be clear that Teilhard's vision about the future of Man is of a piece with his understanding of Nature and Man as an organic whole. It is not a question of juxtaposed elements, but of constitutive elements forming organic wholes in differentiated connections. This means that each component element has a proper place and function which cannot be arbitrarily changed; one part cannot be replaced by another. As Teiihard puts it: "The world must be compared not to a bundle of elements in artificial juxtaposition, but to an organized system informed by a broad unity of growth proper to itself."[13]

And the other connected fundamental plank of Teilhard's thought is that the world is under construction, which could be best compared to gestation and birth.

Pain and suffering become unbearable if devoid of any meaning and purpose. The great merit of Teilhard's vision is that it invests suffering, both personal and collective, with substantial meaning, not merely as something meritorious in the traditional Christian sense, but as ontologically constitutive of the construction of the world. The liberal, democratic political order which prevails in most parts of the world today has conditioned us to take for granted that society is an atomized collection of individuals, in a "each-one-for-himself-God-for-us-all" fashion. Equality, personal liberty and rights are the cornerstones of this philosophy. According to a metaphor Teilhard used often, this kind of society can be compared to a bouquet, say of roses, each rose carefully picked, of equal quality and put together artificially. The bouquet is a collectivity of equal and homogenous elements. Society, however, is not a collectivity but an organic whole, like a tree which has differentiated parts -- leaves, branches, flowers, fruits -- which are neither equal nor unequal, but complement each other in an inner structure of unity. While we expect a bouquet to be perfect and pretty, a tree will be quite imperfect and scarred; because, "it has had to fight against inner accidents in its development and the eternal accidents of bad weather, broken branches, torn leaves; parched, sickly or wilted flowers are `in place' -- they express the more or less difficult conditions of growth encountered by the trunk that bears them."[14] I believe that our inability to comprehend pain and suffering as something meaningful and even necessary is our enslavement to the individualistic mentality of the Liberal democratic view of man and society which prevails strongly in the West. Inequalities, imperfections, failures, -- the general "*dukkha*" of the world finds a natural and meaningful place in its organic structure and the communitarian nature of society. It is not a question of justifying pain, suffering and violence, but of realizing their "place" in the real order of nature. Only those who find such meaning will have the courage to go through and beyond that pain to the peace and joy of a higher unity, others should logically despair and give up.

If the urgent and insistent question on our minds is "What do we do?", Teilhard's vision gives us a sure guide to action. Firstly, to accept the pain of the world not as a meaningless absurdity but as the birth pangs of a new world, struggling to see the light of day. At the present moment our pain and suffering are, to a certain extent, self-inflicted by our blindness and psychological resistance to evolutionary convergence. Hence all our efforts should be directed towards reinforcing those forces which are already at work to liberate persons and social groups to the security of their respective identities, so that they become free to come together in larger voluntary associations which will enhance their being. Teilhard warns us: "beware above all of everything that isolates, that refuses to accept and that divides. Each along your own line, let your thought and

action be `universal' which is to say `total'. And tomorrow maybe you will find to your surprise that all opposition has disappeared and you can love one another.[15] Conversely, we should work, therefore, for the weakening and elimination of the forces of constriction, separation and diminishment of any kind. Teilhard's vision of human development bestows value on human action, not only large scale action at national and global levels, but also on the humblest action, in the right direction, of every person. If evolution has delivered itself into our hands after aeons of automatic operation it is up to us to direct it towards a future which is in line with what it had achieved up to now. This is the grand but critical life-and-death option before us. The right decision will depend so much on how deeply we have interiorized the thrust of the evolutionary process of our planet, groaning and struggling to rise to higher levels of person and spirit -- a level of personalized, communitarian globalization.

NOTES

1. *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 107. No, 4.
2. *The Future of Man*, tran., Norman Denny (New York: Harper and Row 1959), p. 105.
3. *The Phenomenon of Man* (New York: Harper and Row, 1956), p. 165.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 241.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 240.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 266.
7. *Human Energy* (Collins, 1969), p. 63.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 87.
10. Hourani Benjamin T, "Teilhard's Global Ecumene and the Politics of Peace," in *Humanity's Quest for Unity: A UN Teilhard Colloquium*, ed., Leozonneveld (Mirananda-Wassenaar, 1985), p. 49.
11. *Human Energy*, pp. 37-38.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 49.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Activation of Energy* (Collins, 1970), p. 95.

CHAPTER VII

GLOBALIZATION: OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

NGUYEN TRONG CHUAN

On entering the new millennium people face many profound global changes, of which the premises and conditions have been prepared in past years. There will be changes in all areas, from economics, ideology, politics, military, culture, science, engineering and technology to family life, social institutions and human environment. These changes will bring the world closer through a process of globalization which will create favorable opportunities for all countries, especially underdeveloped countries going through stages of development. It will also pose a number of major challenges in these areas, which cannot be underestimated, especially in developing countries. If these cannot overcome these challenges, there is a real chance that they will quickly become submerged in the dependence from which they thought they had escaped.

Globalization: a Modern Trend

There is only one world and only one human race. However, throughout the 20th century, the human race has witnessed genocides, horrible wars at various levels, intense confrontations between the superpowers and small countries, Cold War between the superpowers and the threat of nuclear war with a possibility of the total destruction of life.

Through various measures, some countries were able to develop economically by manipulating the resources of other countries and borrowing the resources of future generations without regard to natural laws or social morality. This, coupled with poor management of the environment, has brought terrible consequences. Thus, the crisis of global ecology is not a future problem. It has in fact become a reality which the human race only begins to recognize.

The expensive arms race between the nuclear superpowers, primarily the former Soviet Union and the United States, has distracted these nations from their capabilities and resources for rapid economic development. At the same time other countries such as Japan and the European Union were able to focus their resources on successful economic development and become rivals in key economic areas that pose a real challenge to the superpowers. This has forced the superpowers to cease, or at least to reduce, the extent and speed of the arms race. The interchange has begun to take a new direction, from military confrontation to business cooperation and competition through trade and exchanges in science and technology.

On the other hand, since the end of World War II, the great nations can no longer use arms to impose their domination on the smaller nations, nor can they settle their differences by war. Similarly, many countries, including the superpowers, cannot eliminate social injustices, narrow the gap between the rich and poor, or settle the racial and religious conflicts within their borders by military means. Nor can many countries, including the wealthiest, on their own resolve the big ecological consequences of economic development and particularly military operations.

Due to these problems, an adjustment of global strategy is necessary: from military confrontation and suppression to negotiations and dialogue; from the arms race to competition in science, technology, culture and life-style; and from protectionism to free trade. The nature of competition and struggle has changed from the military and political to the economic. People have recognized that rapid global economic development requires countries to abandon policies

of isolationism and self-sufficiency previously pursued. From this recognition, a process of internationalization and economic globalization with respect to goods, capital and production emerges, together with the birth of multinational corporations. Globalization spread beyond economics to all other areas, such as politics, culture, education, environment and international cooperation in the fight against organized crime. Settlement of international issues emerged in these areas, among which environmental protection is of the most immediate concern. Its solution requires the common efforts of the international community.

With regional integration and economic globalization, distance between countries has quickly narrowed due to modern development and increasingly efficient global communication, turning local issues of economics, politics, culture, society and military into global issues that attract the attention and participation of the world. In fact, countries now quickly expose and denounce acts of terrorism, suppression of democracy and action against human rights by tyrannical regimes.

Opportunities of Globalization

The globalization process is in fact one of global integration in all areas that offers less developed countries opportunities to participate in various international activities.

The worldwide advance of science and technology and immediate communication of scientific and technological knowledge have made it possible for small countries to take the initiative and participate in worldwide cooperation. These countries can benefit from the world's latest achievements, especially in bio-technology, new materials, and communications to facilitate their growth and development.

The greatest opportunity opened by the process of globalization lies in the economic area. This is significant because every country must develop economically, especially those countries in slowly developing regions aspiring not to fall further behind. The integration of these countries in the world allows them to open exchanges of economic information, gain profitable business opportunities, especially with access to economic forecasts, open the market, share risks and attract foreign investment. Through these activities, they can take advantage of the latest technologies, thereby limiting possible adversities due to the misuse of natural resources for economic growth which has been the situation for many years.

The economic globalization process has tied nations together into a "boundaryless economic world". This contributes to a stable world and interdependent development in many areas, increasing global politics, global cultural communication and a globalized society. In so doing it creates new challenges as great as those of economic globalization.

Major Challenges

The globalization process opens many opportunities. However, inherent in these opportunities are many potential risks and challenges. On the one hand, economic unification, regionalization and globalization attract all countries into economic interaction regionally or globally, providing smaller countries with opportunities to develop and expand economic relations. On the other hand, there are many risks in this process. First, poor countries and poor people may become increasingly impoverished due to losses brought upon them by the rules imposed by big countries. At the same time, if poor and less-developed countries cannot quickly develop an economic institution comparable to regional and global economic institutions, or if

they do not have a real capability to compete and integrate, they may become mere suppliers of raw materials, consumers of products manufactured by developed countries, or even of products prohibited from manufacture countries, namely, obsolete, rejected or pollution-causing technology from developed countries under the guise of technology assistance or technology transfer. To the less developed countries, this would amount to replacing one dependence with another and failing to gain the benefits of globalization.

The economic globalization process is linked to the globalization process in other areas for the purpose of development. However, if the focus of development is growth, where global economic growth has higher priority than people and the ecological environment (as has occurred in the past) the challenges to humanity become increasingly great. Growth is, of course, important unless it is in incompatible with society, the environment and human nature. If growth is achieved at the sacrifice of the environment and without regard for costs, the growth will be against development. Development must be understood as a process through which members of society can pursue self-advancement and contribute to the mobilization and management of resources for sustainable results, fair distribution of resources to all and a rise in living standard. Thus the greatest challenge here occurs during the pursuit of integration into economic regionalization and globalization processes. A country must have a fully humane outlook in such areas as security, politics, national defense, culture, society, environment, science and technology. This poses a very difficult challenge to countries lacking economic advantage and scientific and technological potential.

During the process of integration, the various countries have different status due to their specific level of economic development, especially when defined by political institutions as well as historical and cultural traditions. It is clear that during the process of integration, acceptance of various cultural values is significant. Culture in itself normally does not accept xenophobia and self-imposed isolationism. Thus for its survival and development, a nation must encourage learning and make full use of other nations' achievements in order to enrich its own unique culture and values.

Norms and values of different countries in different periods are not entirely similar. However, imposition of information, norms and values by some countries upon others is a reality today because of the wide gap in mass media capabilities. The greatest challenge in this area is for a country to integrate and acquire the best values of other countries to enrich its own, without losing its cultural character and national identity. This is considered the greatest challenge, because if a country loses its cultural character or becomes culturally assimilated, it loses everything and will never be able to recover. Of all kinds of invasion, cultural invasion is the most difficult to recognize. It is the subtlest and the most dangerous. In addition, there is an inherent danger to the world that an international conflict might arise because a country is threatened by cultural invasion and attempts to defend its cultural character.

Conclusion

Globalization is an irreversible process in accord with natural laws. On the one hand, globalization greatly benefits all countries. Less-developed countries can benefit from globalization to enhance their development and narrow the gap with developed countries. However, there are many challenges and potential risks in globalization that cannot be underestimated. Globalization opens opportunities for integration, peace, dialogues, mutual learning, stability, cooperation and development. However, globalization can also cause under-

developed countries to regress and lose their traditional values if they lack suitable, protective strategies and/or fail to exercise them.

CHAPTER VIII

CONTRARIES AND COMPATIBILITIES IN A TIME OF CULTURAL GLOBALIZATION

TOMONOBU IMAMICHI

Language is one of the most basic characteristics of culture. The diversity of languages shows that culture is basically manifold and depends upon the locality.

Culture is semantically manifold, affecting such various facets of daily life as table manners within the family and modes of self-expression on social occasions. Whether in matters of personal taste or social celebrations, art in general (painting, sculpture, music, drama, literature, etc.) is the most important phenomenon of culture. Both social custom and the legal system are marked by traditional habits, which are called moral culture. Even in the intellectual fields of science cultural differences are due to language which, in turn, influences logic.

Someone may note the relation of the above to religion as a cultural phenomenon, but I will not treat it as culture because I do not consider religion to be culture. It is not that religion and culture are not related, but culture is an entirely human activity, whereas religion presupposes divine activity.

In view of the above, cultures East and West must differ basically in at least "four dimensions," namely:

(a) daily life,
(b) art,
(c) moral values, and
(d) logic

Daily Life

In daily family life, let us consider the dialogue between children and parents. Normally in the Western world family members use a horizontal mode in addressing each other, meaning that they regard each other as equals. No special polite form is grammatically established for the parents, individualism obtains in the form of equality and self-affirmation. In East Asia, however, there is a special polite form for children to address their parents. This has a hierarchial attitude as for people in a higher position or seniority. Concerning human rights, the father or person in a higher position within the group is more empowered. All members are protected in a collective sense, and one's identity is in terms of the group.

In both East and West this influences the way one presents oneself in social life. At the opening of a meeting of an international committee, I would introduce myself as follows: I am Tomonobu Imamichi, Professor of Philosophy at the International Center of Philosophy in Tokyo, Japan.

Note, the order here is:

(1) first personal name
(2) family name
(3) profession
(4) name of institution
(5) town
(6) country

But the same introduction in an East Asian language would be: "I, Japan, Tokyo, International Center of Philosophy, Professor, Imamichi Tomonobu, am." Here, the word order is in complete contrast to the Western self-presentation:

(1) country name
(2) town
(3) institution
(4) profession
(5) family name
(6) personal name

Moreover, usually such a formal self-presentation is finished within 10 seconds and in one breath, starting with a loud voice, which gradually diminishes to almost a whisper. In the Western manner this means that one can hear the personal and family name very clearly, while the country name is often absorbed and scarcely understood. In the Eastern manner, however, one can easily understand from what country the person comes and to which institution or company he/she belongs; but the name is sometimes scarcely understood.

The above indicates that in the West one regards the personal name of the individual as more important than one's belonging to a certain group, whereas in the East one regards one's group higher than the individual name. Here we find the opposite scheme of individualism contra the group or in the degenerated forms of egoism *contra nosism* (derived from the Latin first person plural, *nos*.)

Art

Generally speaking representative masterpieces of Western paintings, from the works of Renaissance masters till such modern painters as Cezanne or Renoir, are mimetic representations of the objective external world. This reflects the Western traditional idea of art, proposed by Greek artists and theorized by Plato and Aristotle.

But since the invention of photography, the precise description of the external world is no longer the task of painting. Art must seek a new task for humanity. As the technology of the machine cannot depict the internal, dynamic, psychological situation of a person, what one has in mind or heart must be expressed in visual art, linguistic form or musical sonority. This modern idea of art is expressionism.

The word *expression* is found in classical Latin where it means the `expression' of the juice of fruit of the vine, namely, it was a term of agriculture and zymurgy. So far as I know, even Goethe did not know the word *ausdruck*, and when Diderot used the word it was for an objective description of the internal landscape. The revolutionary new idea of art was established between the fin-de-siecle of the 19th century and the expressionism at the beginning of the 20th century. Hence, the nature of art in the Western world has developed from the classical *mimesis*, or objective representation, to the modern expressionism as an explosion of subjective passion.

Let us now look to the East. Confucius, the first philosopher in China, living in the 6th century B.C., said, "In painting the background must be left white." This means that the painter should concentrate his efforts only on the theme, and the external details of the background should not be represented in order to avoid the distraction of spiritual attention from the theme.

The oldest Chinese picture, excavated in Changsha in 1947, was painted in the 4th century B.C. according to scientific proof (cf. Haijek, Sekino). It was on silk, showing a lady necromancer, rising dragon (symbol of prayer) and phoenix (symbol of heavenly messenger) and there was no background. This traditional method of eliminating the peripheral phenomena in order to accentuate the thematic has been accepted in various ways throughout history. In the 7th century, e.g., colors are neglected, because they are superficial, incidental and changeable.

Thus, black ink paintings became the main trend in China and throughout East Asia.[1] Wang Wei, poet, painter and aesthetician said, "It is not necessary that the painted mountain be identified as a real mountain, but it is absolutely necessary to show the spirit of the mountain," apparently refusing mimetic representation. In order to paint the spirit of the mountain, the painter must unify himself with the vivid spirit of nature, and then must express his purified mind unified with the mystic spirit of nature.

So, in the 8th century Shie Hwa proposed six value levels of painting according to what is depicted: first or highest is the vivid dynamics of cosmic spirit; second, the essence of a thing with the strength of the brush; third, the phenomenal shape of a thing; fourth, colors according to the species; fifth, good composition; sixth or last, mimetic representation. In medieval times, the idea of pressing out the internal consciousness was crystallized in one term *shai*, which corresponds to expression. Many outstanding painters could do masterpieces of expression in ink. At the same time there arose many unskillful painters who could not achieve mimetic representation.

It is notable that in the 19th century Kazan Watanabe criticized them as unskillful, insisting that art is a matter not of expression, but of the vivid representation of the real nature. Thus, in the East classical idea of art was expression, while the modern idea of art is mimetic representation. One can say without danger, that over the same period the East and the West developed their ideas of art in opposite directions. There are contemporaneous developments but as opposite phenomena.

Moral Values

This is true also in moral philosophy. From classical antiquity till today, this has been symbolized by theater. On the stage the actor must play a responsible relationship with his/her partner according to the text. Here there are two important theatrical concepts, namely, person and responsibility. These must be recognized as fundamental moral concepts also in real life, namely, in the moral perspective of human life.

Through the Socratic philosophical preparation according to the motto: "know yourself" and through the definitive influence of the Christian tradition of persona according to Boethius's definition of persona, the concept of person has been set in Western moral philosophy. However, although there have been practical examples of responsible deeds, the other concept, namely, responsibility was not established till the end of the 18th century in Western moral history. The English word "responsibility" and the French word *responsabilité* were first coined at almost the same time in the 18th century, and the German word "Verantwortlichkeit" was coined at the end of the 19th century.

The content of responsibility, as defined by John Stuard Mill, was accountability, and the first edition of Eisler's "Worterbuch der Fhilosophie" indicates "Verantwortlichkeit" as "Zurechnung". Such chaos of moral consciousness concerning responsibility has been gradually corrected, so that the book of Heinemann finally showed the moral importance of the virtue of "Verantwortlichkeit," namely, responsibility.

Hence, we conclude that the key classical notion of moral philosophy in the Western world was person, while responsibility as a moral idea is of new origin. Western ethics only later integrated responsibility with its original form of individuality.

Let us compare this to the oriental world concerning the same issue. As everyone knows, the five cardinal virtues of Confucian ethics are as follows:

(1) Benevolence or charity.
(2) Responsibility (Yi). This was always translated as justice. But according to the structure of its Chinese character it must be translated as responsibility, for justice in Chinese is fair responsibility.
(3) Liturgy toward Heaven and sublimity of behavior toward others.
(4) Intellect.
(5) Sincerity, as unity of verbal and physical service to one another.

At a glance we can at once assert that of the five cardinal virtues, four are virtues in human relations, with only one exception, namely, intellect. Thus, the human condition is not one of isolated individuality, but is organized according to a common sociability: relationship is the absolute presupposition of human existence. The highest virtue of benevolence or charity is beyond normal humanity; the idealistic longing of normal citizens is for benevolence.

The second virtue, responsibility, is required as one's first task. In Asia the classical idea of morality was responsibility. But there is no clear idea of person through oriental history up to the present day, although the Asiatic world learned the essentials of this from the Christian religion. In the 17th century Wang Yangming and Li Shi came close to the individual center, but not so deeply as the notion of person. Many linguistic forms of the first person singular testify to a vague consciousness of the unchangeable, hidden, fundamental base of individuality. Finally, at the end of the 19th century, the Asiatic world learned the importance of individual existence when confronted by excessive totalitarian tendencies in the political field and reinterpretated Chuang Chou as unobjectified "Ursubjekt". Thus, the focus of classical morality in the East was responsibility in social relationships, whereas the modern idea of morality is centered on the person. Hence we find a contemporaneous development of opposite phenomena in the moral sphere.

Logic

In logic most see no difference, not to mention no contrasts or oppositions, but is this true?

Naturally, in the mathematical field there are no local differences in logical calculation. But human thinking is not limited to mathematics: there is also metaphysical contemplation of the essence of truth.

In Western philosophy, undoubtedly the main current of metaphysics is that formed by Socrates-Plato-Aristotle. In the Socratic dialogue "Politics" by Plato we read that "the most important instruments of a philosopher are *noi logoi*". A philosopher must seek the truth through the most important instruments, namely, *noi logoi*, which is the plural of logos. Socrates uses the plural because logos has many moments:

(1) word
(2) concept
(3) inference

(4) judgement
(5) thinking or calculation
(6) essence

A philosopher must think in linguistic form through concepts and inference in order to make essential judgements as to the truth. Therefore, the truth is the result of an objectively constructed digital operation. There is only one truth; the ideally correct answer is one, others are incorrect.

But in the course of the years there arose the problem of existential decision, which opened the way for veracity or existential truth, which is different from correctness. This is evolved by Heidegger, Jaspers, Marcel and Levinas. Here, instead of calculation the access to philosophical truth is by an entirely new method.

The digital system has lost its absolute dominance, at least in philosophical meditation. Recently, not only in the realm of metaphysics, but also in the logical dimension there arose the so-called fuzzy logic proposed by Zedah, which contained the logical validity of the intermediate digital space between correctness and incorrectness. Where in Western philosophy the classical idea of logic has been that of truth as one of absolute correctness, the modern idea concerns human decision in which the truth is abduced by interpretation from the richness of the given reality.

How does the oriental world stand in this regard? Confucius was a logician and refused to think of heaven, soul, human existence and death. But this does not mean that he abandoned thinking on these important subjects. He did not excuse himself from the effort to treat these problems in a way essentially different from the digital paradigm. Confucius suggests spiritual access to these transcendent objects through poetic interpretation, liturgical practice and musical ecstasy, namely, through pure aesthetic experience.

The task of Lao Tse and Tschuang Tschou was to develop the logical validity and epistemological method of pure aesthetic experiences. Instead of conceptual definition, the Taoists invented an imaginative logic with symbolic images. There must be a delicate sense of anabatic escalation of analogical difference. The significance of intermediate space of value between the conceptually acquired and spiritually postulated in this way of thinking is vitally important and was introduced into the Zen Buddhistic way for enlightenment.

But over the course of the years, the Confucianic rationalism of Shu Chi proposed a realistic way of thinking for describing the natural world and human behavior. Philosophers of this main current after the 14th century attempted a logical description of human history and natural phenomena. In relation to traditional Western rationalism and its effect on 19th century science the objective, descriptive scientific way of thinking was separated from the characteristic soil of Oriental inheritance. With this the classical idea of truth in the Oriental world has been existential "truth as sincerity is in contrast to the modern idea of truth as objectively calculated correct knowledge."

In the Japanese language tradition the word group similar to Greek logos is the *Koto*, meaning the state of affairs or situation. *Koto-wari* means analysis of the situation; *koto-ba* means originally a small part of the situation. *Makoto* originally means perfect situation, and is applied to the concept of truth and veracity or sincerity.

If one sees a child being drowned in a river, for the truth or *alethea* as discovery from the view point of logos one must describe the time and space, the supposed age of the child, the speed of the river, etc. In the midst of this objective description, the child must be completely drowned. In contrast, from the standpoint of *makoto* the movement of logic is as follows: the given situation or data is always incomplete: it is a wounded situation. We must integrate the broken, incomplete and wounded situation into the complete, perfect situation as far as possible through our human acts,

either intellectual, practical or creative. In this case, we must make efforts to save the child in order to bring this broken situation to the perfect situation; this is the true act as truth. Truth and veracity are always unified in the word *makoto*.

In conclusion, both the East and the West, whether in the creative activity of art, in the moral act or in logical thinking, namely, in cultural activity in general, clearly manifest till this century a concurrent process of opposite phenomena.

This means that we can now understand each other very easily. The world is now unifying itself from the local contraries to the one globalized culture in order to create a new philosophy of humanity. We are no longer semi-human but human, and are initiating a creative philosophy for all of humanity in its present technologically cohesive situation.

CHAPTER IX

THE CONSTRUCTION OF A MEANINGFUL WORLD IN *I CHING*: ON THE ORIGIN OF CHINESE PHILOSOPHIZING

VINCENT SHEN

DIVINATION, MANIFESTATION AND CONSTRUCTION

In order to show how Chinese philosophy emerged from its cultural Life-world, I will try to explore the philosophical import of the *Book of Changes*, one of the oldest philosophical classics, and the foundation to Chinese philosophy. This can be done by considering the different levels of its project in constructing a meaningful world. As I see it, the search for the meaning of life fe in the *Book of Changes* moved from divination to manifestation and then from manifestation to philosophical construction.

The *Book of Changes* as the oldest classic of Chinese philosophy, was originally a book of divination for the Chou Dynasty. The act of divination concerns itself not yet with philosophical truth, but rather with consulting the oracles on good or bad omens in order to know the good or bad fortune in the destiny of the individual or the collective. In the evolution of the*Book of Changes*, even in this passive awaiting for the divine revelation, we can already discern the emergence of active participation by human subjectivity, leading eventually to the philosophical construction of a meaningful world. Briefly speaking, in the act of divination there was a search manifestations of the direction of change. From this concern with the manifestation of the vector of becoming, there emerged a philosophical construction of a meaningful world. This means that there was a movement in the *Book of Changes* from divination to manifestation, and then from manifestation to the philosophical construction of meaning.

Historically speaking, we already can see the emergence of human subjectivity in the transformation of the modes of divination from the Yin or Shang dynasty (1766-1122 BC) to the Chou dynasty (1122-211 BC). In the Shang dynasty, people used tortoise shells for divination. It is a way of deciphering signs that emerge naturally from burning tortoise shells. These signs, once fixed, are the way they are and hence unchangeable. In the Chou dynasty, people used the plant, yarrow sticks, which depend upon the choice made, according to the rules of divination, by human beings, their reasoning and judgment. Whereas in divination by tortoise shells there was no place for the intervention of human subjectivity, in divination by yarrow sticks there was a possibility for such an intervention, thus leading to the construction of a humanly meaningful world.

The *Book of Changes* is constituted of two parts, the older is called *Chou Yi* (Text), and the newer is called the *Yi Chwan* (Interpretations). Originally, *Chou Yi* was merely constituted of 64 hexagrams, with all the *Kwa* (hexagrams) explanations and *Yao* (strokes) explanations. Each hexagram is constituted of six strokes, for which the *Kwa* explanation explains the whole hexagram, whereas the *Yao* explanation explains stroke by stroke. For people of the Chou dynasty, each time they got a hexagram in divination, they consulted the *Kwa* explanation and *Yao* explanation of that hexagram in order to know the manifestation of the divine will, or the good or bad omens of the fortune of the man in question.

On the other hand, the *Yi Chwan*, appearing in the period of Warring States, gave systematic interpretations to the *Chou Yi*. Among these interpretations, the *Twan* Interpretations, the 11 symbolism interpretations and the Great Appendix are the most philosophical. They establish a

systematic interpretation to the Way of all things and the principles of human affairs implied in the text of the *Chou Yi* (text). In this way, we can say that the development from the *Chou Yi* (text) to the *Yi Chwan* (Interpretations) is a development from divination to manifestation, and then from manifestation to construction.

FROM DIVINATION TO MANIFESTATION

In order to discern the manifestation of the good fortune or misfortune of a certain action, he who takes part in the divination should consult the *Kwa* explanations and *Yao* explanations of the *Chou Yi*, the explanations given by the *Chou Yi*itself consists in two ways of manifestation: the first is the revelation of the changes of human affairs through the changes of natural phenomena; the second is the reasoning of good fortune or misfortune of human affairs from the logical structure of the hexagram in question. The first is an analogical understanding of human affairs in contrast to natural phenomena. This constitutes a kind of dynamic contrast, whereas the second is a logical constitution of the 64 hexagrams through the combination of logical possibilities of *Yin* and *Yang*, constituting a kind of structural contrast. Let me explain.

First, there is the manifestation of changes in human affairs through the process of natural phenomena: this is a self-understanding of human affairs through an analogical understanding obtained by contrast to processes of natural phenomena. For example, in the *Yao* explanation to the second stroke, undivided, of the *Ta Kuo* hexagram ( ), it says that "The second stroke shows a decayed willow producing shoots, that means an old husband gains the heart of his young wife. There will be no disadvantage in every way." And the *Yao* explanation to the fifth stroke, undivided, of the same hexagram says that, "The fifth stroke shows a decayed willow producing flowers, which means an old wife gains the heart of her young husband. There will be no occasion either for blame or for praise."[2] In the natural phenomena, the producing of shoots or flower of an old decayed willow means the regeneration of the life of an old tree. When this is shown in answer to the demand of an old bachelor or an old widow, it means that it is a favorable time for him or for her to marry again.

Another example is the *Yao* explanations to the third stroke, undivided, of the *Li* hexagram ( ), it says,

> The third stroke shows its subject in a position similar to that of the declining sun. Instead of playing on his instrument of earthenware, and singing to it, he utters the groans of an old man of eighty. There will be evil."[3] This is an answer to the demand of an old man searching for an occasion for pleasure that, as in the situation of the declining sun, for him to have fun willfully is not appropriate. And the *Kwa* explanation to the *Hsiao Kwo* hexagram says that, "*Hsiao Kwo* indicates that in the circumstances which it implies there will be progress and attainment, But it will be advantageous to be firm and righteous. (What the name denotes may be done in small affairs, but not in great affairs. It is like the notes that come down from a bird on the wings -- to descend is better than to ascend. In this way, there will be great good fortune,"[4] because of the fact that the sound of a flying bird descends rather than ascends. It is better in this case for human affairs to obey humbly than to boast proudly.

The kind of explanations exemplified in the above-mentioned cases show a reasoning by analogy based upon, on the one hand, the continuity and discontinuity between natural phenomena

and human affairs. On the other hand, although there is belongingness between nature and human beings, it is also necessary for human beings to keep their distance and to pay respect to natural phenomena in order to achieve self-understanding for conducting human affairs, The existential decision leading to human destiny should not be limited to the observation of natural phenomenon. This is a first emergence of a dynamic contrast leading to the self-awareness of human historical consciousness.

Second, the constitution of hexagrams, which serves as the logical foundation of manifestation, itself results from a logic of two values, exemplified by an unbroken stroke () and a broken stroke (--). As explained by Thomé Fang in his*Logical Problems of the Book of Changes,* there is a logical derivation of the 64 hexagrams.[5] The two constituent strokes, — and --, take alternatively, will generate the two cardinal trigrams, *Ch'ien* ( ) and *K'un* ( ), through trivergence. And then, these two congruent cardinal trigrams will give rise to their six descendants through selective cross-linkage. On the one hand, the two cardinal trigrams, *Ch'ien* and *K'un,* will continue to generate hexagrams by alternative superposition. On the other hand, the other six rudimentary trigrams, by way of super-adding, will generate another group of hexagrams. In this way, after 18 steps of logical derivation, we have a system of 64 hexagrams. As is explained in the *Remarks on the Trigrams* of the *Book of Changes,* "Each trigram embraced those three categories, and, being repeated, its full form consists of six lines. A distinction was made of the positions assigned to the *Yin* and *Yang* lines, which were variously occupied, now by the strong, now by the soft forms, and thus the figure of each hexagram was completed."[6] This logical derivation produces an open system of 64 hexagrams, in which any two co-ordinate hexagrams are put into a state of perfect congruence explicable in terms of logical correspondence. Logically speaking, we have 32 pairs of opposite hexagrams.

From the above, we can say that, in interpreting the results of divination, the supposed divine will or the way of becoming is manifested through, first, the observation of natural phenomena and the analogical reasoning upon these phenomena, and second, systematic structuring by a quasi-logico-mathematical construction. Therefore, the manifestation is constituted of both cosmological and formal meaning. But, either in the structural contrast of its formal constitution, or in the self-awareness of human affairs in contrast to natural phenomena, the principal aim of divination is to attain the manifestation of the Way of becoming in order to conduct a meaningful life by following a certain norms of action. For example, in the *Yao* explanation to the fifth stroke of *Heng* hexagram ( ), it says that, "the fifth stroke shows its subject continuously maintaining the virtue indicated by it (constancy). In the case of a wife, this will be good fortune, in the case of a husband, misfortune."[7]This means that a wife, in following the virtue of constancy, will be in good fortune in what happens, whereas a husband, who should decide what is right in the circumstances, will have misfortune if he keeps to a pattern of behavior stubbornly, so as not to arrive at a right decision.

Another example is the *Yao* explanation to the third stroke of the *Chia Ren* hexagram ( ), it says that, "The third nine (or unbroken stroke) shows that its subject treats the members of the household with stern severity. But since there gives occasion for repentance and rigor, there will be good fortune. But if the wife and children were given to smirking and chattering, in the end there will be occasion for regret."[8] This means that when the husband tends to be serious, even to the point of severity, towards his family, this means good fortune if there were occasion for repentance and encouragement. But if members of the family are frivolous rather than serious, there will be occasion for regret. It is clear then that the words of divination describe only the action demanded in divination and its good fortune or bad fortune, but the *Kwa* explanation and the *Yao* explanation

add some lessons to human action concerning the cultivation of virtue and the conducting of a meaningful life. By doing this, they concentrate upon the life and destiny of the person.

FROM MANIFESTATION TO CONSTRUCTION

If the *Chou Yi* achieved and represented the process from divination to manifestation, then the *Yi Chwan* represents the process from manifestation to philosophical construction. It is here that *the Book of Changes* became a book of philosophy, because here it is enlarged universally to the whole realm of existence, not limiting itself to the function of divination and of telling of good or bad fortune in human affairs. As to its comprehensive functions, the *Great Appendix*, one of the most philosophical texts of the *Yi Chuan,* says:

> In the *Yi* there are four things characteristic of the way of the sages. We should set the highest value on its explanation to guide us in discourse, on its becoming for our actions, on its emblematic figures for the construction of implements, and on its prognostications for our practice of divination.[9]

It is evident, then, that divination is only one of the four functions of the *Book of Changes.* Apart from divination, it serves also the functions of guiding discourse, action, and technological invention, touching upon all aspects of human life. This means the principles elaborated by the *Book of Changes* apply to all domains of human existence.

According to the *Book of Changes*, *Yi* touched not only upon the principle of human existence, but also upon the principle of all things. In this way, it is deep and exhaustive enough to penetrate into all views and all actions. The *Great Appendix* says again:

> The operations constituting the *Yi* are the method by which the sages searched out exhaustively what was deep, and investigated the minutest springs of things. Those operations searched out what was deep, therefore they could penetrate to the views of all under the sky. They made manifest the minutest springs of things, therefore they could bring to completion all undertakings under the sky.[10]

But by what steps were the operations constituting the *Yi* constructed? According to the *Great Appendix*, we could analyze them into the following.

The Construction of Elementary Representations. According to the *Great Appendix*, "The sage was able to survey all the complex phenomena under the sky. He then considered in his mind how they could be figured, and, by a series of diagrams, represented their material forms and their characters. Hence, these diagrams are denominated semblances (for emblematic figures, the Symbolism or the *Hsiang*)."[11] What were to be represented were the greatest natural phenomena of our environmental world: heaven and earth, mountains and accumulations of water, thunder and wind, water and fire. Besides, they could represent also different things in the environment, different plants and animals. For example, *Ch'ien* represents heaven, jade, metal, ice, horse., etc., *Li* represents fire, sun, lightning, turtle, crab, tortoise, etc. These astronomical, physical and biological entities are Reality in itself, whereas our images of them and our knowledge of their nature are Constructed Reality. Starting from the construction of representations, we begin to elaborate a meaningful world.

The Construction of Directions of Action. Actions are taken in the *nexus* of space and time. First, all actions are undertaken in time; therefore temporal direction is most important. In the *Book of Changes*, the direction of time is conceived in two ways: Toward the past, it is a natural process; toward the future, it is an anticipatory process. The *Remarks on Trigrams*says that. "The numbering of the past is a natural process; the knowledge of the coming is anticipation. Therefore, in the *Yi* we have both anticipation and the natural process."[12] But in space, the directions of action, even as taken in the temporal process, becomes more complicated. Eight principal spatial directions are thus possible for any action. As the *Remark on Trigrams*says:

> All things are made to issue forth in *Dzeng* ( ), which is placed at the east. The process of production is brought into full and equal action in *Sun* ( ), which is placed at the southeast. The "being brought into full and equal action" refers to the purity and equal arrangement of all things. The *Li* ( ) gives the idea of brightness. All things are now made manifest to one another. It is the trigram of the south. The sages turn their faces to the south when they give audience to all under the sky, administering government towards the region of brightness. . . . *Kuen* ( ) denotes the earth, and is placed at the southwest. All things receive from it their fullest nourishment, and hence it is said, "The greatest service is done for him in *Kuen*. *Tui* ( ) corresponds to the west and to the autumn -- the season in which all things rejoice. He struggles in *Ch'ien*, which is the trigram of the northwest. There the *Yin* and *Yang* beat against each other. *Kan* denotes water, it is the trigram of the exact north -- the trigram of comfort and rest, the goal to which all tend. *Ghen* is the trigram of the northeast. In it, all things bring to a completion of the issues of the past year, and prepare to begin the next.[13]

In this text, eight spatial directions of action are well represented. More complicated and more minute spatial directions are elaborated with the complexification of hexagrams. The directions of action are important for the good or bad fortune of an action, and often is well indicated in the *Kwa* explanations. For example, in the *Kwa* explanation of the *Kuen* hexagram, it is said that "There is advantage in getting friends in the southwest, whereas he loses his friend in the northeast. If he sticks with righteousness and firmness, there will be good fortune."[14]

The Representation of Our Body. In the texture of space and time, it is our body which takes action and moves in different directions. Therefore our body must be represented and situated in the reality. It is said in the *Remarks on Trigrams*that, *Ch'ien* suggests the idea of a head; *Kuen*, that of the belly; *Kan*, that of the feet; *Sun*, that of the thighs; *Kan*, that of the ears; *Li*, that of the eyes; *Ghen*, that of the hands; and *Tui*, that of the mouth."[15] But we should add here that body is part of reality in itself, part of constructed reality. It is a mediation between the reality in itself and the constructed reality. Because, on the one hand, our body, with all its organs and members, belongs to the order of reality, and, on the other hand, our body moves in space and time according to the representations it conceived of the reality and the decision it takes by judging these representations.

The Construction of Human Relationships, Especially Ethical Relationship. The *Remarks on Trigrams* says that

> *Ch'ien* is the symbol of heaven, and hence has the appellation of father, *Kuen* is the symbol of earth, and hence has the appellation of mother. *Dzeng* shows the first application of *Ch'ien* to *Kuen*, resulting in the first male, and hence is called its eldest son. Sun shows a first application of *Ch'ien* to *Kun*, resulting in the first female, and hence is called its eldest daughter.*Kan* shows a second application of *Kuen* to *Ch'ien* resulting in the second male, and hence called its second son. *Li* shows a second application of *Ch'ien* to *Kuen*, resulting in the second female, and thus called its second daughter. *Ghen* shows a third application of *Kuen* to *Ch'ien*, resulting in the third male, and hence is called the youngest son. *Tui* shows a third application of*Ch'ien* to *Kuen*, resulting in the third female, and hence is called its youngest daughter.[16]

This ethical context means that human beings always act and live in an ethical relationship. Human beings never act and live as isolated individuals. Thus ethical relations could be combined with other dimensions of construction as, for example, the spatial factor, so as to construct a world of meaningful life. Therefore, in the traditional Chinese house, the father lives in the northwest room, the mother that of the southeast, the eldest son that of the east, the eldest daughter that of the southeast, the second son that of the north, etc.

The Construction of the System of Hexagrams. In order that the emblematic representations cover all situations of human existence there should be a logical derivation of all the hexagrams representing all typical situations: According to the*Great Appendix*, "Therefore in the *Yi* there is the Great Ultimate which produces the elementary forms. These two elementary forms produce the four emblematic symbols, which again produce the eight trigrams."[17] The eight trigrams having being completed in their proper order, there are, in each, the three emblematic lines. They were then multiplied by a process of addition till the six *Yao* appeared."[18] The *Yi* is a book in which the form of each diagram is determined by the strokes from the first to the last, which must be carefully observed, The six *Yao* are mixed together according to the time and their substances.[19]The *Yi* is a book of wide comprehension and great scope, embracing everything. There are in it the way of Heaven, the way of man and the way of earth. It then takes three categories, and doubles them till they amount to six."[20] As we have explained above, the system of hexagrams, with six strokes, was elaborated until the number of 64, although it could continue without limit. That is why I call it an "Open System".

The Constitution of a Universal Norm of Action. After the construction of representations, a universal standard of action must be established in order to guide the praxis. The way of *Yi* is universal in the sense made precise by the *Great Appendix*, in which we find a text saying that "The Way by which these things come about is very comprehensive, and must be acknowledged in every sphere of things. If at the beginning there be a cautious apprehension as to the end, there probably will be no error or cause for blame. This is the Way of *Yi*."[21] Here the term "comprehensive" and the phrase "in every sphere of things" mean the universality of praxis. It is an universal norm of action which is the concern here in the *Book of Changes*. That is why the *Great Appendix* says that "A later sage was able to survey all actions under the sky. He contemplated them in their common action, in order to bring the universal standard and proper tendency of each. He then appended his explanation to each line, to determine the good or evil indicated by it."[22] The wisdom contained in the *Book of Changes*, therefore, resulted from contemplation of the universal

standard of human common action, and what it prescribes is, therefore, universal norms of action for human beings.

AGENT AND ACTION: HUMAN INTERVENTION INTO STRUCTURE

Although the structural aspect of the *Book of Changes* is constituted of the logico-mathematical system of hexagrams, the subjectivity and dimension of meaning could intervene also in the structure, even to the point of reorganizing it. This would means that the human subject and its search for meaning could not only render specific interpretations to structures, but could also become a power of structuring. This can be shown by different ways of deciding what is good fortune and what is misfortune in the *Book of Changes.*

The first theory for such decisions is that of proper position, as is proposed in the Twan Explanation and the Small Symbolic Explanation. In appearance, this consists in a kind of structural operation, but later on it introduces Confucian ethical theory and Taoist *Yin Yang* theory. The main proposition of the theory of proper position says that the *Yang* stroke, that is the unbroken line, should be in the *Yang* position, that is, the odd lines; and the *Yin* stroke (broken line) should be in the *Yin*position, that is, the even line. In other words, a hexagram is constituted of six strokes (lines), in which the first, the third and the fifth lines, counting from the bottom of each hexagram, are the *Yang* position, whereas the second, the fourth and the sixth lines, counting from the bottom of each hexagram, are the *Yin* positions. The unbroken lines, which are called *Yang Yao*, should take the *Yang* position as its proper position, otherwise it will be in an improper position. The broken lines, which are called *Yin Yao*, should take the *Yin* as their proper position, otherwise it will be in improper position, To be in proper position is to have good fortune, whereas to be in improper position is to have misfortune. For example, in the 63rd hexagram, the *Ji Chi* ( ), every *Yang* and *Yin* stroke is in its proper position. That is why the *Twan* explanation says that, "There will be advantage in being firm and correct. The strong and soft lines are correctly arranged, each in its appropriate position."[23] On the contrary, in the 54th hexagram, that is the *Kweimei* hexagram ( ), the *Kwa* explanation says that, "*Kweimei* indicates that, under the condition it denotes, every action will be misfortunate and in no wise advantageous."[24] And the *Twan* explanation says that, "Every action will be misfortunate, because the positions of the lines are not those appropriate to them."[25]

When the theory of proper position does not suffice for explaining all the fortunate and unfortunate cases, the *Twan*explanation introduces the theory of respondent position. This theory says that, when in the groups of the first and the fourth lines, the second and the fifth lines, and the third and the sixth lines, there is a *Yin* line responding to a *Yang* line or a *Yang* line responding to a *Yin* line, then it will be a case of good fortune. When, being without proper position, there is no such a respondent, it will be a case of misfortune. For example, in the 14th hexagram, the *Thah Yuo* hexagram ( ), the fifth line is not in its proper position according to the theory of proper position; nevertheless its *Yao* explanation says that, "the fifth stroke shows the sincerity of its subject reciprocated by that of all the others represented in the hexagram. Let him display a proper majesty and there will be good fortune."[26] The judgment of a good fortune in this case falsifies the theory of proper position. The justification offered by the theory of respondent position in the *Twan* explanation says that, "In *Tah You* the soft line has the position of honor and is grandly central, because the strong lines above and below respond to it."[27] The fifth line becomes the sign of good fortune because of the respondent position occupied by the *Yang* stroke in the second line.

In the case that there is neither proper position nor respondent position, it will not necessarily go to the misfortune side, because it can still be remedied by a stroke occupying the central place in the upper or lower trigram. Thus we have a subsidiary theory of central position. This theory says that the stroke which appears in the divination in the second line, which is central to the lower trigram, or in the fifth line, which is central to the upper trigram, will be a subsidiary sign of good fortune. For example, in the 64th hexagram, the *Weitsi* hexagram ( ), the fifth stroke, which belongs to *Yin*, is not in its proper position, but the *Yao* explanations of it tells good fortune. To explain this, the *Twan* explanation says that, "*Weitsi* intimates progress and success because the soft line is in central position."[28] The theory of central position is merely a subsidiary theory, but it can offer remedy to the case of improper position, whereas in the case of proper position, it can offer positive reinforcement.

Finally, there is the theory of proper time. It says that the good fortune or misfortune of a hexagram depends upon the proper or improper character of the time in which it appears. If it appears in proper time, it is good fortune; otherwise, when the time is not appropriate, it is misfortunate. The fact that a line is in the central position does not necessarily make it good fortune. It is good fortune when it is in proper time, and misfortune when in improper time. This follows what the *Great Appendix* says, "The strong and soft lines have their fixed and proper position; their changes, however varied, are according to the requirement of time."[29] For example, when in the 60th hexagram, the *Tsié* hexagram ( ), both the second and the fifth lines are in central position, That is why its *Twan* explanation says that, "*Tsié* intimates that there will be progress and attainment. The strong and the soft are well divided and the strong line occupies the central position."[30] But, unfortunately, the *Yao*explanation of the second line says that, "The second stroke shows its subject not quitting the courtyard inside his gate. There will he misfortune."[31] To this misfortune, the *Hsiang* explanation says that, "He does not quit the courtyard inside his gate. There will be misfortune. Because he loses the proper time to an extreme degree."[32]

From the above, it becomes clear that the *Book of Changes,* even if it contains the structural aspect, will never neglect the factor of human subjectivity and historicity. If human beings want to know the good fortune or misfortune of their actions, they must, on the one hand, refer to the logical mathematical structure, to the point of even supposing something like the*Mathesis Universalis*, or, on the other hand, these structures must submit themselves to the subjective interpretation of human beings in order to render themselves meaningful. The *Great Appendix* says,

> The sticks are manipulated by three and five to determine the process of becoming; they are laid on opposite sides, and are placed one up, one down, to make sure their numbers. And the three necessary changes are achieved in this way, till they form the figure pertaining to heaven or to earth. Their numbers are exactly determined, and the emblems of all things under the sky are fixed. If the *Yi* were not most capable of changes of all things under heaven, how could it effect such an achievement as this?[33]

This important text shows the marvelous effect of the combination of structural factors. But, on the other hand, the *Remarks on the Trigrams* says that,

> In ancient time, when the sages composed the *Yi*, in order to give assistance to the spiritual Intelligence, they created the rule for the use of the divining plant. The number three was assigned to heaven, number two to earth, and from these came the other numbers, They

> contemplated the changes through the broken and unbroken lines and formed the trigrams. From the movements taking place in the strong and soft lines, they created the separate lines or *Yao*. There ensued a harmonious conformity to the Way of Tao and virtue to the discernment of what is just and right. They made an exhaustive investigation into the principle of all things to understand the mandate of Heaven.[34]

This important text shows the interconnection between structural operation and human self-realization

DYNAMIC CONTRAST AND HISTORICITY

The *Book of Changes,* in its philosophical project of constructing a meaningful world, not only introduces the dimension of meaningfulness into the structural contrasts by way of subjective interpretation, but it proposes a vision of dynamic contrast directed towards the development of human historicity. By "dynamic contrast," I mean the interplay between the continuity and discontinuity in the process of time which lead to the evolution of history. The *Book of Changes* not only contains structural contrasts constituted of difference and complementarity, but is full of dynamic contrast and takes the historic movement through dynamic contrast as the essence of Change. Thus, the *Great Appendix* says, "The rhythmic interchange of the *Yin* and the *Yang* constitutes what is called the Way of things. That towards which all things aim in their successive progress toward goodness. That which could be realized in its completeness is the nature of all things."[35] This dialectical interplay between the *Yin* and the *Yang* constitutes the first dynamic contrast in the concept of historical development in *the Book of Changes.* This constitutes the law of nature in the philosophy of *Yi* and has a metaphysical import. But its successive development can lead to the realization of values, that is, goodness and the realization of the nature of human beings and of all things.

The second dynamic contrast. according to the *Book of Changes* is the dialectical interaction between the strong and the soft. "The sages set forth the diagrams, inspected the emblems contained in them, and appended their explanations -- in this way good fortune and bad fortune were made clear. The strong and the soft interact one with another, and produce the changes."[36] Moreover, another text in the Great Appendix says, "The eight trigrams having been completed in their proper order, there were in each the three emblematic lines. They were then multiplied by a process of addition till the six *Yao* (or component lines) appeared. The strong lines and the soft lines push themselves each into the place of the other, and hence the changes of the diagram take place."[37] We can see that, in the *Book of Changes,* the rhythmic interaction between the *Yin* and the *Yang,* the strong and the soft, all belonging to the category of dynamic contrast, constitutes universal principles of the cosmos, but their final objective is to determine the good or bad fortune of human action.

Yin and *Yang*, strong and soft, etc., each pair represents the dynamic contrasts which interchange between themselves. When the becoming of one state of affairs comes to the extreme of its development, it goes naturally to its opposite state of affairs. The fulfillment of *Yang* goes to the emergence of *Yin*. The culmination of the strong goes to the generation of the soft. The maximization of suffering goes to the beginning of happiness. All these represent the process by which the ultra maturation of one state of affairs goes to the commencement of its opposite. Something very much like the dialectical process.

For example, the *Hsiang* explanation of the first hexagram, the *Ch'ien* hexagram uses the images of the becoming of a dragon to illustrate the becoming of human destiny. Such as "The dragon lies hid in the deep." "The dragon appears in the field." "Active and vigilant all the day." "Leaping up as from the deep." "The dragon is one wing in the sky." "The dragon exceeding its proper limits, there will be occasions of repentance." The Wen Yen explains this, saying "Only he who is the sage knows when to advance and when to retire, when to maintain and when to let perish, and that without losing the righteousness of his nature."

The text shows the sage's deep concern with human historicity and the destiny of humankind. The *Great Appendix*explains in the same way, "He who keeps danger in mind will rest safe in his seat; he who keeps ruin in mind will preserve his interests secure; he who sets the danger of disorder before his own eyes will maintain the state of order. Therefore the superior man, when resting in safety, does not forget that danger might come; when in a state of security, he does not forget the possibility of ruin. And when all is in the state of order, he does not forget that disorder might come. Therefore his person is kept safe, and his country with all its clans can be preserved."[40] This text shows a deep concern for the destiny both of the individual and the collectivity. The positive direction of human destiny for the *Book of Changes* is the wholesome unfolding of human potentiality and the completion of human historicity.

Let me conclude. In the *Book of Changes* the construction of meaning has the following characteristics: First, it refers always to reality in itself, to nature and its regulations, to the natural phenomena appearing in our environment. Not only the existence of reality in itself is never denied, we can even always draw from nature resources for our knowledge and action. Second, what we can refer to for the decision of what we should do is not reality itself, but the representations and their structures that we construct out of our interaction with the environment. Centering around our body, representations of both the natural and social environments are constructed and organized in a rigorous way in order to set up a system of possibilities which human beings could endow with their own interpretations. Finally, there is an evident pragmatism in the *Book of Changes* which concerns itself with human action and its good or bad fortune. Since going toward the better or toward the worse is the matter of the most concern in human affairs, here the *Book of Changes* touches upon the human soul. It is a philosophy of action and of bringing action to the betterment of the human being in the process of history.

In the *Book of Changes*, we find not only cosmic regularity and comminatory logical structure, but also human subjectivity and historicity, both leading to the betterment of human beings. It is in this context of the betterment of human beings, not only in referring to the cosmological structure, but also in the formation and unfolding of human historicity, that we should reconsider the structure and meaning of science, culture and other constituents of human culture.

CHAPTER X
TRADITIONAL CULTURE AND MODERNIZATION

R. BALASUBRAMANIAN

BACKGROUND

This paper focuses upon three issues. First, I want to show that the perennial elements in traditional cultures like those of India and China are relevant even today as they play an important role in the achievement, on the one hand, of harmony between the individual and society at the social level, and, on the other hand, of harmony of spirit, mind, and body at the individual level. Second, we should not lose sight of the distinction between knowledge and information, between wisdom and knowledge, and more importantly between life and living. The perennial elements in the traditional culture have helped us to care for life, knowledge, and wisdom, which are essential for spiritual development. Third, modernization as interpreted by the West has a narrow connotation and is, therefore, a distorted concept. Through science, it brings in the colonial attitude, the imperialism of the West. It is possible for one to be modern without accepting all that is implied by modernization.

Culture, which comprises philosophy and religion, art and literature, science and technology, social organization and political administration, is the mirror of the theory and practice of a people. It is originated, developed and sustained by the people over a period of time. In turn, the perennial elements which constitute its core inspire and sustain the posterity to whom it is transmitted from time to time. Traditional cultures like those of China and India are undoubtedly ancient, but not antiquated; their ideals and practices, which are relevant in any situation, help the people to meet the new challenges which surface from time to time. As a result they not only survive, but are admired, adored, and accepted by the people. There cannot be a better explanation of the way a culture is able to hold the people and sustain them than the one given by Sri Aurobindo:

> The culture of a people may be roughly described as the expression of a consciousness of life which formulates itself in three aspects. There is a side of thought, of ideal, of upward will and the soul's aspiration; there is a side of creative self-expression and appreciative aesthesis, intelligence, and imagination; and there is a side of practical and outward formulation. A people's philosophy and higher thinking give us its mind's purest, largest, and most general formulation of its consciousness of life and its dynamic view of existence. Its religion formulates the most intense form of its upward will and the soul's aspirations towards the fulfillment of its highest ideal and impulse. Its art, poetry, literature provide for us the creative expression and impression of its intuition, imagination, vital turn and creative intelligence. Its society and politics provide in their forms an outward frame in which the more external life works out what it can of its inspiring ideal and of its special character and nature under the difficulties of the environment. We can see how much it has taken of the crude material of living, what it has done with it, how it has shaped as much of it as possible into some reflection of its guarding consciousness and deeper spirit. None of them express the whole spirit behind, but they derive from it their main ideas and their cultural character. Together they make up its soul, mind, and body.[1]

Of the various components of culture the role of philosophy and religion is significant. Philosophy and religion can never be separated though they can be distinguished. It may be that in a particular culture, philosophy is in the forefront and religion in the background. It can also be the other way with religion at the surface and philosophy in the background. The point to be noted here is that philosophy and religion interact with, and influence each other. Philosophy is made dynamic by religion, and religion is enlightened by philosophy. If it is admitted that there is the need for a unity of theory and practice, philosophy cannot remain merely as a view of life; it must also be a way of life. In other words, philosophy has to become religious if it is to mold, organize and regulate life. Religion is not an untouchable; its need for life can neither be ignored nor underestimated. It will be helpful to contrast the pursuit of philosophy in Europe with that in India and China. Unlike the Europe of the Enlightenment where philosophy did not touch life at all, there was a tremendous impact of philosophy on life both in India and China. In the words of Sri Aurobindo:

> Philosophy has been pursued in Europe with great and noble intellectual results by the highest minds, but very much as a pursuit apart from life, a thing high and splendid, but ineffective. It is remarkable that, while in India and China philosophy has seized hold on life, has had an enormous practical effect on the civilization and got into the very bones of current thought and action, it has never at all succeeded in achieving this importance in Europe. In the days of the Stoics and Epicureans it got a grip, but only among the highly cultured; at the present day, too, we have some renewed tendency of the kind. Nietzsche has had his influence, certain French thinkers also in France, the philosophies of James and Bergson have attracted some amount of public interest; but it is a mere nothing compared with the effective power of Asiatic philosophy.[2]

There is no doubt that the average European who draws his guidance not from the philosophic, but from positive and practical reason, puts "the philosophical treatises on the highest shelf in the library of civilization." The situation is entirely different in India. Sri Aurobindo says:

> The Indian mind holds . . . that the *Rishi*, the thinker, the seer of spiritual truth is the best guide not only of the religious and moral, but [also of] the practical life. The seer, the *Rishi* is the natural director of society; to the*Rishis* he attributes the ideals and guiding intuitions of his civilization. Even today he is very ready to give the name to anyone who can give a spiritual truth which helps his life or a formative idea and inspiration which influences religion, ethics, society, even politics.[3]

The phenomenon known as modernization is a product of the one-sided pursuit of both philosophy and science -- philosophy purely as an intellectual affair without any bearing on life and science as the most effective instrument for the possession of unlimited power, eliminating the sacred. I shall take up the problem of modernization later. It may be added here that what is said about the Indian mind is equally true of the Chinese mind. Confucius, Mencius, and others are the great *Rishis*of China, the seers who exhibited the most uncommon insight into men and matters, into the moral and social problems of human beings.

Drawing a distinction between two kinds of philosophers, systematic and edifying, Richard Rorty characterizes Wittgenstein as an edifying philosopher, like Kierkegaard, Heidegger, and others. In a brief analysis of the spirit of Western civilization which is fully manifest in the industry,

architecture, and music of our time, in its fascism and socialism, Wittgenstein openly admits that he has "no sympathy for the current of European civilization, that he does not understand its goals, if it has any," and that "it is alien and uncongenial" to him.[4] He goes on to say:

> A culture is like a big organization which assigns each of its members a place where he can work in the spirit of the whole; and it is perfectly fair for his power to be measured by the contribution he succeeds in making to the whole enterprise.[5]

Wittgenstein's brief explanation of culture requires some elucidation. He says that culture is a whole, that every individual has a place in it, that every individual has to function as a member of the whole, and that what he does is significant socially as well as morally. The two traditional cultures, Chinese and Indian, have recognized the importance of the ideas embedded in Wittgenstein's explanation of culture. While the Indian culture appears to be predominantly spiritual and religious, the Chinese culture seems to be basically humanistic, with a clear emphasis on the moral and social dimensions of life. It must be pointed out in this connection that the difference between these two traditional cultures is only at the surface. Since the traditional culture comprehends the total life of a person, it provides a place for the different dimensions of life -- spiritual, religious, moral, and social -- which can be distinguished, but not separated. The spiritual and religious dimension of life presupposes the moral and social realm; and the moral and social sphere of life points to the religious and spiritual goals. That the two realms, ethico-social and religio-spiritual, are complementary, has been recognized by both these cultures, even though the Indian culture lays emphasis on the spiritual and religious side of man while the Chinese culture focusses on the ethical and social side of man. The *motif* of the two cultures is the harmony of spirit, mind, and body; and it is to achieve this harmony that they take care of both realms of life. Once again what Sri Aurobindo says in this connection is worth quoting:

> A true happiness in this world is the right terrestrial aim of man, and true happiness lies in the finding and maintenance of a natural harmony of spirit, mind, and body. A culture is to be valued to the extent to which it has discovered the right key of this harmony and organized its expressive motives and movements. And a civilization must be judged by the manner in which all its principles, ideas, forms, ways of living work to bring that harmony out, manage its rhythmic play, and secure its continuance or the development of its motives.[6]

There is need to harmonize the eternal and the temporal, for the spirit works through mind and body, which belong to the temporal; and this is what every great culture has aimed at.

There are four components in the traditional culture associated with India and China. They are: (1) the primal Spirit which is the source and support of the universe may be viewed both as transcendent to, and as immanent in, the universe; (2) this Spirit which is immanent in all human beings can be realized by every human being; (3) it lays down a discipline which is both moral and spiritual for realizing the Spirit; and (4) it has provided an organization of the individual and collective life not only for the sake of the harmony between the individual and society, but also for the sake of the harmony of spirit, mind, and body. Each one of these components needs some explanation in the context of these two cultures.

INDIAN CULTURE

Though Indian culture as it is today is composite in character, comprising Hindu, Jaina, Buddha, Islamic, and Christian elements, it can be characterized as Vedic culture since not only Hinduism, which is predominant, but also Jainism and Buddhism, which originated in protest against Vedic ritualism, have been influenced by the *Vedas*, the basic and oldest scriptural text in the world. Islam and Christianity entered the Indian soil consequent on the invasion of India by the foreigners -- by the Moghuls in the former case, and by the English, French, and Portuguese in the latter case. Though they try to retain their identity, the followers of these two religious traditions have been influenced by the Vedic culture. Kabir (1398-1518 AD), for example, who is a greatly respected personality in the religious history of India, is a product of both Hinduism and Islam. In recent times, Indian Christians talk about and practice inculturization, which is a new and growing phenomenon. The predominant Hindu culture which has a long and continuous history is the Vedic culture; and the Vedic culture, which has its beginning round about 2500 BC, may be characterized as primal culture, since it traces everything in the universe to the primal Spirit, which is variously called Brahman, *_tman*, Being, and so on.

Spirit or Being is the primal reality. It is that from which all beings arise; being supported by it, they exist; and all of them move towards it as their destination. In the language of T.S. Eliot, the beginning is the end. The *Upani ad* says:

> That, verily, from which these beings are born, that by which, when born, they live, that into which, when departing, they enter. That, seek to know. That is Brahman.[7]

Spirit or Brahman is primal in the sense that it is foundational. It is the sole reality; it is one and non-dual; and there is nothing else beside it. It is spoken of as the First Cause, Unmoved Mover, of the entire manifest universe. With a view to bring out the independent nature of the primal Spirit on which the manifest universe is dependent, it is referred to as the Ground. That which is independent is real; what is dependent is an appearance. The ground-grounded relation brings out the *reality* of Spirit and the *appearance* of the universe. Ordinarily we distinguish the material cause from the efficient cause; the one is different from the other. The wood from which a table is made is the material cause; and the carpenter who works on the wood and makes a table according to a certain design is the efficient cause. The carpenter is different from the wood. What makes the primal Spirit unique is that it is both the material and efficient cause of the universe, because it alone existed in the beginning and nothing else beside it.

Like wood, it is the material cause of the world; and like a carpenter, it is the efficient cause of the world. So, the Vedic culture traces all beings, living as well as non-living, to one source, viz. Spirit or Being. It may be pointed out here that in recent times quantum physics attempts to trace everything in the manifest universe to one source which is non-material or spiritual. Einstein declared:

> Everyone who is seriously involved in the pursuit of science becomes convinced that a spirit is manifest in the Laws of the Universe -- a Spirit vastly superior to that of man, and one in the face of which we, with our modest powers, must feel humble.[8]

That Spirit or Brahman is the source, support, and end of everything in the universe, is the major premise of the Vedic culture.

Derived from the major premise are two minor premises, one relating to living beings called *j_va* and the other, to non-living beings called *jagat*. Since Spirit or Brahman is immanent in *j_va* and *jagat*, neither *j_va* nor *jagat* is isolated from the primal Spirit. It means that all living beings, whatever they may be -- humans, animals, birds, reptiles, and so on -- are spiritual or divine. Non-living beings which are material constitute the physical universe. They are the products of the five elements -- ether, air, fire, water and earth -- which are material. The divine principle is present not only in living beings, but also in non-living beings, and so they are also divine. Characterizing Brahman as the indwelling Spirit (*antary_min*), the *Brhad_ra yaka Upani ad* says that Brahman is present in all beings -- the sun, the moon, and the stars, the elements which constitute the physical universe, and the organs of the *j_vas*. Just as our body does not know the Spirit inside it, even so the beings, whatever they may be, do not know Brahman, the indwelling Spirit in them. The following text is relevant here:

> He [Brahman or Spirit] who dwells in all beings, yet is within all beings, whom no beings know, whose body is all beings, who controls all beings from within, he is your Self, the inner controller, the immortal.[9]

That which dwells in material objects and controls them also dwells in all living beings and controls them. Just as all living beings are essentially divine, even so the entire physical universe is essentially divine. Whatever may be the differences among the species and within the individual members of a species, all are essentially one, because one and the same divine Spirit is present in all of them. The message conveyed by these two minor premises of the traditional culture deserves careful consideration. First of all, if the land and the water and the sky of the physical universe are divine, then we should take care of them in the same way as we take care of our body. The claim that human beings are rational, that they are superior to the physical world, and that they are, in the words of Descartes, the "masters and possessors of nature" resulted in the unscrupulous, cruel, and destructive despoliation of nature in the name of the quest for knowledge, scientific development, and technological progress. It is not nature that is red in tooth and claw, but the human being who is unabashedly selfish and blatantly aggressive and makes nature bleed and scorch. Fortunately for us, there is a global awakening to the significance of the earth and the water and the sky as sources of sustenance and nourishment. Secondly, the application of this principle of the oneness to the human realm is of great consequence. The understanding that all human beings are essentially one and that differences of color and caste, of gender and race, of sharpness and dullness of mind, and so on are due to the mind-sense-body adjunct by which the Spirit is enclosed will help us to tackle the universally rampant problem of discrimination of all kinds -- social, religious, economic, and political.

Ved_ntic philosophy, which is an important component of culture, tells us what a human being is, does, and should do in order to achieve the harmony of spirit, mind, and body. A human being (*j_va*) is a complex entity consisting of Spirit and matter. The term used in *Ved_nta* for Spirit is the Self or *_tman*. Matter which is totally different from the Self is referred to as not-Self, as other-than-the-Self. According to *Ved_nta*, the not-Self, which is the material outfit of the human being, is made up of the mind, the senses, and the body. The Self in the human being requires a physical medium for its involvement in the day-to-day life as the subject of knowledge, the agent of action, and the enjoyer of the consequences of action. The mind and the senses are the cognitive instruments. With the help of the mind, the five senses give us knowledge of the things of the external world. The work of the mind does not stop with the cognitive support it gives to the senses. As the internal organ

(*anta karaa*), the mind generates the knowledge of the subjective states such as pleasure and pain. It also does something more, which is very important from the moral and spiritual perspectives. It gives us knowledge of the right and the wrong, *dharma* and*adharma* as they are called. When chastened by the moral and spiritual discipline, it is the mind which helps us to realize the primal Spirit or Brahman. So the work of the mind is manifold. The mind is the most marvelous instrument that a human being possesses. The emergence of the mind has not only accelerated the evolutionary process in its upward movement, but also has given enormous powers to the human being, making him/her the crown of creation, unique among all living beings. In the course of his commentary on the scriptural account of the creation of the world, _a_kara raises the question about the preeminence of the human being among all creatures and answers it by saying that the human being is preeminent because he alone is qualified for knowledge and the performance of prescribed duties (*j__na-karma-adhik_rah*).[10] Why is it that he alone has this competence? _a_kara justifies the supremacy of the human on three grounds. First, he has the ability for acquiring knowledge not only of the things of the world, but also of the supreme Being, the primal reality. This is because he is equipped with the mind which, being inspired by the Self or Spirit in him is capable of comprehending everything including the highest reality. Secondly, he has the distinctive quality of *desiring* certain ends as a result of discrimination, deliberation, and choice. Thirdly, when he has consciously chosen an end, he is earnest about it, finds the right means for achieving the end, and persists in it till he reaches the goal. A scriptural text which is quoted by _a_kara in this connection says:

> In man alone is the Self most manifest for he is the best endowed with knowledge. He speaks what he knows; he sees what he knows; he knows what will happen tomorrow; he knows the higher and the lower worlds; he aspires to achieve immortality through perishable things. He is thus endowed (with discrimination) while other beings have consciousness of hunger and thirst only.[11]

According to *Ved_nta*, the Self in the human being is eternal, whereas his material outfit, the mind-sense-body complex, is temporal. The birth and death of a human being are connected with, and because of, the body. They are illicitly transferred to the Self with the result that we think of it as perishable and finite. The human being is caught in the cycle of birth and death because of ignorance (*avidy_*) whose beginning is not known. The empirical journey of the Self through its association with the material adjunct is due to *avidy_*. It is *avidy_* that pulls down the trans-empirical Self into the empirical realm, superimposes on it, which is non-relational, a relation with matter, and is thus responsible for the "fall" of the Self. What is above categorization is now categorized and made an object of knowledge; what transcends relation is now explained through the logic of relation; and what is beyond the scope of language is now brought within the grammar of language. Thus, just as a tree and a table are known through perception and other means of knowledge, even so Brahman or the Self, we claim, is known through the scriptural text called *_ruti*. The trans-relational reality is viewed as characterized by omniscience and other qualities and also as the cause of the world. What is trans-linguistic is now spoken of as real, knowledge, infinite, and so on. In other words, we employ the categories of substance and attribute, cause and effect, whole and parts for the purpose of understanding the highest reality. It will be of interest in this connection to refer to the views of two influential thinkers from the West -- one belonging to the pre-sixth century and the other our own contemporary. Pseudo-Dionysius, who occupies an important place in the history of Western spirituality, observes:

> [The supreme reality] is neither perceived nor is it perceptible. It suffers neither disorder nor disturbance and is overwhelmed by no earthly passion. . . . It endures no deprivation of light. It passes through no change, decay, division, loss, no ebb and flow, nothing of which the senses may be aware. None of all this can either be identified with it nor attributed to it.[12]

Again, he says:

> It falls neither within the predicate of non-being nor of being. Existing beings do not know it as it actually is and it does not know them as they are. There is no speaking of it, nor name, nor knowledge of it. Darkness and light, error and truth -- it is none of these. It is beyond assertion and denial. We make assertions and denials of what is next to it, but never of it, for it is both beyond every assertion, being the perfect and unique cause of all things, and, by virtue of its preeminently simple and absolute nature, free of every limitation, beyond every limitation; it is also beyond every denial.[13]

Pseudo-Dionysius conveys in the most unambiguous terms the *Ved_ntic* conception of Brahman or the Self.

Instead of terms such as Brahman or the Self used by the *Ved_ntin*, Wittgenstein uses terms such as the "metaphysical subject," the "I," the "philosophical `I' " and contrasts it with the "body." The human body, he says, is a part of the world among other parts, but the Self or the philosophical "I" is not a part of the world; it is outside the space-time-cause world. In the words of Wittgenstein:

> The subject does not belong to the world, but is a border of the world.[14]

The philosophical "I" is not the human being, not the human body, or the human soul of which psychology treats, but the metaphysical subject, the border -- not a part -- of the world.[15]

What is obvious from the foregoing account is that we have to make a distinction between two concepts, Brahman-in-itself and Brahman-in-relation-to-the-world, for the purpose of analysis. The latter concept is meaningful only on the presupposition of the fall of Brahman or the Self.

When did this fall take place? No one knows, and no one can answer. Once there is the fall, the empirical journey of the Self goes on in different forms, conditioned by the space-time-cause framework. However, the promise of *Ved_nta* is that the empirical journey of the *j_va* can be put an end to, that the vicious cycle of birth and death can be broken by destroying *avidy_*through knowledge of one's Self. That is why there is the scriptural instruction of "Know thy Self." Not only does scripture say that the Self should be realized or seen, but it also suggests the means for realizing it.

It will be difficult to understand the full significance of the distinction between Brahman-in-itself and Brahman-in-relation-to-the-world without a reference to the principle of standpoints which is enshrined in Indian culture. There are two sets of features, perennial and temporal, in Indian culture which contribute to its continuity as well as its change. While the basic doctrines constitute its perennial dimension, religious practices covering a wide range are temporal and transitory. Decadence sets in when the temporal and transitory features gain importance almost to the point of ignoring or sidetracking the perennial features. Historical, social, and political changes call for modification, sometimes radical, sometimes minor, in the religious practices and social norms of the

people, while the basic doctrinal side remains intact. Continuity of the essentials amidst the changing flow of life helps to preserve the cultural tradition.

The essential structure which has endured through the vicissitudes of time contains the basic doctrines as stated in the major premise and the two minor premises to which reference was made earlier. The three basic doctrines are: primal Being or Spirit is the source, support, and end of everything, sentient as well as non-sentient; all living beings are divine; also, the physical universe which has originated from the primal Spirit is spiritual.

The monistic vision, which is pervasive in the *Vedic corpus*, is a notable feature of Indian culture. The doctrine of levels or standpoints skillfully adopted by Indian culture helps to reconcile monism and polytheism as well as monism and pluralism. Though each pair contains two extremes in the religio-philosophical thinking, they have been accommodated as different standpoints at different levels. They are irreconcilable only when they are placed together at the same level. For example, one of the oft-quoted hymns of the *g-veda* provides a clue for reconciling the problem of one Godhead and many gods and goddesses. It says: "What is but one, wise people call by different names -- as *Agni, Yama, M_tari_van.*"[16] Reference to gods, such as, Agni and Yama may be replaced by the well known gods of the Hindu pantheon such as *_iva, Vi u, _akti*, and so on. _a_kara explains the distinction between the supreme Godhead and its various forms such as *_iva, Vi u*, and so on, as the distinction between the "unconditioned" reality, what we referred to as Brahman-in-itself, and its "conditioned" forms such as*_iva* and *Vi u*, all of which can be brought under Brahman-in-relation-to-the-world. *_iva*, *Vi u*, and other gods are conditioned beings endowed with a name and a form and other qualities, whereas the One is unconditioned, devoid of name and form, specifications and qualities and is, therefore, trans-empirical, trans-relational, and trans-linguistic.

This mode of drawing the distinction between the supreme Godhead and its many forms for the purpose of worship and other religious practices of the devotees, which is unheard of in other religious traditions of other cultures, is of great consequence in the religious practice of the people. Since it is the one reality that is worshipped in many forms such as *Agni*, *_iva*, and so on, one who worships *Agni* or *_iva*, should not quarrel with one who worships Yama or *Vi u*, because *Agni*, *Yama*, *_iva*, and *Vi u* are the conditioned aspects of the same reality. This significant idea of the *g-Vedic* hymn was accepted, fully elaborated, and further deepened by the *Upani ads*. It provides a theoretical framework for religious harmony, which is one of the characteristic features of primal culture and which has received special emphasis right from the beginning till this day.

What makes primal culture valid for all times and in all places is its *inclusiveness*. It includes everything by providing a place for it in the whole. Religious, social, economic, scientific, and political activities are necessary and meaningful; but they must be made subservient to, and must be viewed and judged in the context of the spiritual goal of life. A culture which is mainly concerned with the bare economic necessities of life, social institutions, and political organization will be neither enduring nor elevating; it may look energetic and enterprising, but it is not worth the name, if it is not geared up to the spiritual side of life. Once again, what Sri Aurobindo says is worth quoting here:

> A mere intellectual, ethical, and aesthetic culture does not go back to the inmost truth of the spirit; it is still an ignorance, an incomplete, outward, and superficial knowledge. To have made the discovery of our deepest being and hidden spiritual nature is the first necessity and to have erected the living of an inmost spiritual life into the aim of existence is the characteristic sign of a spiritual culture.[17]

The *Ved_nta* philosophy solves the problem of monism versus pluralism on the basis of the distinction between two levels or standpoints called *p_ram_rthika* and *vy_vah_rika*, or absolute and relative respectively. The *Upani ads* make use of this distinction in the explanation of the epistemological, metaphysical, axiological, and soteriological problems. What is true at one level may not be so at another level. A dream-lion which is accepted as real in dream experience loses its reality at the waking level. What is accepted as a value at one time may turn out to be a disvalue at another time. The pluralistic universe which is accepted as real may cease to exist in the state of liberation following the spiritual ascent. The *p_ram_rthika* or absolute standpoint is higher, whereas the *vy_vah_rika* or the relative standpoint is lower. It must be borne in mind that the higher standpoint which transcends the lower does not invalidate it. One who has moved from the relative to the absolute standpoint knows the truth of the former; but one who is tied to the relative standpoint cannot understand the truth of the absolute standpoint. Consider the case of two persons who attempt to climb up a mountain in order to reach the highest peak. While one of them reaches the top, the other, due to some disability, is not able to proceed beyond the foothill. The person who has reached the summit knows what kind of experience is available to one at the foothill; but one who is at the foothill does not understand the kind of experience one has at the top.

We have to apply this logic to the different kinds of experience without subverting the *p_ram_rthika-vy_vah_rika*hierarchy. The *Upani ads* describe the two levels as signifying higher wisdom and lower knowledge. Experience of plurality is quite common; it is quite natural; we have it in our daily life. No special effort or discipline is required for such an experience. But experience of oneness is uncommon. One does not get it without special effort or appropriate discipline. The transition is from the common to the uncommon. A text of the *Brhad_ra yaka Upani ad* describes the two levels of experience as follows:

> For, where there is duality as it were, there one sees the other, one smells the other, one knows the other. . . . But, where everything has become just one's own self, by what and whom should one smell, by what and whom should one know?[18]

Without disregarding the pragmatic value of day-to-day empirical knowledge, primal culture emphasizes the importance of higher wisdom. It will be of interest to quote Wittgenstein in this connection. He says:

> In religion every level of devoutness must have its appropriate form of expression which has no sense at a lower level. This doctrine, which means something at a higher level, is null and void for someone who is still at the lower level; he *can* only understand it *wrongly* and so these words are *not* valid for such a person.

For instance, at my level the Pauline doctrine of predestination is ugly, nonsense, irreligiousness. Hence it is not suitable for me, since the only use I could make of the picture I am offered would be a wrong one. If it is a good and godly picture, then it is so for someone at a quite different level, who must use it in his life in a way completely different from anything that would be possible for me.[19]

The teaching of the *Ved_nta* philosophy is positive. According to it, life in this world is meaningful and purposive -- meaningful for the reason that it serves as the training ground for one's spiritual uplifting through the proper use of the objects of the world by the mind-sense-body equipment of which one is in possession, and purposive as one has to achieve freedom or liberation by overcoming the existential predicament. Freedom or liberation which is projected as the goal must

be understood in the spiritual sense. It is true that human life is made difficult by economic constraints, political oppression, social hierarchy, and religious discrimination; and a situation of this kind points to, and calls for, freedom of different kinds so that a person can exist and function as a moral agent enjoying economic, political, social and religious freedom. However, the goal of life remains unfulfilled in spite of these different kinds of freedom. Though they are necessary, they are not sufficient. The highest freedom which is eternal and totally satisfying is spiritual freedom, which is called *mok a* in Indian culture. A socio-political system may ensure political freedom, social justice, economic satisfaction, and unrestricted religious practice; but still there is no guarantee of harmony of spirit, mind, and body which one can achieve only through the teaching of philosophy and religion. The socio-political machinery cannot be a substitute for religion and philosophy, though it can and should maintain a system of rights and obligations in which alone a human being can lead a moral life as formulated in religion and can pursue the goal of liberation as projected by philosophy. Sri Aurobindo says:

> The whole aim of a great culture is to lift man up to something which at first he is not, to lead him to knowledge though he starts from an unfathomable ignorance, to teach him to live by reason, though actually he lives much more by his unreason, by the law of good and unity, though he is now full of evil and discord, by a law of beauty and harmony, though his actual life is a repulsive muddle of ugliness and jarring barbarisms, by some law of his spirit, though at present he is egoistic, material, unspiritual, engrossed by the needs and desires of his physical being. If a civilization has not any of these aims, it can hardly at all be said to have a culture and certainly in no sense a great and noble culture. But the last of these aims, as conceived by ancient India, is the highest of all because it includes and surpasses all the others. To have made this attempt is to have ennobled the life of the race; to have failed in it is better than if it had never at all been attempted; to have achieved even a partial success is a great contribution to the future possibilities of the human being.[20]

Excepting the *C_rv_ka*, which advocates a thoroughgoing materialism, all other philosophical systems in India accept the ideal of *mok a*. The Indian mind, right from the beginning, has accepted a hierarchy of values, ranging from the bodily and economic values at the bottom to the spiritual values of which liberation is at the top. The human being leads his life at two levels -- organic and hyper-organic. Bodily and economic values which he pursues belong to the organic level. In so far as the pursuit of the organic values is concerned -- values which are necessary for life preservation -- his life and activities are in no way different from those of animals; at this level, hunger and sleep, shelter and sex are common to man and animals. Endowed as he is not only with the body, but also with the mind, he also lives at another level, pursuing higher values such as truth, beauty, goodness. The life-activity of man which is fully reflective of his cognition, desire, deliberation, and choice cannot stop short of the highest value called *mok a*. It is not necessary here to discuss the broad scheme of values accepted in the Indian tradition. Suffice it to say that, though *artha* and *k_ma*, which emphasize the importance of the material and hedonistic side of life, have been accommodated in the scheme of values, the moral and spiritual side of life has received special attention in Indian culture. That is why it has accepted two higher values, *dharma* and *mok a*, the former functioning as a moral guide, and also as a regulative principle of *artha* and *k_ma* pursued in our secular life, for the realization of the latter. All the philosophical systems, Vedic as well as non-Vedic, hold the view that *mok a* as the highest value is both ultimate and all-satisfying -- ultimate since there is nothing

else to which it can be the means, and all-satisfying since it comprehends all the higher values. _a_kara says that one gets the feeling of the fulfillment of all values when one attains *mok a*.[21]

There are three questions that we have to consider in connection with the ultimate value. The first one is whether it can be realized at all. There is the view that the ultimate value is only an ideal to inspire and regulate our conduct and that it can never be attained. We can regulate our life so as to come nearer to it from time to time, from stage to stage; but we can never reach it. Such a view is untenable. Also, it goes against the spirit of Indian culture. Realization of one's true nature is liberation. We have already pointed out that the human being is a complex entity consisting of Spirit and matter. Spirit by its very nature is ever free and never bound. But it appears to be bound because of the material adjunct with which it is associated in the empirical life. Overwhelmed by ignorance, the human being does not realize that he is essentially Spirit and therefore free. When he attains the right knowledge and knows his real nature, he is no more under the limitation or bondage of the psycho-physical material outfit, because ignorance which conceals his real nature is removed by knowledge. It means that the ideal of *mok a* has a basis in the very constitution of the human being; also, the human being, not being satisfied with the material achievements, what the *Upani ad* calls *preyas,* longs for spiritual freedom, which is called *_reyas*. The *Upani ad* says:

> Both the good and the pleasant approach a man. The wise man, pondering over them, discriminates. The wise chooses the good in preference to the pleasant. The simple-minded, for the sake of worldly well-being, prefers the pleasant.[22]

One cannot have both *_reyas* and *preyas*. The pursuit of the former requires the renunciation of the latter. Spiritual illumination follows purgation. Speaking about the importance of the ideal and its close relation to human nature, Hiriyanna observes:

> Ideals are rooted in needs inherent in human nature. It is their reality that constitutes their true charm. Take this charm from them, and they reduce themselves but to pleasant fantasy. The reality of such a value may not be vouched for by common reasoning. But we should remember that neither is there any adequate proof for denying it. Not to admit the ideal would therefore be to be dogmatic in the sense that we deny it without adequate proof for the denial.[23]

The second question is whether the ideal of *mok a* can be realized by all. Here also the great philosophical traditions, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Jainism, are unanimous in their affirmative answer. There is nothing in human nature which either disqualifies or incapacitates him from attaining this ideal. Whatever may be the differences among human beings at the bodily, vital, and mental levels, everyone has the right and duty to aspire for the highest value by virtue of what he/she is. As every human being is endowed with the mind, the most precious and unequalled instrument through which one can look before and after, know the things given to him, and choose from them after discrimination and deliberation, he is not in any way incapacitated from pursuing the ultimate value. Indian culture looks down on the doctrine of the chosen few. Since ignorance is the obstacle that stands in the way of realizing one's divine nature, realizing one's Spirit, which is liberation, it can be removed by knowledge which anyone can acquire through moral and spiritual discipline. The philosophy of *Ved_nta*, according to which every human being is divine, is opposed to the theory of privilege -- of birth, intellect, spirituality, etc. It is anti-hierarchical. In everyone there is a sleeping

Buddha, a hidden Brahman, to which everyone can have access. That the doors to the spiritual realm do not remain closed to anyone is conveyed in a forthright manner by Sri Aurobindo:

> A wider spiritual culture must recognize that the Spirit is not only the highest and inmost thing, but all is manifestation and creation of the Spirit. It must have a wider outlook, a more embracing range of applicability and, even, a more aspiring and ambitious aim of its endeavor. Its aim must be not only to raise to inaccessible heights the few elect, but to draw all men and all life and the whole human being upward, to spiritualize life and in the end to divinize human nature. Not only must it be able to lay hold on his deepest individual being, but to inspire, too, his communal existence. It must turn, by a spiritual change, all the members of his ignorance into members of the knowledge; it must transmute all the instruments of the human into instruments of a divine living. The total movement of Indian spirituality is towards this aim.[24]

The third question, whether the ultimate value can be realized here in this life or only hereafter, is answered in two different ways. Some philosophical systems maintain that the proper preparation that a person undertakes for achieving this end will help him to realize it only after death, whereas some other systems hold the view that it can be realized in this life itself, if one follows the prescribed moral and spiritual discipline. The former view is called the eschatological conception of*mok a* while the latter is known as *j_van-mukti*. "*J_van-mukti*" means liberation-in-life. The person who has attained enlightenment or wisdom is free even while he is in the embodied condition. It is not necessary to discuss these two views of*mok a* in detail. It may be pointed out here that the view that it is possible to overcome bondage and attain liberation here and now deepens the significance of the present life. A *j_van-mukta* does not run away from society. He lives in society for the benefit of others; when he is engaged in activities, he has no sense of "I" and "mine"; his activities, that is to say, are impersonal. Also, he imparts spiritual instruction to others, for, having realized the truth, he alone is competent to do this. The life of a *j_van-mukta*, as portrayed in the Hindu tradition, is comparable to that of a *Bodhi-sattva* as explained in the *Mah_y_na*tradition. The ideal of life goes beyond self-perfection; it also includes work for the universal good.

According to the Indian tradition, knowledge is different from information, and wisdom is different from knowledge. We may say that information, knowledge, and wisdom constitute a hierarchy. To know a thing is to know it in a determinate way, as such-and-such -- as a substance possessing qualities, as a whole consisting of parts, as the cause or effect of something, and so on. Every object has two kinds of relations, internal and external. A lump of clay, for example, is internally related to its color, its parts of which it is made. It is also externally related to the ground on which it is placed, its immediate surroundings, and so on. No object remains isolated from other things; on the contrary, it has a network of relations with other things in such a way that it is what it is because of other things. When the poet says that, to know a flower seen in a crannied wall, one must know the plant, root and all, and also the wall, its location, and so on, he draws our attention to the fact that every object is an integral part of the cosmic system and that, to get an insight into the nature of a thing, one must know the whole of which it is an integral part. Bits of information do not constitute knowledge. Piecemeal information about the roots, the trunk, and the branches of a tree cannot be viewed as the knowledge of a tree.

Just as knowledge is different from information, even so wisdom is different from knowledge. Though knowledge is superior to information, it cannot be a substitute for wisdom. The Vedic tradition draws a distinction between two kinds of knowledge, higher (*par_*) and lower (*apar_*).

_aunaka, the great householder, requested A_giras to teach him the supreme reality by knowing which everything is known. To him A_giras said: "Two kinds of knowledge are to be known, as indeed the knowers of Brahman declare -- the higher as well as the lower."[25] The higher knowledge, otherwise known as wisdom, is the knowledge of the eternal Brahman or Spirit, the source or ground of everything. The lower knowledge deals with things perishable, with everything other than Brahman, with the disciplines relating to instrumental values. It should not be thought that the lower knowledge is of no value. It may be noted that scripture insists on the acquisition of the lower knowledge; but one should not stop with it. One should acquire the lower knowledge, which is undoubtedly helpful to the attainment of spiritual wisdom. However useful and important the lower knowledge may be, it cannot liberate a person from the bondage of empirical life. The *Upani ad* narrates an episode in the life of N_rada, who approached Sanatkum_ra and requested him to teach the higher knowledge. N_rada was learned. He was proficient in the scriptural lore; he knew the *Vedas* and the epics, logic, ethics, and politics, etc. After giving a long list of the subjects he knew, he confessed to Sanakum_ra:

> Sir, I am only the knower of the text (*mantra-vit*), but not the knower of the Self (*_tma-vit*). I have heard from those like you that a person who knows the Self crosses over sorrow. Such a sorrowing person I am. Venerable Sir, please help me to cross over to the other side of sorrow.[26]

What the *Upani ad* conveys through this story of N_rada is that wisdom alone can save a person from the existential predicament and not mere knowledge, however profound and extensive it may be.

The hierarchy among information, knowledge, and wisdom suggests that we have to make a distinction between life and living. The life that a human being leads should reflect the level he has reached in the evolutionary scheme. As stated earlier, because what is distinctive of the human being is the mind one possesses one's life-activity should take place at the mental level and not merely at the bodily and sensuous level. According to the Greeks, "What a thing is when its growth is completed, that is what we call its nature."[27] Only when what is potential in a thing becomes actual can we say that its nature (*svabh_va*) is fully manifest. It is well known that the nature of a seed, e.g. that of the banyan tree, can be known only when the seed is allowed to grow into a mighty tree with its hanging roots from the branches scattered far and wide. What is potential in a seed becomes actual, revealing its nature. The same principle holds good in the case of the human being. What is potential in the human being must be allowed to become actual through the full and proper exercise of the mind. The purpose of the moral and spiritual discipline which fully utilizes the mind is to help man realize the hidden divinity in him. Life is judged by its quality, whereas living is commonly understood in terms of the basic organic needs, such as food, water, clothes, shelter, and sex. The fulfillment of the basic needs takes place at the bodily and sensuous level. But the harmony of spirit, mind, and body can be achieved only at the mental level, through reason and will, through knowledge and purposive action. Sri Aurobindo in his own characteristic way, brings out the distinction between life and living. To the question, "What is meant after all by life, and when is it that we most fully and greatly live?" his answer is:

> Life is surely nothing but the creation and active self-expression of man's spirit, powers, capacities, his will to be and think and create and love and do and achieve. When that is wanting or, since it cannot be absolutely wanting, depressed, held under,

> discouraged or inert, whether by internal or external causes, then we may say that there is a lack of life.[28]

He points out that religion, philosophy, and science, art, drama, and song, war and peace, the thoughts, emotions, words, deeds, joys, and sorrows which make up the existence of man -- all these constitute life in its largest sense. What, then, is mere living? It is restricted to the day-to-day things required for survival. One who does not rise above the "ordinary materials and circumstances of mere living" does not live at all as a human being. Sri Aurobindo observes:

> If life is not uplifted by great hopes, aspirations, and ideals, then we may well say that the community does not really live; it is defective in the characteristic greatness of the human spirit.[29]

When T.S. Eliot asks,

Where is the life we have lost in living
Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge
Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?

he is concerned about the importance of life, whose quality and worth must be judged in terms of knowledge and wisdom.

It is impossible to realize the ideal of liberation without a rigorous pursuit of discipline, moral as well as spiritual. A few remarks about the background of this discipline will be helpful to understand it in the correct perspective. First, this discipline will not be meaningful to one who is satisfied with the fulfillment of the bodily needs without any thought of the higher side of life. One who is interested in living and not in life will not come anywhere near this discipline. Second, it takes into consideration the differences among the spiritual aspirants in their abilities and aptitudes. Third, there is a built-in order, as well as freedom, in the scheme of discipline. It is the same, age-old discipline that every spiritual aspirant desirous of liberation should follow. If we examine the content of the discipline as formulated in the different religio-philosophical traditions, we find that it is substantively the same. At the same time, taking into consideration the attainments and attitudes of the individuals, the discipline has provided variations in the practices to suit the individual needs; it recognizes what the tradition calls *adhik_ri-bheda*. The "firm spiritual order as well as the untrammeled spiritual freedom" has contributed, on the one hand, to the continuity of the cultural tradition and, on the other hand, to additions and modifications in the practices without any detriment to the essentials of the discipline. Fourth, there is a sequence, chronological as well as logical, in the discipline. Moral discipline is the *sine qua non* for spiritual discipline; one should, that is to say, start with the moral discipline and then proceed to the spiritual discipline in order to reap the benefit of the discipline. It is said that no one who has not studied geometry could get into Plato's Academy; the curriculum and academic set up were such that knowledge of geometry was considered to be a prerequisite for entry into the Academy. Spiritual discipline will not be fruitful for one who has not successfully completed the moral discipline. Indian culture has always emphasized the need for a gradual ascent from the lower to the higher stages accommodating diversity of paths and practices all leading to the same goal. To quote Sri Aurobindo:

> At first he [the spiritual aspirant] needs lower supports and stages of ascent; he asks for some scaffolding of dogma, worship, image, sign, form, symbol, some indulgence and permission of mixed half-natural motive on which he can stand while he builds up in him the temple of the spirit. Only when the temple is completed can the supports be removed, the scaffolding disappear. The religious culture which now goes by the name of Hinduism not only fulfilled this purpose, but, unlike certain other credal religions, it knew its purpose. It gave itself no name, because it set itself no sectarian limits; it claimed no universal adhesion, asserted no sole infallible dogma, set up no single narrow path or gate of salvation; it was less a creed or cult than a continuously enlarging tradition of the Godward endeavor of the human spirit. An immense many-sided and many-staged provision for a spiritual self-building and self-finding, it had some right to speak of itself by the only name it knew, the eternal religion, *san_tana dharma*. It is only if we have a just and right appreciation of this sense and spirit of Indian religion that we can come to an understanding of the true sense and spirit of Indian culture.[30]

The moral discipline, which is preliminary, consists of four stages or steps known as *s_dhana-catu aya*. They are: discrimination between the eternal and the ephemeral, non-attachment to the enjoyment of fruits, here in this life and hereafter, possession of virtues like control of the senses, control of the mind, etc., and an intense longing for liberation. The entire discipline is progressive in character. A person who is capable of discriminating the eternal from the ephemeral develops dispassion or non-attachment towards the things of the world. This again will help him to acquire control of the mind and the senses and to cultivate certain virtues such as endurance. Having acquired these qualifications, he develops an intense longing for liberation. Thus we can see how the preceding step in the discipline is the cause of the succeeding one. The successful completion of the moral discipline makes a person eligible for the spiritual discipline consisting of the study of the scriptural text (*rava a*) under the guidance of a competent teacher, rational reflection on the teaching (*manana*), and contemplation (*nididhy_sana*) on it.

Hinduism adopts a comprehensive view of man's life in such a way that the individual, social, and spiritual aspects of his life are taken care of, and his entire life is a preparation for the attainment of the final goal of liberation. Consider, for example, the detailed instruction regarding the duties to be performed when a student completes his formal education. Besides learning and teaching, one should practice righteousness, austerity, control of the senses, one's own duty, entertaining guests, socially good conduct, and begetting children after marriage. These duties are comprehensive. They are, according to _a_kara, contributory to the attainment of human goals.[31]

The four stages of a man's life as envisaged by Hinduism must also be taken into account in understanding the life-activity of man. Hinduism divides the ideal life of a man into four successive stages (__*ramas*) -- the stage of a student, that of a householder, that of a recluse, and finally that of a monk. It is not necessary to go into the details regarding the duties as well as the values assigned to man at each of these four stages of life. However, a few observations about the nature and purpose of this scheme are relevant in this context. First of all, this scheme of the four stages of life shows that "the way to a higher life is normally through the world." The stage of a householder which follows that of a student is considered to be the mainstay of social life. Man's life at one stage is necessarily this-worldly. Family, which is not only the earliest but also the most important of all the social institutions, provides opportunities for the pursuit of pleasure and wealth, for the development of social and communal life, and above all for the development of the spiritual side of man through

a gradual and progressive conquest of spirit over flesh. Secondly, it affirms the Hindu belief in the principle of spiritual progression. Thirdly, it should not be thought that one has to go to the last stage of life by passing through the stages of a householder and a recluse. Hinduism provides the option to become a monk even from the state of a student. The *Upani ad* says: "After completing the life of a recluse, let one renounce; otherwise, let one renounce even from the state of a student."[32] It all depends upon one's mental frame and spiritual maturity. Also, one can even remain a life-long student. Fourthly, this scheme of the four stages of life is only an ideal for the guidance of man. It does not mean that everyone goes through all the four stages of life.

The Hindu ethics lays emphasis on the system of duties rather than on the system of rights of man. The reason for this is not far to seek. Ethics is ultimately concerned with social harmony. The needs and claims of one person have to be adjusted and reconciled with those of others in society. Certain types of conduct which would contribute to the harmony and solidarity of society have to be enforced, and those which would endanger them have to be forbidden. It is for this reason that in every society there are moral codes and principles, the system of duties, which must be carried out with moral earnestness. Duty is that which, when properly discharged, upholds society, sustains it, and nourishes it. That is why it is called *dharma* in Hinduism.

The classification of the duties of man, which are ethico-social, has a bearing on the value system, as well as on the *vara-__rama* system. These duties are intended to help man achieve three kinds of integration -- self-integration, social integration, and integration with God. The classification of duties comprises common duties (*s_dh_ra a-dharmas*), which everyone has to perform, irrespective of the class (*var a*) he belongs to and the stage of life (*__rama*) he is in, and special duties (*vi_e a-dharmas*), which are relative to the social class and the stage of life. The list of common duties prescribed by Manu includes the following: (i) steadfastness, (ii) forgiveness, (iii) application, (iv) non-appropriation (v) cleanliness, (vi) control over the appetites, (vii) wisdom, (viii) learning, (ix) veracity, and (x) restraint of anger. The common and special duties, which are both self-regarding and other-regarding, are intended to help man achieve self-integration and social integration. Practices which are designed to achieve self-control are conducive to self-integration; and conduct which calls forth the cultivation of virtues such as compassion, practice of charity, and social service, contributes to social integration. What is called integration or communion with God must follow self-integration and social integration. It means that one cannot attain God-realization without achieving self-integration and helping social-integration. Love of God is possible only for a person who has achieved harmony in his life-in-society. In the language of the *Bhagavad-g_t_*, a person who has achieved this harmony is one "by whom the world is not afflicted and who is not afflicted by the world."[33]

III CHINESE CULTURE

Chinese philosophy is concerned with human beings on the one hand and the universe which they encounter on the other. It is impossible to think of humans outside the universe; the universe in its turn is enriched by the humans. The humans and the universe cannot be separated because they are parts of a spiritual whole. A passage which is attributed to Wang Shou-Jen is worth quoting here:

> In Heaven and Earth there is one spirituality or consciousness. But because of his bodily form, man has separated himself from the whole. My spirituality or consciousness is the ruler of Heaven and Earth, spirits and things. . . . If Heaven, Earth, spirits, and things are separated from my spirituality or consciousness, they

> cease to be. And if my spirituality or consciousness is separated from them, it ceases to be also. Thus, they are all actually one body, so how can they be separated?[34]

So, the Chinese way of thinking is both anthropocentric and cosmocentric.

Unlike scientific/naturalistic humanism, Chinese humanism is ethico-spiritualistic. Its moralistic orientation is supported by its spiritualistic basis. Whatever be the role that a human being plays in society -- that of an artisan or an agriculturist, that of a scholar or a politician -- he/she must function as a human being. In every specialized role that a human being plays, he/she aims at the best -- the best as an artisan, as an agriculturist, as a statesman, and so on. In the same way he/she must aim at the best as a human being. Confucius' doctrine of the "rectification of names" is relevant in this context. According to this doctrine, every name stands for the essence of the class of things to which it refers. For example, the name "ruler" suggests an *ideal* "ruler," what the ruler ideally ought to be. The situation connected with a ruler, i.e. what a "ruler" does, should accord with what is implied by the name "ruler." We must extend this logic to other cases such as father, son, and so on. That is why Confucius said, "Let the ruler be ruler, the minister, minister, the father, father, and the son, son."[35] If there is accord between the name and the situation connected with it, then we can say that a ruler, for example, is a ruler in fact as well as in name. Applying the same reasoning, we have to say that a human being, true to the name, must be a human being in name as well as in fact. If so, what is it that is expected of a human being? The answer is *jen*, which means human-heartedness. Confucius has provided a simple guidance for the practice of *jen*:

> The man of *jen* is one who, desiring to sustain himself, sustains others, and desiring to develop himself develops others. To be able from one's own self to draw a parallel for the treatment of others, that may be called the way to practice *jen.*[36]

According to Confucianism, one should regulate one's conduct by using oneself as a standard, as "a measuring square." This regulatory principle of applying a measuring square can be stated in two ways. Positively it says: "Do to others what you wish yourself." When negatively stated, it will be: "Do not do to others what you do not wish yourself." The principle of *chung*and *shu*, the positive and negative formulation of the principle of applying a measuring square, is the way to practice *jen*.

The basis of moral life for the Chinese, as in the case of the Indians, is spirituality. The *Tao*, which is eternal and unnameable, is not only the way, but also the source of life. That is why it is spoken of as the beginning of Heaven and earth.

According to Maritain, scientific or naturalistic humanism has paved the way for the triple tragedy that has overtaken the West. They are the tragedy of man, the tragedy of culture, and the tragedy of God. In the present context it is enough to consider the first two tragedies. Maritain is of the view that the tragedy of man is the result of three forces that have dominated the West in the wake of the Enlightenment. Science which makes use of knowledge and power for the purpose of controlling and conquering nature views reason as an instrument. The scientific conception of humans treats them as mere agents, making use of reason as the instrument for acquiring power and attaining progress. The scientific conception of the human being is backed by two other forces -- Freudian psychology and the emergence of the collective man. Freudian psychology, with its emphasis on the *libido* and the unconscious, has reduced humans to the level of animals. Rapid industrialization, which has created a technological society, is responsible for the emergence of the "collective man." Humans have become rootless, homeless, and alienated from the world because of technology. In the words of Martin Heidegger:

> The essence of technology only comes slowly to light. This day is the world-night turned into a merely technological day. This day is the shortest day. . . . Now not only is man denied a shelter, but the safety of all beings remains in darkness. The wholeness [*das Heile*] is withdrawn. The world has become unwhole [*heil-los*]. Thereby not only does the holy remain hidden as the sign of divinity, but even the sign of the holy, namely wholeness, seems to be obliterated.[37]

The tragedy of culture, according to Maritain, has been brought about by three factors -- the reversal of the value system, the ruthless subjugation of nature, and the subordination of humans to material forces. Chinese humanism has escaped these two tragedies because of its emphasis on the role of human beings as human beings in society and the preservation of a value system which accords a higher status to moral and super-moral values.

Ethics of human-heartedness is not wanting in the Hindu tradition. One of the *Upani ads* gives an account of Praj_pati's instruction to his threefold offspring -- gods, men, and demons.[38] It highlights the importance of loving others by regulating one's conduct. At the conclusion of his teaching to them, Praj_pati uttered the syllable "*da*," which was understood in three different ways by them, reflecting their own nature. The gods who are naturally unruly understood it as "*dama*" which means self-control. Since humans are by nature avaricious, they thought that "*da*" means "*d_na*" and that they were advised to be charitable. The demons who are normally cruel understood it in the sense of "*day_*" (compassion) and thought that they were instructed to be compassionate to others. _a_kara, in the course of his commentary on the text, remarks that Praj_pati's instruction is relevant to us even today; and we must practice what Praj_pati taught his threefold offspring. _a_kara remarks that the whole episode may be understood in another way.[39] There are no gods or demons other than humans. There are gods as well as demons among humans. Those among humans who are wanting in self-control, but who are otherwise endowed with many good qualities, are the gods; those who are particularly greedy are men; and those who are cruel and harm others are the demons. Hence, humans should follow all the three instructions, for they are unruly, greedy, and cruel.

It is not possible to discuss elaborately the various characteristics of Chinese humanism in this paper; and I am, therefore, selective in the choice of my concepts/theories. Three concepts/theories associated with three great masters deserve special attention -- Confucius's concept of "doing for nothing," the principle of extension of graded love enunciated by Mencius, and the theory of transcendence formulated by Lao Tzu. I will also bring in parallels to them from the Hindu tradition.

Confucius makes a distinction between duty-prompted action and profit-motivated action. The former is called *yi* and the latter, *li*. All of us are members of the family system and also of society. Five kinds of relationship are identified by Confucius -- relationship between the ruler and the ruled, between father and son, between brothers, between husband and wife, and between friends. Of these, three are family relationships. Whatever be the relationship, a person, when placed in a moral situation, must act with a sense of duty or righteousness (*yi*). One must do one's duty because it is a duty and not because of any other consideration. If he/she has some other consideration in performing an action, then it is done for (the sake of) something and not for nothing; it is not, then, following a categorical imperative. According to Confucius, it is the sense of duty or righteousness that should regulate a person's relations with others. It must be borne in mind that *yi* and *jen* are closely connected with each other. Their relation is like that between form and matter. As stated earlier, *jen* is human-heartedness, loving others. The principle that one must do one's duty is formal like the categorical imperative. However, it becomes concrete in the context of relationship.

According to Confucius, one who is guided by *yi* rather than by *li* is a superior man. Confucius says, "The superior man comprehends *yi*; the small man comprehends *li*."[40]

The concept of doing for nothing is comparable to the justly famous concept of *ni k_ma-karma* (disinterested action) of the *Bhagavad-g_t_*. It will be helpful to quote the relevant text:

> To work alone you have a right and not at all to its fruits. Let not the fruits of work be your motive. Nor should you be tempted to withdraw from work.[41]

It is significant that the text enjoins not only disinterested action, but also forbids inaction (*akarma*) as the alternative to it, which one will be tempted to think of in the context of doing duty without aiming at the results of one's action.

The success or failure of an action which one performs with the consciousness of duty depends upon the Will of Heaven which is called *Ming*. According to Confucius, *Ming* is the purposeful force that controls the whole situation in which a person functions. It is beyond our control; and we have to submit to it. To acknowledge *Ming* as the supreme force which makes the situation what it is, is to know *Ming*. In the words of Confucius, "If my principles are to prevail in the world, it is*Ming*. If they are to fall to the ground, it is also *Ming*."[42] Confucius holds that one who knows *Ming* is a superior man.

The Hindu tradition identifies five factors involved in the production of an act. Of these five factors, four are human and the fifth one non-human. The *Bhagavad-g_t_* mentions the five factors as follows:

> The seat of action and likewise the agent, the various organs, the many kinds of efforts and the divinity (providence) also being the fifth.
>
> Whatever action a person does by the body, speech, and mind, whether it is right or wrong, these five are its causes.[43]

The body is the seat of the manifestation of desire, hatred, happiness, and so on. The embodied self is the agent possessing the sense of "I." The visual sense, the auditory sense, etc. are the various organs required for performing an action. Again, there is the involvement of various functions performed by the vital breath. Finally, there is the non-human factor, viz. divinity or providence (*daivam*). The first four factors may be explained in terms of the concept of sheath (*ko_a*). The sheath of food (*annamaya*) is the seat (*adhi h_na*); the sheath of vitality (*pr_ amaya*) is the source of the vital functions; the sheath of mind (*manomaya*) is the complex of organs; and the sheath of intellect (*vij__maya*) is the agent. All these four factors are part of the*j_va*. The fifth one, which is the non-human factor, is called *daivam* which means divinity or providence. It is this which is comparable to *Ming*. Commenting on the nature and role of *daivam*, Radhakrishnan observes:

> [It] represents the non-human factor that interferes and disposes of human effort. It is the wise, all-seeing will that is at work in the world. In all human actions, there is an unaccountable element which is called luck, destiny, fate, or the force accumulated by the acts of one's past lives. It is called here *daiva*. . . . *Daiva* or the superpersonal fate is the general cosmic necessity, the resultant of all that has happened in the past, which rules unnoticed. It works in the individual for its own incalculable purposes.[44]

There is an important question one may raise with regard to the theory of human-heartedness (*jen*) advocated by Confucius. Why should a human being, one may ask, practice *jen*? Confucius did not consider this question at all. It was Mencius who answered this question. According to Mencius, who represents the idealistic side of Confucianism, it is the very nature of a human being to be human-hearted. A brief explanation of Mencius's view of human nature will be helpful. As against the view that human nature is neither good nor bad, a view associated with Lao Tzu, Mencius holds that human nature is *essentially* good and that whatever is bad or undesirable in human beings belongs to the "animal" side in them. He identifies four components in human nature -- feeling of commiseration, feeling of shame and dislike, sense of modesty and yielding, and sense of right and wrong.[45] All these four are distinctly *human*; they differentiate humans from animals. These four aspects, which may be called human-heartedness, righteousness, propriety, and wisdom, are inherent in human nature; and they have to be developed. A person who does not develop these aspects is no better than an animal.

If human nature is such that it is capable of loving others, then is it possible to love everyone in the same way? There is a difference of opinion on this issue. While the Mohists hold the theory of equality in loving others, Mencius, following Confucius, argues for degrees in love or graded love. The distance from oneself to others decides the gradation in love. The love for one's family members is stronger than the love for one's neighbors; the love for one's neighbors is stronger than the love for one's villagers, and so on; and the love for living beings is stronger than the love for non-living beings. In the words of Mencius:

> The superior man, in his relation to things, loves them, but has no feeling of human-heartedness. In his relation to people, he has human-heartedness, but no deep feeling of family affection. One should have feelings of family affection for the members of one's family, but human-heartedness for people; human-heartedness for people, but love for things.[46]

What Mencius says is based on our day-to-day experience. The principle of graded love has been formulated by him in a realistic way, with a remarkable insight into human nature. But he does not stop with this. Since the ideal is to love everyone, he suggests extension of the principle of graded love to include others. Taking his stand on what human nature is capable of, he supplements his realism by idealism. To quote Mencius:

> Treat the aged in your family as they should be treated, and extend this treatment to the aged of other people's families. Treat the young in your family as they should be treated, and extend this treatment to the young of other people's families.[47]

His idealistic principle of extension of graded love, which is rooted in human nature, is a valuable contribution to the philosophy of humanism.

The spiritualistic philosophy of the *Upani ads* justifies the principle that one should extend oneself so as to include others on the basis of the oneness of all beings which originated from the same sources, viz. primal Being or Spirit. The *Upaniads* maintain that, though there is a plurality of beings, all of them are *essentially* the same. The primal Spirit includes everything; it in-dwells in everything; and all beings, though apparently different from it, are indeed identical with it. The three ideas of inclusion, indwelling, and identity which are inbuilt in the philosophy of oneness are set forth in the following texts of the *Upani ad*:

> He who sees all beings in the very Self and the Self in all beings feels no hatred by virtue of that realization.
>
> When to one who knows, all beings have, verily, become one with his own Self, then what delusion and what sorrow can be to him who has seen the oneness?[48]

The Self in me which I love is the same in every other person I encounter; and if I realize this, I cannot but love the other person. _a_kara remarks in his commentary on the text:

> One [who realizes the unconditioned Self in all beings] does not hate. This is only a restatement of a known fact. It is a matter of common experience that hatred comes to one who sees something as bad and different from oneself, but for one who sees only the absolutely pure Self as a continuous entity, there is no object to be hated.[49]

Chinese humanism, which is based on primal spirituality, has a metaphysical dimension. Primal spirituality holds, as stated earlier, that primal Being or Spirit is the source and support of all beings. The central metaphysical problem of the relation between the primal Spirit and the things of the world has been discussed by Taoism. The Taoists have been described as "recluses," as persons "who despised the world," as individualists "who desired to maintain their personal purity," and so on. They systematized a rigorous philosophy in justification of their way of life. To them, the *Tao* is the source of everything; it is also the way of life. Chuang Tzu, who represents the third phase of Taoism, speaks of "Fundamentals for the Cultivation of Life." He says:

> When you do something good, beware of reputation; when you do something evil, beware of punishment. Follow the middle way and take this to be your constant principle. Then you can guard your person, nourish your parents, and complete your natural term of years.[50]

The way of life one leads must reflect one's understanding of the *Tao*, that is to say, the way one understands the relation between the *Tao* and the things of the world.

Lao Tzu, who represents the second phase of Taoism, has discussed at length the nature of the *Tao vis-à-vis* the nature of the things of the world. According to Lao Tzu, first of all, the things of the world have shapes and features and so they can be named. Normally there is no difficulty in understanding an object which has a shape and possesses qualities. The real difficulty arises only when we try to find out the reality of things characterized by forms and features. Secondly, the things of the world are subject to change; and so they are not eternal. The eternal is what lies behind the ephemeral. If the empirical things can be named and if they are also not eternal, then that which is their source must be both unnameable and eternal; and that "entity" is called the *Tao*. Using the imagery of a block of wood from which objects such as table, chair, etc. are carved, Lao Tzu characterizes the *Tao* as the Uncarved Block. Once a block of wood is carved there are objects which are named table, chair, and so on. In the same way, from the Uncarved Block the things of the world are carved; and each one of them having a shape and qualities, has a name. Thus, the things of the world are nameables, whereas their primal source, which is called the*Tao*, is the Unnameable. It may appear that, when the primal source is called the *Tao*, we are using a name "*Tao*." Strictly speaking, it is not a name at all. When we call table "table," the object we are talking about has a shape and possesses qualities; and so it is identified as such-and-such by means of a conventional name, viz.

"table." When we call the primal source "Tao," we are not using a name at all because the primal source, the Uncarved Block, has no form and features; consequently, it cannot be identified by a name. Everything has a name; but the *Tao* is not a thing. So it is nameless. It is, for this reason, said to be the Unnameable. What is sought to be conveyed by Taoism is the contrast between the empirical and the trans-empirical, the relational and the trans-relational, the linguistic and the trans-linguistic; the *Tao* is just the opposite in all these three respects.

Lao Tzu analyses the problem of the origination of the things of the world from the *Tao* in another way. Every object of our experience, which is nameable, is a being. If every object which exists is a being, then the existence of beings implies that there must, first of all, be Being. We have already said that the *Tao* is not a thing, i.e. it is not nameable. It is, therefore, Non-being. If the *Tao* is the source of all beings, then the *Tao* as Non-being is the source of Being from which all beings have come into existence. In the words of Lao Tzu: "All things in the world come into being from Being; and Being comes into being from Non-being."[51] How beings which we experience in our day-to-day life came into existence from Non-being (the *Tao*) is a mystery; and no metaphysics in its explanation of the origin of becoming, which characterizes all objects, from Being can escape this unavoidable entry of mystery.

It may be stated here that Taoism does not deny the existence of the world of becoming. On the contrary, it insists on the need to transcend it by one who is desirous of attaining absolute happiness. "The happy excursion"[52] into the infinite, as Chuang Tzu would put it, calls for overcoming the distinction between myself and others, the distinction among things.

Just as the *Upani ads* make the distinction between lower knowledge (*apar_ vidy_*) and higher knowledge (*par_ vidy_*), even so Chuang Tzu draws a distinction between two levels of knowledge, lower and higher -- the former accommodating all kinds of distinctions and the latter transcending the distinctions. The things of the world, which are finite, have a dependent existence. A depends on B, B depends on C, C on D, and so on. One can derive only relative happiness by depending on things which are finite and which have dependent existence. Narrating the story of how a person was able to ride on the wind without resorting to walking as others do, Chuang Tzu remarks that, though the achievement of this man was great, still he had to depend upon something and that his happiness was, therefore, relative. Then, he poses the question:

> But suppose there is one who chariots on the normality of the universe, rides on the transformation of the six elements, and thus makes excursion into the infinite, what has he to depend upon? Therefore it is said that the perfect man has no self; the spiritual man has no achievement; and the true sage has no name.[53]

To see things in the light of Heaven, i.e. to see things in the light of the *Tao*, is to transcend the finite, the lower point of view. It is to be with the *Tao*, the nameless. A perfect man who has become one with the *Tao* is also nameless: he has nothing to achieve, having overcome the distinction between the me and the non-me. In the language of *Ved_nta*, he is a *j_vanmukta*. It will be appropriate in this connection to refer to Sanatkum_ra's instruction to N_rada which occurs in the seventh chapter of the *Ch_ndogya Upani ad*. He tells N_rada that finite objects have a dependent existence and that they do not give us happiness. If finite objects have dependent existence, then what about the infinite? To this question asked by N_rada, Sanatkum_ra replies: "On its own greatness" (*sve mahimni*).[54] He also explains in this context the difference between finite experience and the experience of the infinite. He says:

> Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else, that is the infinite. But where one sees something else, hears something else, understands something else, that is the finite.[55]

His final teaching is: "The infinite is happiness. There is no happiness in anything finite."[56] Chuang Tzu is in the company of Sanatkum_ra.

MODERNIZATION

The term "modernization" does not admit of a simple and straight definition. Everyone seems to understand what it means, though no one would agree with any definition of it. People generally welcome modernization as an antidote to traditionalism, conservatism, backwardness, and so on. Whenever we say that someone is modern, we seem to suggest that he is not traditional, or conservative, or backward; and for many people what is modern has a value preference, as against what is traditional. Modernization seems to provide a new hope against old ways of thinking and doing; and it is a continuing process; there can be, strictly speaking, no end to it; and from time to time it will always be needed. The process of modernization will be meaningful, purposive, and fruitful only when it functions in the context of tradition. As stated earlier, a traditional culture has two sides, perennial and temporal. While the former cannot be changed, the latter admits of change in accordance with the changes in the socio-political reality. It must be borne in mind that the changes in the temporal structure of culture do not in any way damage the perennial elements. The traditional culture of India, which has spanned nearly four millennia, is still relevant today because of the perennial elements in it. What is true of the Indian culture is equally true of the Chinese culture. What preserves a culture is the combination of the perennial and the temporal. A culture which is rigid and unchanging cannot survive; also, a culture which does not have an in-built perennial structure will become a thing of the past. In other words, there must be scope for conservation as well as change in a culture. Emphasizing the need for both conservation and change, A.N. Whitehead said:

> Mere change without conservation is a passage from nothing to nothing. Its final integration yields mere transient non-entity. Mere conservation without change cannot conserve. For, after all, there is a flux of circumstances and the freshness of being evaporates under mere repetition.[57]

Modernization as understood in the West has most unfortunately a narrow connotation, and is, therefore, a distorted concept. Both philosophy and science paved the way for the emergence of the phenomenon of modernization in the seventeenth century. The part played by two philosophers, Francis Bacon and Rene Descartes, to usher in this phenomenon was significant. To them, knowledge is not an end in itself, but a means to power. Bacon thought that "the propagator of man's empire over the universe" would be the benefactor of the human race. Descartes suggested that men should become "the masters and possessors of nature." The scientific-empirical method advocated by Bacon and the analytical-rational method of inquiry formulated by Descartes were useful not only in philosophy, but also in science.

The scientific method, which tests hypothesis through observation, and experiment, which reduces a complex object to its simple components, which insists on the repeatability of an experiment, and which swears by objectivity, separated science from religion by formulating its new

cosmology and provided man with powerful tools of engineering and technology for asserting his supremacy over nature. It shaped the development of science in a particular direction for more than two centuries till the quantum physics gave a new direction to science. Scientists today speak of "quantum integration" which has put an end to the four-hundred-year split between science and spirituality.[58] Though the achievements of science during the last four hundred years are numerous and remarkable, its concepts and theories have undermined everything connected with the spiritual order.

The story of the development of science, which has ended up in the present crisis, is frightening. Science, which started as the pursuit of knowledge in search of truth, was a noble intellectual enterprise worthy of human beings. When there was persecution of scientists, e.g. Bruno, Galileo, for the revolutionary views advocated by them, science became an ideology. When Galileo was on trial, science, it is said, was on trial. To quote Skolimowski:

> Science was at that time undercutting the foundations of a decaying civilization. The medieval civilization was coming to an end, unable to sustain itself through its own means. Science was helping man to evolve a new civilization. Science was at that time the torch of light, the agent of progress and liberation. It was put on trial by the agents of the dying epoch.[59]

Then, science became an integral part of Western civilization. It was no more a body of pure ideas, but became a mighty social phenomenon, influencing and controlling the social institutions by formulating ideals and setting up goals which it sought to realize through the support of state and other agencies. Space program, missile agenda, militarism, institutions of learning -- all these, inspired and supported by science, strengthen and support, in their turn, science. The scientific *Weltanschauung* determines the nature of the world around us. Once again what Skolimowski says is worth quoting:

> The nature of knowledge determines the nature of the world around us. We perceive and understand what we are made to perceive and understand through the knowledge we acquire. The dominant position of science in our system of learning assures a further perpetuation of what is called the scientific outlook and what is tantamount to a vision of the world through the spectacles of science. . . . Seen in this context, science does control people; it does control people subtly and indirectly because it furnishes them with the categories of understanding. It acts as a series of filters through which we view reality.[60]

In the next stage of its growth, science becomes technology.[61] Drawing a distinction between science and technology, it is very often argued that it is technology, not science, that is responsible for the present crisis of society. This argument is untenable. Technology is only an extension of science; and the separation of the one from the other in the present context cannot be justified, because both of them are the promoters of the Western civilization, both of them serve the same purpose -- that of perpetuating material progress, and both of them are committed to the preservation of the *status quo*. The religious-spiritual view and way of life has been replaced by technological consciousness. Skolimowski enumerates the characteristics of technological consciousness -- objectivization, atomization, alienation, power domination, de-sacralization, and consumerism. He observes:

> When we interact with the world via technology, we never think how to be benign and compassionate and loving, but always how to be efficient, controlling, assertive. This attitude of controlling and manipulating is now a part of the mental make-up of the Western people.[62]

Contrasting ecological consciousness with technological consciousness, Skolimowski pleads for concerted efforts for strengthening and supporting the former. Ecological consciousness is wholistic in its outlook; it cares for the quality of life; it emphasizes the importance of spiritual quest; it promotes a reverential attitude to life; it accepts the evolutionary process; and finally it insists on the duty of participation by every individual as a member of the whole. It may be noted that the characteristics of ecological consciousness mentioned above co-define each other. He presents the ecological consciousness with its six characteristics in a *mandala* as follows:[63]

ParticipatoryWholistic
Evolutionary Ecological ConsciousnessQualitative
Reverential Spiritual

Human beings are both corporeal and spiritual, both rational and mystical. They are rational and moral agents. The universe we live in is transphysical and transbiological; it is, that is to say, spiritual.

Modernization is equated with Westernization, though the term "modernization" does not carry such a connotation. The identification of modernization with Westernization is purely contextual. We have referred to the development of science in the West from the beginning of the seventeenth century and the new consciousness it was able to generate as it moved from stage to stage. It was able to bring about many changes in the modes of thinking and ways of life of the people: in short, since science modernized the people in the West, modernization is equated with Westernization. This identification has a tremendous impact on the outlook of the people in the East. The majority of the people in the East and the South, whose many countries were conquered, controlled, and coerced by Western nations, such as England and France, think that to be "modern" is to be "Western," and the easy way to be "Western" is to imitate the life-style of the Westerners. This kind of mentality and mode of life is most unfortunate, calamitous, and deplorable.

My approach to the problem of modernization is both negative and positive. Let me, first of all, remove some of the wrong notions about modernization by explaining what it is not. Modernization should not be confused with industrialization, urbanization, technocracy, and so on, though it is true that all these bring about changes in the existing socio-economic-political order affecting the life-style of the people. Secondly, modernization should not be confused with the changing economic process at the material level. Thirdly, modernization does not mean Westernization. To dress like the Westerner, to speak English or any other "modern language," i.e. European language, to have the facility to live like a Westerner -- these are not the real index of modernism. Fourthly, modernization does not mean a higher standard of living symbolized by automobiles, television sets, sophisticated instruments of information technology, and so on. One who possesses these "status symbols" is certainly not modern, if one's thinking is primitive and behavior, barbarous.

Very often we hear political leaders talking about improving the standard of living. In the case of those who do not have food, clothing, and shelter, to improve their standard of living is to provide them with all these, in the absence of which they cannot function as human beings. But in the case of those who are already in possession of them, what does it mean to talk about improving their

standard of living? Is it, for example, to help a family which has just one automobile to have more than one -- one for the husband and one for the wife? Improving the standard of living does not necessarily mean improving the quality of life.

Modernization, as I understand it, consists in modifying the existing institutions which have proved inadequate to meet the demands of life in the context of industrialization and urbanization. It is not the cancellation of everything old. The attempt to modify the existing institutions or to create new institutions and values should not result in a condition where people become "rootless." It is neither desirable nor possible for a community to run away from, or to disown, its past. There is an organic relation between the past and the present, as well as between the present and the future. It is worth remembering, in this context, Edmund Burke's conception of society: "Society is a contract. . . . It is a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born." So far, the core of Hinduism remains unchallenged, though the traditional social institutions have been questioned and modified, and some of them have even been replaced by new ones. It is worth quoting Radhakrishnan in this context. He says:

> The great ideals of our culture cannot be discarded; but their embodiment in forms and institutions we must get beyond. There is no reversing history. We must steer clear of a radical revolution as well as of a return to the past.[64]

While it is possible to think of conflict between institutions and modernization, we need not think of any conflict or incompatibility between traditional doctrines and modernization. This means that institutions may change without affecting the essential doctrines of a tradition. If rationality, freedom of expression and conduct, human dignity and creativity are considered to be the criteria of a modern society, then there is no conflict between the universal and eternal doctrines of the Hindu tradition and modernization. The basic principles of the humanism of Confucius, of the mysticism of Mencius, and of the metaphysics of Taoism have not become outmoded. Taken together, they constitute the spiritual culture of China. They are compatible with, and provide room for, modernization.

NOTES

1. Sri Aurobindo, *The Foundations of Indian Culture* (Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Ashram, sixth impression, 1988), pp. 51-52.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 57.
3. *Ibid.*
4. Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Culture and Value*, tr. Peter Winch (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, reprinted 1980), p. 6 e.
5. *Ibid.*
6. Sri Aurobindo, *op.cit*., p. 2.
7. *Taittir_ya Upani ad*, 3.1.1.
8. Quoted by Denis Kenny, "Science, Creativity and Morality," in *Holistic Science and Human Values* (Madras: Theosophical Society, 1995), p. 41.
9. *Brhad_ra yaka Upani ad*, 3.7.15.
10. See his commentary on the *Taittir_ya Upani ad*, 2.1.1.
11. *Aitareya _ra yaka*, 2.3.2.5.

12. *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works*, tr. Colm Luibheid and Paul Rorem (New York: Paulst Press, 1987), p. 141.
13. *Ibid.*
14. Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus*, 5.632.
15. *Ibid.*, 5.641.
16. *g-veda*, 1.164.46.
17. Sri Aurobindo, *op.cit.*, p. 139.
18. 4.5.15.
19. Wittgenstein, *Culture and Value*, p. 32 e.
20. Sri Aurobindo, *op.cit.*, pp. 172-173.
21. See his commentary on the *Brahma-s_tra*, 4.3.14.
22. *Ka ha Upani ad*, 1.2.2.
23. M. Hiriyanna, *Indian Conception of Values* (Mysore: Kavyalaya Publishers, 1975), p. 244.
24. Sri Aurobindo, *op.cit.*, pp. 140-141.
25. *Mu aka Upani ad*, 1.1.4.
26. *Ch_ndogya Upani ad*, 7.1.3.
27. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1.1.
28. Sri Aurobindo, *op.cit.*, p. 183.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 184.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 122.
31. _a_kara's commentary on the *Taittir_ya Upani ad*, 1.9.1.
32. *J_b_la Upani ad*, 4.
33. 12.15.
34. Quoted by Fung Yu-Lan, *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan, 1958 4th printing), op. 309.
35. *Confucian Analects*, XII. 11.
36. *Ibid.*, 6-28.
37. Quoted by John R. Williams, *Martin Heidegger's Philosophy of Religion*, SR Supplements/2 (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1977), p. 118.
38. *Brhad_ra yaka Upani ad*, 5.2.
39. *Ibid.*, _a_kara's commentary.
40. *Confucian Analects*, IV.16.
41. 2.47.
42. *Confucian Analects*, XIV. 38.
43. 18.14-15
44. S. Radhakrishnan, *The Bhagavad-g_t_* (Bombay: Blackie India Ltd., 6th edn., reprint 1977), p. 356.
45. *Mencius*, II a.6.
46. *Ibid.*, VII a. 45.
47. *Ibid.*, I a. 7.
48. *__av_sya Upani ad*, 6-7.
49. *Ibid.*, _a_kara's commentary.
50. See *Chuang-tzu*, chapter 40.
51. See *Lao-tzu*, chapter 3.
52. The first chapter of the *Chuang-tzu* is entitled "The Happy Excursion."
53. See *Chuang-tzu*, chapter 1.

54. *Ch_ndogya Upani ad*, 7.24.1.
55. *Ibid.*
56. *Ibid.*
57. A.N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (Cambridge: CUP, 1953), p. 250.
58. See Amit Goswami and Maggie Goswami, *Science and Spirituality: A Quantum Integration* (Delhi: PHISPC, A-15, Nirman Vihar, 1997).
59. See Henryk Skolimowski, *Dancing Shiva in the Ecological Age* (New Delhi: Clarion Books, 1991), p. 18.
60. *Ibid.*, pp. 20-1.
61. *Ibid.*, see chapter 2 for a detailed and fascinating account of the development of science.
62. *Ibid.*, p. 48.
63. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
64. S. Radhakrishnan, *Religion and Society* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1969), p. 138.

CHAPTER XI
THE AESTHETIC DIMENSION OF SCIENCE

JEAN LADRIÈRE

HARMONY AND NUMBER

The question of the aesthetic dimension of science is noted in the text of Hermann Weyl from his magnificent book on symmetry: "We still share the belief of a mathematical harmony of the universe. It has withstood the test of ever-widening experience. But we no longer seek this harmony in static forms like the regular solids, but in dynamic laws."[1] The regular solids to which Hermann Weyl refer are the five regular polyhedrons used by Kepler in his famous *Mysterium Cosmographicum* (published in 1596), in order to reconstruct *a priori* the structure of the solar system.

The idea of using the regular polyhedrons in a cosmological context was not at all new. They had been used already by Plato, in the *Timaeus*, to explain the composition of the "body" of the cosmos and to give a mathematical expression to the old theory of the five elements. What is quite remarkable in Plato's idea of Plato is that, by transposing the classical theory of elements into a mathematical form, he introduced necessity into that theory. Indeed Plato knew the theorem concerning the regular polyhedrons and stated that there exist five regular polyhedrons and not more. This theorem is proposition 18 of the 13th *Book of the Elements* by Euclid. It can be considered as a very profound theorem because it establishes a negative property: it is not possible to construct regular polyhedrons other than those with four faces, six faces, eight faces, twelve faces or twenty faces. This means that among all the possibilities, which could be considered as infinite, only these five correspond to real, that is, effectively constructable, mathematical objects.

It is highly significant for our question that Weyl's statement introduces the word "harmony", which evokes an aesthetic property and formulates a thesis, presented under the form of belief rather than as scientific knowledge, regarding the aesthetic dimension of science. It is true that Weyl refers to science not as a whole but to the science of nature. His thesis can be considered as a thesis of natural philosophy. The question of the extension of that thesis to other parts of scientific knowledge must, of course, be raised, but what we can learn from physics could in any case be suggestive for the other sciences. The thesis of Weyl contains three parts:

a) the adequate scientific representation of the universe is a mathematical one,

b) there is a specific harmony in mathematics,

c) this harmony reflects an intrinsic property of the universe and that property can thus be called a "mathematical harmony."

The first proposition is an epistemological principle and can be radicalized under the form of an ontological principle that the internal structure of the universe, taking into account all properties, is actually a mathematical one.

This ontological version of the proposition is the grounding principle of the *Timaeus*, probably reflecting Pythagorean concepts. As reinterpreted by Plato, this proposition becomes the key to the solution of a fundamental speculative problem, namely, that of mediation. The aim of the work is to

construct a theory of the cosmos which process is explained as if it was the work of a supreme artist, the demiurge, according to a fundamental analogy between nature and art.

The demiurge is good, and his aim is to build a world as perfect and as beautiful as possible. He takes as a model for his work a realm of pure forms which is the paradigm of excellence. The cosmos must be concrete and therefore visible and tangible. The problem then is to create a model compatible with this concrete status. In other words, the forms which give it its configuration must be imprinted in a principle of receptivity, conceived as a receptacle, the *chôra*. The problem then becomes one of mediation. In order to ensure the relation between the forms and the *chôra* some intermediate entity, participating in the perfection of the forms and also in a certain way of the opacity of the *chôra*, must intervene. For Plato, mathematics plays the role of that intermediate entity.

The cosmos must be like a work of art and by its own resources must provide for its constitution and appearance. To ensure its unity, that is, the full integration of its constitutive parts, it must be a living entity, a great living being. Like any living being, it must have a soul and a body, which two constitutive principles are the two levels of the mediation between the purity of the model and the lack of determination of the receptacle. The "how" of that mediation is explained by the mathematical structures of the soul and body of the cosmos. These two mathematical structures provide the principles of an astronomical theory, on the one hand, and the principles of a theory of the elements on the other hand. This is the spirit of mathematical physics, but developed very visibly from an aesthetic point of view. This is particularly clear in the platonic reconstruction of the constitution of the soul of the cosmos.

The leading idea of that reconstruction is that the soul is structured by numbers, according to fundamental ratios. The demiurge makes a mixture of two primary components. This duality accounts for the difference between the absolutely regular movement of the sky and the movement of the planets (the sun included) which presents irregularities. The demiurge divides the mixture in numerical ratios, the core of the theory of the soul being the construction of a numerical series defining the intervals according to which the mixture is divided. That construction starts from the two numbers which immediately follow the unity, two and three. The first step is to build a series obtained by composition of two geometric progressions, a progression of ratio, starting from 1 and limited to four terms, 1, 2, 4 and 8, and a progression of ratio, starting also from 1 and limited to four terms, 1, 3, 9 and 27. By taking the two together, in the natural order of their terms, we obtain the basic series 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9 and 27. Then the intervals are "harmonized", by equalization of the ratios, thanks to the insertion between those integers of rational numbers, obtained by the use of the arithmetic and the harmonic mean.

The result of that construction gives the relative distances between the planets. But it gives also exactly, and unexpectedly, the Greek musical scale. Thus it appears that at the same time the same mathematical structure gives account of the principles of music and of the constitution of the solar system. This shows that the astronomical world, which corresponds to the global structure of the cosmos, is organized according to the same numerical properties as those by which the virtue of human art creates musical beauty. That effect is due to the structure of the soul, formed by the series constructed by mathematical operations. Finally with the structure of that formal numerical series we can find the reason of the beauty of the cosmos as well as of the beauty of the musical works. By generalizing that conclusion of the reading of the *Timaeus*, we could say that for Plato nature is beautiful because the cosmos has a mathematical structure and because mathematics itself is beautiful, or perhaps more exactly, because mathematics itself discloses the formal configurations which make the beauty of what appears beautiful.

ANTIQUITY: NUMBER AS THE *A PRIORI* OF TIME

Particularly significant here is that number is the *a priori* of time. After the explanation of the structure of the soul in the*Timaeus* comes the explanation of the constitution of the heavens and of the apparition of time, which is the ordered motion of the heavens. According to a current interpretation, time is conceived by Plato as "the mobile image of eternity." Remy Brague, in his book *Du temps chez Platon et Aristote*,[2] has criticized that interpretation and proposed another one, which seems to conform much more to the thought of Plato. It is that time is indeed linked with motion, actually the motion of the heavens, but this motion occurs "according to the number," and that number is the number of the soul. It is not time, but the heavens which image eternity, and this image is going *kat'arithmon*. It is precisely because the motion of the heavens is conformed to number that it is the image of the eternal reality: number is the mediation between the model and the heavens. Time, then, according the interpretation of Remy Brague, "is the ordered motion of the heavens, which manifests the numerical structure of the soul of the world. Conceived in this way, the soul produces time rather than taking consciousness of it." That conception of time orders the priority to number as the structuring condition, not created by human thought but inscribed in the very constitution of the cosmic reality.

That same speculative strategy is pursued in the Platonic analysis of the body of the world, that is to say, in the study of the elements and of the dynamics of cosmic transmutations. In the context Plato makes use of the theorem about the five regular polyhedrons. He establishes a correspondence between those mathematical objects and the traditional four basic elements: fire is identified with the tetrahedron, earth with the cube, air with the octahedron, and water with the dodecahedron. Concerning the eicosihedron, the polyhedron with twenty faces, Plato explains that the demiurge has used it for the figure of the whole, that is, for the envelope of the cosmos as a whole, which is a sphere. That polyhedron is indeed, among the five regular bodies, the one nearest approximation of the sphere.

But the real scope of that theory of the elements lies in the dynamics of transmutations, based upon the analysis of the polyhedrons. Plato shows that those can be constructed with rectangular triangles which are really the elementary constituents of the cosmos. These triangles differ only from each other by the ratios of their longer side with respect to their shorter side; they are of the same nature, and this homogeneity entails that each one can be used for the construction of any one of the five polyhedrons. A transmutation can then be understood as a recomposition, and the possible processes of decomposition and recomposition determine *a priori* the transmutations which are admitted in the cosmos. Thus, two particles of water, being polyhedrons of twelve faces, can give way to three particles of air, which are octahedrons: 2 x 12 = 3 x 8. In qualitative language: water can become air, or, in more modern terms, water can pass into a gaseous state. Again, that geometrical structure of the regular polyhedrons, conceived as by themselves constituting the elements of what we call matter, provides *a priori* the reason for all the kinds of transformations we witness in the world. The explanatory power of mathematical interpretation matches its elegance and allow us to understand how the demiurge has succeeded in his project.

In the Greek tradition the relationship between the properties of some mathematical objects and the constitution of the cosmos is completely analogous to the relationship between some mathematical properties and the works of art which give a prominent role to proportions, music and architecture. They have a close analogy to each other as shown for example by the myth of Amphion. Paul Valéry, in his famous poem, *Cantique des Colonnes*, has celebrated the connection between architecture and music and has evoked the role of mathematics as providing the principle of the

concrete harmony of the constructive art when he wrote the columns that they are "daughters of the golden numbers, resting on the laws of heavens."

Plato saw in certain arithmetical properties the key at the same time of music and of cosmology. It would be interesting to take into consideration also the case of architecture. In his *Ten Books of Architecture*, Vitruvius explains "*ex quibus rebus architectura constet*." Vitruvius puts a particular emphasis upon what he calls "proportion" which he defines in the following terms: "Proportion is the relation that all the work has with its parts, and the relation which the parts have separately, comparatively with the whole, according to the measure of a certain part."[3] The precise expression of those relations is, of course, given by mathematical relations.

A good example is given by the famous "golden number," also known as the "golden section," it is defined as the ratio between two quantities submitted to the following order: the ratio of the sum of those quantities to the greater one is equal to the ratio of this greater one to the other one. If a is greater than b, that condition can be written: a + b / a = a / b. The geometrical version of this concept is the solution of the following problem: given a segment AC, find a point B on this segment such that the above condition applies to the segments AB and BC. We must thus have the following equation: AB + BC / AB = AB / BC. Let us denote by the letter g the numerical value of this ratio. A simple calculation shows that g has two possible values: g = 1,618..., and g = - 0,618. . . .

That number n has remarkable arithmetical and geometrical properties. For example, if we take the successive powers of g, we obtain a series, 1, g, g2, g3, . . . where each term is the sum of the two preceding ones. This number g appears in different properties of the polygons and of the polyhedrons. For example, in the case of the dodecahedron, which has twenty summits, we have the following property: those summits are also the summits of four regular pentagons, equal two by two, placed in parallel planes cutting the dodecahedron. The lengths of the sides of the two greater pentagons, are to the lengths of the sides of the two smaller pentagons exactly in the ratio g.

From the point of view of its architectural use, the most interesting intervention of the golden number is in the definition of the so-called "rectangle of modulus g." It is a rectangle such that the ratio of the longer side to the shorter side is equal to g. That rectangle has the curious property that if we divide the longer side in two segments having between themselves the ratio g, we can draw a new rectangle, inscribed in the given one, which is also a rectangle of modulus g. This process can, of course, be continued up to infinity. The series of those rectangles has the marvelous property that it is possible to draw a logarithmic spiral passing by three summits of decreasing rectangles of the series, this being the case for the whole series.

We have here purely geometrical properties. The striking fact is that the architectural use of those properties, as determining proportions, creates harmonious effects which to give to architectural works those qualities of equilibrium, of clarity, of rhythmical composition, and of perfect correspondence between the parts and the whole, which are characteristic of classical monuments. Thus what is apparent in works of art is already present intrinsically in mathematical objects. In the case of the golden number, what produces an aesthetic impression is not only the quality of the proportions determined by that number, but what could be called the fruitfulness of its definition. That fruitfulness appears, on the one hand, in the fact that the number g can be found again in many geometrical properties, and, on the other hand, in the fact that it gives way to processes of iteration, in the case of the series of powers of g and in the case of the rectangles of modulus g.

In the ancient speculation which finds its inspiration in the Platonistic tradition, the beauty of the cosmos is grounded in the properties of the numbers. And the numbers themselves have this virtue of producing the harmonious texture of the visible world because they belong themselves to the invisible world of the pure intelligible. In the sixth book of the sixth *Ennead, Peri Arithmôn*,

Plotinus undertakes a long discussion to demonstrate that the number exists by itself, independently of the beings which are determined by it, independently also of our thinking, because it belongs to the intelligible, which exists before thought.[4] That realm of the intelligible is organized according to a hierarchy of degrees, corresponding to the movement of release of the One, which is also a process of generation, the procession from the One. The first degrees following the One are the Being, the Intelligence and the Living in itself. Plotinus shows that number is before the Intelligence and the Living in itself, and that it is thus in the Being. It is produced by the Being inside itself, and the Being in itself produces the finite beings according to the numbers, which are the rules of every generation. There is thus an internal procession of the numbers, which is the condition of possibility and the exemplary cause of the procession of the *physis*. The numbers which are in the Being are finite in "that nothing can be added to the intelligible number,"[5] but they are infinite in "that there is nothing above them which could limit them and that they determine themselves . . . by a movement interior to themselves. . . . The infinite number is like the First Number, which is to say the one which contains, realized, the model of all the possible numbers; it designates all the properties, ratios or proportions which can exist between numbers. It is like an eternal arithmetic."[6]

Saint Augustine has reinterpreted that neo-Platonic conception of the numbers in his own conception of the eternal harmonies, developed in the second part of the sixth book of his *De Musica*, "The eternal harmonies and God their source". He explains the sensible harmonies by numerical proportions and he relates those to the properties of pure numbers, like Plotinus. However he places those eternal harmonies in God himself, by reinterpreting the Greek theory of the Intelligible in a theory of the divine Ideas, exemplary causes of creation.

MODERNITY: SYMMETRY AND FINALITY

The modern science of nature follows the idea of the fruitfulness of the mathematical representation without trying to justify it by speculative considerations. It continues to raise an actual philosophical problem, namely, the aesthetic aspect of science. In order to approach that question in its modern version, it would be useful to evoke two concepts which play a central role in physics and which illustrate significantly our question, the concepts of symmetry and of extremality.

Symmetry

As Hermann Weyl explains in his book on symmetry, there is an intuitive notion of symmetry and a precise geometric one. According to the intuitive idea, symmetry is the quality of what is well proportioned; namely, the "concordance of different parts by the virtue of which they integrate themselves in a whole." The precise geometric idea is the notion of bilateral symmetry: a spatial configuration is symmetric with respect to a plane if it can be transported in itself by a reflection with respect to this plane. A reflection with respect to a given plane is an application of the space in itself which transfers an arbitrary point of that space into a point which is its "image" with respect to that plane (and can be defined by a simple geometric construction). That notion can be generalized by deletion of the condition "with respect to a plane." We have then the simple notion of "application": it is a correspondence, many-one, which associates to each point of the space a point-image. If the correspondence is one-one, the application is called a transformation, for example, a translation or a rotation around an axis. What is characteristic in a geometrical object is what is not affected by transformations, or in other terms is invariant with respect to specific transformations. It could be said that such an invariance reflects something intrinsic to the object

studied, which appears the same from all the points of view, which can be taken by submitting the space to transformations of a certain kind. The notion of symmetry expresses precisely this idea of invariance and thus of intrinsicality. An object can thus be characterized by the symmetries that it exhibits under given transformations.

The geometric analysis makes use in particular of a kind of transformation which does not change the structure of the space. Such a transformation is usually called "similarity," but Weyl prefers to call it "automorphism." It appears that the automorphisms form a group, endowed with the operation of composition of two transformations, the one following the other. The identity, which applies each point on itself is an automorphism, the composition of two automorphisms is an automorphism, and to each automorphism corresponds an inverse, the composition of an automorphism with its inverse being the identity. Now, given a spatial configuration, the automorphisms let this unchanged configuration form a group which is actually a subgroup of the group of automorphisms of the space. A geometric object can thus be characterized by the group of automorphisms which transform it into itself with respect to which it is symmetric. For example the sphere is symmetric with respect to the spatial rotations, the five regular polyhedrons are symmetric with respect to rotations around a point in space, and so on.

That notion of symmetry has been transposed from geometry to physics and thereby generalized. As the physical situations and events occur in space and time, their representation must make use of a geometric frame, endowed with an appropriate structure. Such a frame can be considered as a space, this term being taken in an abstract sense. A "space" in this sense includes the properly geometric space and time: it is actually a "space-time." The idea of symmetry can be used therefore to characterize the geometrical aspects of the physical phenomena. But it can be extended to other aspects of physical reality. It is indeed possible to define transformations applying to the properly physical magnitudes, like the sign of an electric charge: this sign can be changed into its opposite.

The laws governing the physical phenomena are expressed by mathematical relations, or "equations," connecting the variations in time of the different parameters characterizing the kind of phenomenon which is studied. Those parameters are dependent upon the spatial coordinates defining a point in the space-time. This means that they can take different values when measured at different points of space-time. Thus a spatial transformation can transform the values of the parameters. The relation between different parameters can be conserved under spatial transformations, and more generally under certain sets of transformations, including those which are not spatial transformations. Given a set T of transformations, if a given relation R remains the same when the transformations of T are applied, that relation expresses a symmetry with respect to T. A symmetry, in quite general terms, is thus an invariance, which is to say an independence with respect to the particular point of view under which the phenomenon is observed, and even with respect to particular aspects of the phenomenon (submitted to some of the transformations of the set T), for example the sign of the electric charge of the particles involved. Again symmetry is the symptom of intrinsicality. It appears that a property of symmetry entails the conservation in time of certain dynamical characteristics of the system studied and also certain rules of selection, which stipulate that in such or such experiment, implying a transformation, only such or such effects are possible. This explains that the search of symmetries is a very important heuristic tool in the exploration of the physical world. A representative example of the usefulness of this concept is that the introduction of the new principles of symmetry led to the models unifying the so-called "weak" and "strong" electro-magnetic forces.

Like numerical proportions, symmetry plays an important role in art, at least in that part of the artistic tradition which can be called "classical" and to which the rejection of symmetry makes

indirect reference. In any case, that role is probably connected with some properties of perception, which could explain why it can have a positive or negative affective impact. The study of symmetry in physics leads to very abstract formulations. Something from the perceptive properties of symmetry is conserved in the physical concept of symmetry. The kind of intellectual pleasure which we experience when we discover how highly sophisticated mathematical theories, like the theory of representation of groups, correspond so magnificently with what nature reveals of its internal principles of organization. This is not so different from that kind of aesthetic emotion which we can experience in the presence of a musical piece or of an architectural work where we discover that the parts answer to each other as images of each other, giving thereby an intrinsic intelligibility to the work as a whole.

Extremality

The idea of extremality plays also a fundamental role in theoretical physics. The law governing a dynamic process can usually be expressed by means of a differential equation. Such an equation says how the system under consideration passes from one state to an infinitely proximate state, and thus gives the key point by point of a reconstruction of a trajectory between any two points. A differential equation expresses a local property. Apparent in the main physical theories, it is possible to deduce the fundamental differential equations of the theory from what is called a "principle of *extremum*," which is an integral one expressing a global property. It stipulates that the system under consideration, passing from a state A to a state B, must follow a line of evolution in such a way as to give to a certain expression L, which is related with the energy of the system, an extremal value, the least possible or the greatest possible one (according to the cases). An extremal principle imposes thus a constraint upon the trajectories or the lines of evolution of a system; in a sense it contains the complete specification of the dynamic possibilities of the system. The formulation of a dynamic theory on the basis of such a principle is thus extremely elegant and provides a high degree of intelligibility, as it reduces all that can be known about the behavior of a system to one simple condition.

The interesting fact, for our problem, is that this clearly has an aspect of finality which could be formulated in the form of an injunction: "In your passage from state A to state B, follow the path for which the expression L has the greatest value [or, according to the case, the least value]." That injunction could be in turn reformulated as follows: "In passing from state A to state B, adjust your behavior so as to give the highest [least] possible value to the expression L." Here the condition of extremality is presented as a final cause, which explains the behavior of the system. What is actually imposed upon the system is precisely to adopt as maxim of its behavior the realization of the end represented by the condition of extremality.

That example is particularly significant because it introduces the idea of finality, which plays a fundamental role in Kant's doctrine of judgement. In his *Critique of Judgement*, Kant introduces a fundamental distinction between two kinds of judgement. In general, judgement is the faculty which enables us to think the particular in the general. It can function according to two modes: by going from the general to the particular or the other way around. In the first case, judgement determines the particular object by subsuming it under the apriority of a law. In the second case, it is in search of an *a priori* principle which would be able to unify the different empirical laws concerning a particular realm of reality. The "principles of pure understanding" give way to "determining judgements," thanks to which we can obtain a certain rational knowledge of nature. But that determination is quite general. It does not give a real understanding of the diversity of the natural

world and in particular of the living forms. It is only by "reflecting" upon the conditions of a rational knowledge of nature in all its details that we can find the concept adequate for such a task. This is the concept of finality, in which we think the unity of all the particular laws of nature such as it would be conceived by a superior understanding. The judgement in which the objects of nature are thus understood under this concept is therefore only a "reflecting judgement," and it has only a subjective value. Kant gives the following definition: "The concept of an object, in as much as it contains also the reason of the reality of that object is named end."[7]

For Kant it is this concept of finality that forms the basis of the aesthetic judgement as well as the hermeneutic understanding of nature and which gives thus a foundation to the kind of mutual reflection between art and nature. This same concept of finality discloses a certain parallel between the domain of art and mathematics. There are two kinds of representation of the finality of nature, on the one hand, the aesthetic representation and, on the other hand, the "logical" representation: the first is subjective, the second objective. "What, in the representation of an object, is simply subjective, that is to say what constitutes its relation to the subject, not to the object, is its aesthetic nature; but what in the representation is serving or can be serving to the determination of the object (for knowledge) is its logical value."[8] What is proper to the aesthetic representation is the affective character: "The subjective element of a representation, what cannot become knowledge, is the pleasure or the pain which are attached to it, because they do not give anything to know of the object of the representation, although they can be the effect of some knowledge."[9] The simple apprehension of the form of an object of intuition, without the intervention of a concept, can give way to a reflective judgement which, at least, "compares that apprehension with its own power to relate intuitions to concepts".[10] "If, in that comparison, imagination (as faculty of *a priori*intuitions), is in accordance with understanding, as faculty of concepts, . . . and if that agreement produces pleasure, the object must be considered as final for the reflecting judgement. Such a judgement is an aesthetic judgement about the finality of the object which is not founded upon any existing concept of the object and does not provide any one."[11]

In the aesthetic representation of finality, this one is represented "only subjectively, by reason of the agreement of its form, when it is apprehended (*apprehensio*) prior to any concept, with the faculties of knowledge in order to unite intuition and concept in a general knowledge."[12] In the logical representation of finality, this one is represented "objectively, by reason of the agreement of its form with the possibility of the thing itself according to a concept of that thing which precedes and contains the cause of that form."[13] The first kind of representation "depends upon the immediate pleasure produced by the form of the object, in the pure and simple reflection on that form", whereas the second kind of representation "brings back the form of the object, not to the faculties of knowledge of the subject in apprehension, but to a determined knowledge of the object under a given concept." It therefore has "nothing to do with a feeling of pleasure in the presence of the things, but addresses itself to the understanding for the judgement to be passed on them ".[14]

To this distinction between two forms of representation of finality corresponds a distinction between two kinds of reflecting judgement, the aesthetic judgement, which is "the faculty of judging the formal (subjective) finality thanks to the feeling of pleasure or of pain," and the teleological judgement, which is "the faculty of judging the (objective) finality of nature thanks to understanding and reason."[15] The aesthetic judgement expresses itself in the concept of beauty which contains an intrinsic relation to finality. This is expressed in its third characteristic according to Kant from the point of view of relation: "Beauty is the form of the finality of an object as perceived in it without the representation of an end."[16] He gives the following example: "A flower, for example a tulip, is

regarded as beautiful because while perceiving it we encounter a certain finality which, judged as we do, does not relate to any end."[17]

Now a new distinction is introduced in the realm of objective finality: this one can be purely formal or material. The formal objective finality is the kind of finality which we find in mathematics, the material objective finality is the kind of finality which we find in nature. The difference is the difference which separates what is only a determination of space, a pure form of intuition, from what is given in empirical experience. The kind of finality which we find in some mathematical objects is their property of giving the solution of a multitude of problems by a purely *a priori* necessity without any reference to possible applications. There is a striking contrast between the simplicity of their definition and of their construction and the fecundity of their explanatory and unifying power, which can be seen in the case for example of the circle or of conic sections. It is this capacity of unifying a great variety of particular cases and of disclosing thus the internal connections which make of a mathematical domain an organic whole which produces that harmony which suscitates our admiration and which induces us to attribute to those objects the quality of beauty. But the mathematical objects, being only determinations of space, are not "constitutive properties of external things" but "simple interior forms of representation." The finality which I recognize in a geometrical figure is introduced in it by myself, by drawing it "according to a concept, that is to say, according to my proper form of representation of an external object, which in itself can be any thing."[18] The finality of mathematical objects is thus "not in need of an end as principle nor, consequently, of a teleology."[19]

By contrast, the objective material finality is that kind of finality which can be recognized in existing things, given in the empirical intuition. The unity exhibited by the object, in this case, unifies different particular rules which are synthetic in character and "do not derive from a concept of the object."[20] What unites them is an external principle, "distinct from our faculty of representation;"[21] in the empirical datum. To characterize what can be recognized as "an end of nature," Kant introduces the idea of self-organization. Comparing a product of nature with a work of art, he underlines the fact that in a natural object each part not only exists for all the others as an instrument or organ -- which could be the case for a work of art -- but must be considered as an organ generating all the others and reciprocally. It is thus "as organized and organizing itself that a natural being can be named end of nature."[22]

We find another suggestive point of view about mathematics in the section of the *Critique of Judgement* dedicated to the Analytic of the sublime. This analysis constitutes the second part of the theory of the aesthetic judgement. Kant introduces the distinction between the concept of beauty and the concept of sublimity by opposing the character of limitation connected with the idea of finality to the character of infinity connected with the idea of unformedness. "The beauty of nature concerns the form of the object and that form consists in the limitation; but the sublime is encountered also in an unformed object in as much as infinity is represented in this one or thanks to it, while adding moreover by thought the totality of infinity. And this entails that the beautiful seems to serve as presenting an undetermined concept of understanding, but that the sublime serves as presenting an undetermined concept of reason."[23]

The sublime is characterized by an emotion and this one is related by imagination or to the faculty of knowing or to the faculty of desiring. It can thus be attributed to the object either as a mathematical disposition or as a dynamic disposition. The dynamic sublime is what is attributed to nature as a power of arousing fear. The mathematical sublime is defined by Kant as "absolutely large."[24] That characterization corresponds exactly to the mathematical concept of infinity. As absolutely large, infinity is beyond any finite determination. An infinite magnitude cannot be

"entirely apprehended, but is nevertheless judged . . . as given in its entirety, it demands the totality, thus a comprehension in an intuition."[25] The possibility of such a judgement demands "a faculty of the soul exceeding every sensible measure."[26] Visibly, we have to do here with the actual infinite, which cannot be effectively given in all its terms but which can be conceived by that faculty in the human mind which is precisely able to pass from a given conditioned to the totality of its conditions. That faculty, reason, is by itself the exigency of the thinking of the totality, in every field of conditioning.

The history of mathematics shows that it is not only possible to introduce infinity in reasoning in a coherent way, for example by using a process of passing to the limit in a converging series, but to speculate in mathematical terms about what could be called the internal structure of the infinite. The path has been opened by the works of Cantor about the so-called "transfinite numbers". The decisive step, apparently, has been the discovery by Cantor of the famous diagonal argument, which shows that the cardinality -- discrete measure of size -- of the set of all the parts of a given set, called the "power-set" of that given set, is greater than the cardinality of that given set. This entails that, once we have a set of a given cardinality, we can pass to higher cardinalities by the operation of taking the power-set of the given set. So, starting with the set of natural numbers, which is the first type of infinity which we know, and whose cardinality is denoted by the term "denumerable," we can pass to the set of all the parts, or sub-sets, of this set and obtain thus a higher cardinality called "the continuum." This process can be continued. But after the continuum it becomes purely formal and apparently uninteresting. Cantor has built a theory which opens the possibility of a constructive ascent through an infinite hierarchy of determined infinities.

The medium of that construction is the "ordinal number." We can consider a natural number as an ordinal: it characterizes the type of order of the sequence made of the preceding ones. For example the number 3, taken as an ordinal, is the type of order of the sequence 0, 1, 2. The different natural numbers, taken as ordinals, characterize thus the types of order of the successive finite sequences of natural numbers (taken themselves as ordinals) belonging to the whole sequence of the natural numbers. They are called "the finite ordinals," and they form a class, called "the first class of ordinals." If we take the whole sequence of the finite ordinal numbers, in their natural order, we can attribute to it a type of order, which is denoted by the Greek letter *omega*. The cardinality of that sequence is evidently the denumerable. Let us denote that cardinality by the letter *aleph* with the suffix zero, aleph-0. Now we can build a new sequence by adding to the sequence of the finite ordinals the new ordinal *omega*, which is an infinite ordinal (as type of order of an infinite sequence). Let us denote the type of order of that new sequence of ordinals "*omega* + 1". It is easy to show that the cardinality of that new sequence is again the denumerable. It is thus possible to generate an infinity of infinite sequences of ordinal numbers, each one of those sequences having the cardinality of the denumerable. But they have different types of order and we can thus associate with them different ordinals. We shall say that those ordinals are of the cardinality of the denumerable (*aleph*-0), which is the cardinality of the first class of ordinals.

Those ordinals, having the cardinality of the denumerable, form a class, called "the second class of ordinals." It can be shown that the cardinality of that class is greater than the cardinality of the denumerable. Let us denote that new cardinality by the letter *aleph* with the suffix 1, *aleph*-1. The second class of ordinals, itself of cardinality *aleph*-1, is thus formed by all the ordinals of cardinality *aleph*-0, each one of those ordinals representing a possibility of ordering a denumerable set of ordinals of the first class, that is, of finite ordinals. That construction can be iterated. We can consider the different possibilities of ordering infinite sets of cardinality *aleph*-1, made of ordinals of the second class, that is to say of ordinals of cardinality*aleph*-0. We can attach to each of those

possibilities a new ordinal. We shall say that it is of cardinality *aleph*-1. Those ordinals form a new class, called the third class of ordinals whose cardinality is greater than *aleph*-1. We shall denote that cardinality by the letter *aleph* with the suffix 2, *aleph*-2, and so on.

In general let us say that an ordinal belonging to the nth class, whose cardinality is *aleph*-(n -1), is of the cardinality of the preceding class, *aleph*-(n -2). Each ordinal belonging to that nth class represents a possibility of ordering a set of cardinality *aleph*-(n -2), made itself of ordinals of cardinality *aleph*-(n -3). We can thus say that the cardinality *aleph*-n is the cardinality of the class formed by all the ordinals of cardinality *aleph*-(n -1). It is thus possible to generate an indefinitely extensible class of cardinalities, a new cardinality being formed by the ordinals of the preceding cardinality. As a cardinality is denoted by the symbol *aleph* with an ordinal number as suffix, and as each new cardinality gives birth to a new infinity of ordinal numbers, we have a construction in zigzag, the cardinality sending back to the ordinality and vice versa.

There is something beautiful in a theory like the general theory of symmetry; there is something sublime in the cantorian theory of the transfinite. Whereas the beautiful "induces in the mind a state of calm contemplation and maintains it," as Kant says,[27] the sublime arouses an "emotion"[28] which is at the same time one of admiration and of surprise, the breathtaking ascent toward the higher levels of infinity opening ever larger horizons and revealing ever new possibilities for the thought. But precisely what is thus proposed is of the order of possibilities. Those possibilities must be explored and give way to the creation of new objects, which at their turn will manifest new aspects of mathematical beauty. So the beautiful and the sublime are not really separated. They are the two forms of the aesthetic dimension of mathematics.

THE AESTHETIC DIMENSION OF SCIENCE IN GENERAL

We must now come back to the question of the aesthetic dimension of science in general. Could we say simply that the aesthetic aspect of a scientific theory is due entirely to its mathematical apparatus? First it must be recalled that the role of mathematics is only partial in many theories and highly problematic in the field of the so-called "human sciences." We could nevertheless consider the case of theoretical physics as paradigmatic for our problem. A scientific theory, in general, is made of a conceptual system endowed with an explanatory power and applicable to a given empirical domain. Such a system can by itself manifest an aesthetic quality, even if it is not expressed in mathematical terms, and even if there are arguments to show that, by its very nature, it is not expressible in mathematical terms. It could be suggested, in such cases, that the foundation of their aesthetic quality lies in some implicit structural properties which are not presented as such, but which operate implicitly quite analogously to the way in which the explicit mathematical structures of theoretical physics operate openly.

In the case of physical theories we must take account of the fact that a mathematical structure cannot be fruitful unless interpreted in physical terms. This means that there is in such a theory a conceptual apparatus underlying the mathematical representation. It is through that apparatus that a correspondence can be established between the mathematical terms and propositions, on the one hand, and the terms and propositions in which the experimental data can be expressed, on the other hand. The role of the mathematical representation is, as Kant says, to provide "the construction of the concept," it is to say the presentation of the concept in a kind of intuition, which makes it visible and able to be submitted to different kinds of operations. That intuition is very probably not the *a priori* intuition of Kant, but what could be called a formal intuition, the capture of the intrinsic

meaning of formal expressions, for example of the definition of an abstract object and of the operators acting upon such objects.

The aesthetic quality of a physical theory is the aesthetic aspect of its conceptual frame. As this one is presented in a mathematical apparatus, that aesthetic aspect is actually made visible in that apparatus, and as such it becomes identical with the aesthetic aspect of that apparatus itself. This could justify the idea that it is, indeed, the aesthetic dimension of the mathematical structure used by a theory which confers its aesthetic dimension to that theory. It is must be added that the fruitfulness of a mathematical structure, from the point of view of the applications of the theory in which it is used, contributes to the aesthetic aspect of that structure. There is very often something marvelous and worthy of aesthetic admiration in the way in which a very abstract structure fits the empirical facts. It is told that Einstein said about the equation of Dirac, which is at the basis of the relativistic theory of the electron, "It is a true miracle!". This connection of the theory with an empirical domain is what is proper to a physical theory as such and makes the difference between pure mathematics and mathematical physics. This entails that there is something more, from the point of view of the aesthetic dimension, in a physical theory as such than in the pure mathematical theory which gives the representation of its underlying conceptual frame.

CONCLUSION

It is time to come to a general conclusion, not in order to close the reflection but on the contrary in order to open it to possible developments. The case of theoretical physics must be considered as particularly suggestive, but from what it suggests we must try to bring to light the fundamental disposition which, in the very texture of the scientific discourse in general, confers to it an aesthetic dimension.

In this perspective, it would be useful to take support in the analogy of the poem. There are, in a poem, two components which react upon each other to produce the specific kind of resonance proper to the poetic language. On the one hand, there is a dimension of discursivity, according to which the poem conveys an informative meaning. On the other hand, there is a dimension which gives to that meaning a kind of sensible manifestation, which inscribes it in the materiality of the words of which the poem is made. There are two ways of understanding that specific status of the meaning in poetic language. There is a formalist understanding, which retains only that materialization of the meaning achieved by the poetic language and pays particular attention to the musical resources used by that kind of language. On the other hand, there is what could be called a speculative understanding, which attributes to the concretization of the meaning the capacity to give access to an originary word that reveals something of the secret heart of reality and of the ultimate meaning of existence.

Analogously, there is in the scientific discourse a dimension of discursivity and a dimension which gives to it a similarity with the poem, and which we could call the dimension of poematicity. In its discursive dimension, the scientific discourse makes manifest the intrinsic intelligibility of the world, showing that there is an immanent *logos* in the cosmos and in ourselves. There is certainly an inadequateness in our representations, but at least they resonate to that intrinsic understandability of the real, and they reveal themselves as attuned, partially in any case, to that intelligibility of the world, capable of producing limited but authentic agreement between themselves and what is given in the field of our experience. That discursive aspect of scientific discourse ought to be interpreted, from the metaphysical point of view, in the light of the great idea of exemplarity. That immanent intelligibility of the world, whereof our mind is able to give account in its proper means of

representation, is the trace of a constituting Idea from which it derives by participation. We could remember in this context the concept of *vestigium* in the thought of Saint Thomas Aquinas.

But there is also in scientific discourse a poematic dimension in which respect it is susceptible to the two kinds of interpretation of poetic language. On the one hand, it falls within the province of formal interpretation in the measure which it gives, in its models, a concrete form to theoretical ideas. This is particularly the case when the theoretical models are mathematical structures which illumine the meaning of the underlying concepts by focusing on abstract objects, presented in the concreteness of formal representation. On the other hand, scientific discourse, in its poematic dimension, falls also within the province of the speculative interpretation of poetic language. It expresses an originary word, in the measure in which it makes sense of the visible world through the invisible presence of the Word giving it its reality and intelligibility.

Whereas discursivity reveals the intelligible, poematicity is celebration. In the scientific poem we hear, so to say, the voice of Nature, which is itself celebration. Nature celebrates, by the way it reveals its proper being as partaking of its Source, and thus celebrates the Source itself.

NOTES

1. Hermann Weyl, *Symmetry* (Princeton University Press, 1952), p. 77.
2. Remy Brague, *Du temps chez Platon et Aristote*. Quatre études, (Coll. Epiméthée) (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1982). See also "Le temps, image mobile de l'éternité" (Platon, *Timée*, 37 d), pp. 11-71.
3. Quotation according to the French translation of Perrault: *Vitruve, Les Dix Livres d'Architecture*. Traduction intégrale de Claude Perrault, 1673, revue et corrigée sur les textes latins et présentée par André Dalmas (Paris: Balland, 1979), p. 31.
4. Plotin, *Ennéades*, VI, 2ème partie, Texte établi et traduit par Emile Bréhier, (Collection des Universités de France), Deuxième édition (Paris: "Les Belles Lettres", 1954).
5. E. Bréhier, *Notice*. In: Plotin, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-16.
6. E. Bréhier, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
7. Quotation according to a French translation: Emmanuel Kant, *Critique du Jugement*, Traduit de l'allemand par J. Gibelin (Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1946), p. 21.
8. Kant, *op. cit.*, in the Introduction, VII, De la représentation esthétique de la finalité de la nature, p. 28.
9. *Idem*.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 21.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
17. *Ibid.*, footnote 1.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 173.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 172.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 173.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Ibid.*, p. 181.

23. *Ibid.*, p. 74.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
25. *Ibid.* , p. 83.
26. *Ibid*.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 76.
28. *Ibid*.

CHAPTER XII

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SUBJECT IN VIEW OF CONTEMPORARY GLOBALIZATION

GHISLAINE FLORIVAL

At the end of this century the question: "What is the `human person"' is still relevant. This question appeared to have become outmoded in contemporary philosophy "which seemed to relegate it to an earlier generation". The new philosophical work, like the different forms of structualism, abandoned any idea of the subject or of an objective ethic. The theme of this colloquium invites one to take a retrospective view on anthropology in order to grasp the value and meaning of a philosophical anthropology today when the question is no longer what is the human person, but rather what is the meaning of the human dimension in a globalized world.

A RETROSPECTIVE HISTORY OF 20TH CENTURY ANTHROPOLOGY

The philosophical anthropology of the 20th century took a new turn in abandoning the classical philosophical idea of a substantial union of body and soul. Progressively it freed itself from the idealistic categories which thematized formal essences; it no longer proceeded through a reflexive analysis of a *metaphysica specialis*, which treated the concept of the human person as a universal essence. On the contrary, it focused on the concrete life of the subject as involved in human interaction based on the act of existence, and relating to other beings in the context of this world. Undoubtedly, philosophical anthropology is being progressively acknowledged in circles of "second reflexion," but concrete philosophy (Gabriel Marcel), even purified of all substantialist dualism, remains marked by the problem of soul and body because I am my body in the lived unity of my presence to others.

At the same time, Husserl provided philosophical anthropology with methodological underpinnings. Phenomenology begins by questioning the essence of consciousness and considers lived action. That grasp of human identity still is subsidiary to a sense of constitution on the basis of the pure ego, which is its *terminus a quo*. In fact, Husserl freed himself from rationalism or empiricism by the concept of intentionality as the perspective of consciousness in encountering things. This understands itself according to a double intentionality: through perception it lives among the things of the world and reflects upon itself in its intentional effort. In the end, one must turn to a pure ego "which enters and departs from the scene" in order to appreciate the dynamic source of meaning, for it is the ego in its proper intentionality which understands one's conscious outlook. There are then two intentional outlooks which are not parallel, but mutually imply each other: reflective and non-reflective consciousness. Thus, the phenomenalizing subject can deconstruct the life of the subject in the absence-presence of the self to itself, without losing thereby its perceptive bond to others and to the world. At the same time, in an impersonal mode the reflecting subject attributes to itself what is just passed. Thus the play of nothingness passes through the "I" which is a presence to oneself in the continued process of moving beyond oneself into the future. This directed Sartre toward an impersonal foundation of the I and Paul Ricoeur to the narrativity of "oneself as an other."

In contrast to Descartes, Husserl holds that consciousness constitutes itself in a self-surpassing process of attention to sensible things (*aisthesis*), that the *psyché* is the concrete life of the ego and

that the *Geist* is constituted in intersubjective cultural relations. In his later recent philosophical publications this horizon absorbs the whole field of transcendental reflection to the point of transforming into intentional meaning -- this time on the basis of the life-world (*Lebenswelt*) -- the whole project of "reason." This is the source of the attempt of phenomenological philosophy to contemplate the *telos* of humanity. The philosopher, says Husserl, is a functionary of humanity. But as a matter of transcendental subjectivity this returns to the *terminus a quo* of meaning and thence to the constitution in time of the history of reason.

Putting aside the phenomenological idealism of transcendental subjectivity as conceived by its author, Heidegger situated the existent in the transcendental exteriorization of its being-in-the-world, underlining thus the extatic ontological dimension of the *Dasein* as existence open to the total horizon of world. Phenomenology, having become ontological, provides an existential analysis of *Dasein*. This makes explicit the manifestation of existence as "*phénomene*," in as much as existence is self-constitution understood as emergence in time of its own self-transcendence as "being-towards-the-world." The transcendence of the *Dasein* immediately manifests its structure of being-with in interrelation to the other existents in the *Mitwelt*. Experiencing the original affective field (*Befindlichkeit*) of its "habitat" as feeling of the situation, it expresses its essentially existential mode, which is to say its finitude. This manifests itself in existence under the structural form of concern throughout the whole course of the development of its being (*das Geschehen*) from birth to death. In its passion to exist the *Dasein* comprehends itself between these two terms which constitute it as a finite being, which enables it to realize its existence in the "historical" horizon of the world.

Phenomenological ontology as such then is not in principle an existential anthropology, even if it draws support therefrom. For phenomenological anthropology is always already within the hermeneutic circle in the comprehensive act of philosophy; it cannot escape the fact that it concretely lives its ontological question. This is not a matter of the given experience which constitutes the unique reality each one lives in oneself; rather it is a matter of bringing out the operative structures of concrete existence (the universalizable dimensions) according to which existence is deployed. The ontological *différence*, Heidegger's fundamental ontology, has been drawn on both by Sartre and by Merleau-Ponty for the metaphysical life of the concrete existent.

Merleau-Ponty confirms this concept of meaning in its concrete living significance: the term "*sens*" connotes a plurality of meanings, such as the sensible, direction and signification by gesture and language, both symbolic and affective. What makes the presence of meaning is the "concrete *différence*" which always is overcome and extended in the time and space of every encounter. Repeating an expression of Husserl, Merleau-Ponty speaks of the "flesh of the world". The term "flesh" is impersonal, expressing a fundamental ontological relation of meaning, that is to say, concretely all forms of relation. It consists of the dynamic sequence of all sensible and significant relations in the foundational and reciprocal exchange of Nature and Culture.

The concrete chiasm (intersection or fusion of terms) which constitutes the "flesh" of the world is the place where every existent concretely achieves meaning. It is situated in the interplay from the beginning of the evolution of living things and of people up to their symbolic cultural interrelations. The *Ineinander* of nature/culture relation as such reversibility or "différence" should be understood as the basic relation of meaning. *Différence* is found in the reversibility of the concrete and the symbolic, life and language, ego and the other. Far from the classical substantialist context, Merleau-Ponty opens a new way for philosophy which brings into play the experience of the intersection of figure on foundation in exchange relations. Thus, every dimension can be traced back to the originary ontological source whence meaning emerges and is exchanged.

To the ontological meaning of *Dasein*, the notion of body adds singular concrete expression. Already described by Husserl as mediation between *psyche* and the physical body, bodiliness becomes for Merleau-Ponty the concrete dimension of existence as transcendence with others and the world: "the body, the intentional arc which rises over the world." Constitutive of the self, not as "the other of the other" in the Husserlian sense, but in the interexchange of every encounter, the subject lives originally in the exchange of affective experience found throughout the whole field of intersubjective sensibility (which constitutes *intropathie*) and of the symbolic exchange signified through gesture and language. The existent emerges in its subjectivity thanks to the ensemble of affective and linguistic relations, from birth to death. This is sustained by the power of desire which signifies the experience of exchange, always evolving yet always already there in the limited and passing opening of the existence shared between the "speakers".

This brief presentation of existence indicates that philosophical anthropology has been renewed thanks to phenomenology with its concrete manifestation of lived experience. This concerns the existential neutrality of fundamental ontology as well as the formation of the transcendental schema of the freedom (the pure ego), but it emerges from the analysis of lived behavior, both interrelational and linguistic, in the mutual recognition between the denizens of the life world.

Change of Perspective: Action

A change of perspective took place in mid-century after the war. Philosophical anthropology, notably with Sartre, assumed a militant role in response to the socio-political needs of the times. The philosophical goal was not only comprehension, but critical involvement. This qualitative change provoked by social and cultural conflicts was reinforced by a new vision of the world in its concrete dimension of real and potential globalization. Not only exchanges between cultures, but techno-scientific powers with universal impact evoked a new mode of behavior on the part of philosophy. There was a need to reflect no longer merely theoretically, but with a practical view to action. Sartre spoke of action in the mode of coexistence under the pressure of a scarcity of goods which, tied to desire, depended not only on an actual situation, but also on the perverse effects of inertia which checked the achievement of the goals of action.

That warning from French philosophy spread during the second half of the 20th century. Structuralism inverted the humanist perspectives of Sartre to situate the focus of the philosophical perspective upon the linguistic or systematic interplay of signs. Concurrent with this change of mentality there was a great development of the techno-sciences; this promoted the sense of a constructed world which distanced one from daily life. In the measure in which for the first time humanity was able to recognize itself as a cultural whole (information being instantly broadcast by the media on a planetary level) and in which the individual person is taken up in this flow, all of life is subject to a process of objectification. Because the daily world was being transformed in its vital content and traditional values, this imposed a new mode of life in which one finds oneself alienated in one's own subjectivity.

Undoubtedly, human coexistence should reform itself in other forms, but it is no longer possible to escape the globalization of relations at a planetary level; hence what is affirmed on the existential level risks losing all its meaning. Today the subject is measured by artificial intelligence, projects a scientifically defined image. The globalization of practical reason is supported also by a new type of rational interpretation of reality. Instrumental reason has transformed the real into an operational mode, thereby introducing a quantitative vision of the world and a utilitarian and economic interpretation of humanity. These changes in information and culture not only condition the modes

of life, but support new rules of existence. Reason in its concrete planning is preempted by the interplay of instrumental functional possibilities continually reprojected by new technologies. The ordinary person now has lost the resources of Descartes is "good sense."

We find ourselves faced with a new dualism of subject and object which no longer has anything to do with the old Cartesian rationalism but on the contrary emerges from a new form of scientific positivism, subjected to a constructed functional reason. Scientists have developed new techniques which rapidly transform the whole field of life at all its levels, whether material, geographic, vital or socio-economic-cultural. That "constructed" world from now on will articulate itself in world terms. It has the power over the subject which is now become an object determined by the system. That is to say, the subject interprets itself also from the point of view of instrumental reason, and thereby is reduced while losing its own existential opening. Thus one finds oneself faced with a new dualism. On the one hand, the subject is considered as a rational agent on the instrumental level, abstracting from its lived dimension; on the other hand, the functioning of the constructed world produces situations in which subjects, themselves objectivized and constructed, must live their lives.

All these situations raise problems for action; they confront individuals and collectivities with their responsibilities with which they have neither prior experience nor any possibility of foreseeing the consequences to follow from action.

Let us take the example of new developments in biology: biological research on the human genome poses the acute ethical problem of the risks of experimentation both to the individual and to the species as a whole. The contemporary mastering of life by the techno-sciences in every domain generates a new collective awareness of the ethical problem. The universality of the system has radicalized that ethical self-awareness and risks itself becoming part of the schema of instrumental reason through availing itself of the positivist presuppositions of the techno-sciences. This results from considering only the utilitarian and quantitative results of material nature and culture and thereby alienating the human condition in general. The subject will be only a system of utility to be run rationally. At this price, even the objective language of the ethicians is reduced to the effectivity of the individual in the collectivity, omitting thereby the behavior of the existential subject in order to consider only positive or empirical factors. Moreover, what survives of the traditional ethic has been absorbed into the present situation and values. In the attempt to guarantee the objectivity of a *consensus*, ethics constructs itself on purely exteriorized and positive bases, in search of a majority voice to justify the ethical answer.

RESTRUCTURING THE ETHICAL SUBJECT: THE RETURN TO ANTHROPOLOGY

In the light of this distress of ethics and the need for creativity in this field one notes now a renewal of interest in philosophical anthropology. It is no longer questioned that issues of the human person underlie ethical responsibility: they are seen rather as its radical anchor. Of course, this is tied no longer to a theoretical understanding of *anthropos*, but to a practical anthropology which infolds from the center of action. For example, when the philosopher enters the ethical debate, he or she must critique the issues and reasoning in ethics in function of human interests. Proceeding then to the conditions of existence, one must debate actual problems as, for example, otherness, dwelling place, the future of humanity in general, and respect for the individual and for cultural groups. One must question especially the reduction of the practical to only instrumental reason, and in a parallel manner the reduction of human life to only techno-scientific or techno-economic views of globalization. One certainly must reflect on the new dependence of the human in relation to nature and to the new powers of a globalized system of the socio-economic world. The ensemble of applied

problems radically transforms individual and social life and raises all sorts of new ethical questions. Ethics, in effect, assumes a preponderant place in philosophy in the measure in which it becomes conscious of the urgency of redefining all in terms of a destiny which now has come to be shared universally.

Philosophy then is called to action, that is to the elaboration of a prospective strategy which not only permits control of applied research, but responds to the problems raised by the new inventions which upset people in their being, nature and traditions. Deontology certainly should permit regulating the initiatives of science and of all systematic manners of collective planning in view of living human destiny, both present and future. Therefore, ethics can no longer be only a theoretical science, a reflection either *a priori* on the essence of action or *a posteriori* on acquired human experience, but must begin and carry out work on new matters, yet unexplored, which have an immediate impact on the life of individuals, cosmic possibilities, the protection of peoples, or socio-cultural life. There are numerous examples: nuclear energy, control of the internet, genetic manipulation like cloning, excessive production of hydrocarbons, effects of socio-economic manipulation, environment, cultural heritage, etc. When one touches upon the integrity of the human in its natural habitat and cultural dimension the whole of existence is put in cause in its goals and values.

All these questions oblige ethicians to return to the original structure of meaning which conditions existents in their individual autonomy and their coexistence. It is necessary to rediscover the foundations which assure authentic ethical reflection. Here philosophical anthropology can provide important help in response to two questions: first, protecting the foundations of life, and second, ethical concerns.

The Analysis of Anthropological Structures

Phenomenological anthropology enables ethics to free itself from instrumental and utilitarian reason, while responding fundamentally to the original intent of developing *consensus*, which is in risk of remaining tied to a purely extrinsic rationality of discourse. This is a matter of regaining contact with communicative action and understanding the bases in action of its central justifications.

Today our life and that of others are redirected by the development of a globalized world. How can one respond on that basis to the three fundamental ethical directions suggested by Paul Ricoeur in his *Soi-même comme un autre*, that is: self-esteem, concern for the other, and solidarity according to institutionalized justice in the face of the anonymous globally omnipresent institutional system? One must return to the source and renew the bond of the subject to its lived roots. Phenomenological anthropology recalls the fundamental dimensions of existence: (a) bodiliness in all its dimensions: perspective, spatio-temporal, affective and expressive, (b) the recognition of the other, and (c) the world as lived horizon or *habitat*.

(a) The concept of "bodiliness" by Merleau-Ponty indicates the structure of openness of the existent to the world and to others on the basis of the practical dispositions which condition action. The analysis of bodiliness takes up the modalities of the existent. My body is the opening by which existence engages the sensible through active perception and experience; it is the dynamic milieu of the senses at once internal and external. It consists in the active-passive relation of one's relational and linguistic gestures which tie one to other existents and enable one to recognize oneself in relation to the other who manifests his or her subjective identity.

(b) As sensible, motor, affective and expressive, the body is experienced in every encounter, and is at the root of every lived experience of sense. Both actively and passively it is a source which recognizes itself in every encounter. It is the other which enables me to take my own stand (in the

Sartrean sense of an ethical and immediately perceptive subjectivity: testifying to the "feeling" of remorse, pride in self . . .). Those sentiments, lived in the immediacy of one who is "for the other", are possible only because of the affective relational inter-play is always found in the *Ineinander* of natural and cultural life. Bodiliness therefore is immediately an affective relation, an intropathy. It manifests our relation with the lived other which in an unreflected mode is at the level of our common existential openness to the world. For example, behavior is not the same when it is a matter of respect for life with regard to a human or an animal, even if even vegetable life relates us affectively to the living. In that sense, even on the most abstract cultural level, all behavior finds its roots.

The phenomenological analysis of affectivity uncovers the meaning of behavior. It points out the way to comprehend the other through the mediation of feeling. "Feelings" of compassion, remorse and shame are the different affective forms found in every encounter. Similarly "feelings" of respect and responsibility are the affective forms tied to ethical action. These are, as it were, the affective resonance of the subject with regard to the ethical goals of the other in action.

(c) Bodiliness is experienced in the affective resonance to the world as its existential horizon. On the one hand, cosmic nature is the vital objective anchorage of techno-science. But that concept of the cosmos is second phenomenologically by comparison to that of the life-world. It is always on the basis of our affective insertion as being-in-the-world that we discover our "*habitat*". The world opens us up to existence, that is, to bodiliness, in as much as it is the perceptive horizon in which things and others are perceptible for our senses. But that is only an horizon of perception; it is intrinsically significant with spatio-temporal depth only to the point in which it retains the traces of the past and anticipations of the future. Vestiges of the past, the world lived as *habitat* points back to cultural traditions and institutions which present themselves as the unspoken horizon of memory; anticipations of the future, in so far as the cultural and natural potentialities at the same time join to offer the ingredients of a new world to be constructed.

These three existential dimensions of bodiliness, recognition of others and affectivity in the habitat that is the world, define the structure of the existent. At all costs, that existential structure should be preserved in any existential reconstruction at any level. In other words, the existential structure must be able to maintain itself in the most elaborate forms of constructivist reason, at the risk otherwise of a tower of Babel, that is, a collapse into phenomenological and anthropological insignificance.

Interest in Ethics

Phenomenological anthropology which interprets the original anchorage of affectivity makes it possible to discover the emergence of meaning in all that is human since the dawn of life.

We use the concept of affectivity in the sense of an originating dimension and not of an analysis of affects. Phenomenologically we can suggest this only on the basis of a mature affective experience. The body appears in every lived experience as the milieu of exchange which leads to the recognition of others through intropathy, based on the reverberation of the "affective" sense of pleasure or displeasure. This affective sense is reopened already by the new born who lives an experience fused to the mother, and through her to the affectivity of parental desire. That fused presence introduces the existent, from the beginning of life, to the affective "dimension" much before having for oneself the experience of desire as relational. The infant experiences need in recognizing otherness at the time of the breaking away by its birth. This provides at the same time a notion of return to the fusional dependence and a movement of installation in being as a project of effective existence. This constitutes the transcendence of the subject, its existential step. The *infant* is able to

reflect itself as in a mirror through its bodiliness before discovering its distinctive otherness through eventually meeting the other, which encounter constitutes one as a relational subject, situated in relation to an "other."

Finally, the affective experience of jealousy, made possible by the presence of the other parent -- the other of the other -- enables the infant to discover the possibilities of putting one's self at a distance as well as the experience of reality constituted as objectively significant. The temporality of the *infant*, already manifest in the negative phase of separation, becomes self-conscious in what has been called the Oedipus complex, that is in the reduplication of the desire of desire, where one discovers the objectivity of an affective, sexed other. This introduces the self as the pole of a differentiated sexed relation, which prefigures one's future affective and sexual autonomy as an adult. One could hypothesize that the relational play of sexual "life" is already at work even before the relation of otherness at the moment of separation, though in an impersonal manner in its first fused manifestations. Here the constitutive meaning remains undifferentiated and yet to be decided by lived pleasure or non-pleasure. It could be that the meaning of life as sexualized "difference" is the radical source of all meaning, lived unreflectively and sustained symbolically by parental desire. Without doubt, only the speaking subject (or more strictly, philosophy) can theorize the earlier experience of life as the lived past of the affective ego.

From the emergence of meaning on the basis of this sexed-experience present from the first recognition of distinctiveness or otherness, one can hypothesize that the meaning attached to the original sexed affectivity is reflected in every encounter or interplay of otherness, whatever be the dimensions of the exchange of different divisions and relations of meaning. One need not conclude that the sexed dimension is identified with the sexual difference, but only that differentiation as a relation of meaning in the reciprocal exchange of the feminine and masculine bears the mark of meaning which becomes sensible or significant at all levels. From the beginning of its entry into language, meaning is autonomous in defining all its levels of meaning. Contrarily, life expresses itself in each person according to the situated condition of man or woman, which polarizes the whole course of existence in all its meetings. This is not, however, to be confused with the tension of effective sexual life, of which is birth, its most intimate expression.

Surely, the meaning of affectivity thus described is expressed in phenomenological language only at the cultural level of a consciousness able to reflect it. But inversely, it is on the basis of that origin of meaning that existence comes into possession of itself in the course of its journey between birth and death. On this basis it establishes its "bio-logical" destiny: it is anchored and achieves its own dynamism of "sense." In that case, the rational dimension also emerges through a reciprocally constitutive sharing of the truth according to the manner of the affective anchoring in which the individual is situated. In other words, there is no integrating truth which is not differentiated in its structure. It is necessary then to recognize the affective sexed situation of all action whatever it might be, inasmuch as meaning emerges in lived interaction -- which is true of all societies and of all human cultures.

This means also that the coordinates of interrelational experience are borne by an originating affectivity, whatever might be said of the separations and reintegrations which generate the most abstract formalizations. Hence, ethics too should be able to separate out the affective implications lived in all circumstances, and in its practical projections maintain the sensed expressions of the originating bodiliness.

In that light, interest in ethics has its source in the analysis of affectivity as a significant dynamic force. The question is whether affectivity as a source of meaning can induce an ethical attitude. It could be suggested that affectivity enables the existent to understand itself in response to ethical

problems on the basis of the comprehensive condition of relatedness to the other. On that basis, every person becomes capable of identifying their experiences, even their collective ones, in their shared relations lived affectively. That originating affective communication gives meaning to feeling as an ethical "intuition." It also can open feeling to meaning that surpasses ethical experience, which one ultimately is called to transcend.

CHAPTER XIII

THE CONTRIBUTION OF ART TO CREATIVE HUMAN POTENTIAL

NGUYEN VAN HUYEN

Whether or not each country can achieve its development target depends first on the human factor. To speak of man as a factor is to speak of his talents and contribution to society. Creative ability is seen as the first index of this talent and contribution, as it is the decisive factor for the efficiency of each individual activity, especially in the present era marked by intelligence.

Since time immemorial, mankind has focused upon social life and the ability of human development in perception, education, prediction and creation.

Of itself art is both creativity and the creative product. The world of art and that of the human spirit, in which lies the human creative potential, are similar. Using art to educate and develop man in general is one of the most effective ways to develop the creative ability of each social subject.

THE CHARACTERISTICS AND STRUCTURE OF ART

Art is a lively and attractive way to reflect the world. Like scientific conceptions or ideological forms the art image is itself the subjective image of the objective world. The only difference is that the art image constitutes a dialectical unity of the content expressed in matter. Through the prism of subjective-objective relationship the different art forms reflect the real world in the individual human consciousness. According to the degree of life, knowledge, experience, ideology and world outlook, art reflects in the form of feeling-emotion the aspiration to harmony between the genuine good, the beautiful and the perfect in life, moving always towards a true ideal. In his "Reflex Theory," academician Todor Pavlov explained the art image as a perfect whole of aesthetic reality, ideology, spirit and art. To reflect the world art uses such methods as symbolization, idealization, ideologization, exaggeration, stylization, metaphor and comparison.

These art methods reached high art and expression due to the impact of the dialectic between the plastic and the expressive elements as principles of all art forms. The art image was always the model in which the particular and the common combined the qualities of the haphazard and the indispensable. The haphazard and the indispensable combine in a symbol. The artist's subjective action through images make art richer and livelier, and gave it personal life with joy, happiness, pain and sadness. It enables life to be evaluated and judged and provides orientation for thought and action.

Art unites content and form, the outward and the inward. Such elements go deeply into human psychology and provide a starting point for broadening and reaching deeply into the world of imagination, fiction and creation. In contrast to other forms of reflection, in any stage of creative art, feeling is always mixed with reason. Thought is never separated from image, for it expresses both feeling and reason.

A perfect art image has a wholeness which consists of a central nucleus with reciprocal impact between several parts and the whole. Each part in its turn is a "smaller whole," creating the greater whole and thence constituting the substance of new content-image.

These characteristic attributes create a three layer structure of the art image: (1) the material layer -- word, sound, line, color, light and their combinations; (2) the psychological layer -- feelings and emotions which create the symbolic and typical; and (3) the abstract philosophical aesthetic layer -- ideology, intelligence and significance.

The expressed and hidden implications which appear in the three layers constitute two dialectically united aspects: real content and ideological depth. One is expressed as the integrity of the reality described; the other is hidden but implied is the depth reality of society and humankind.

It could be said that nature as a rich, comprehensive, original structure exists only in art whose dialectical unity, flexibility and dynamism comprise many attributes and qualities; the common and the particular, feeling and reason, the conventional and the similar, the concrete and the abstract, the expressed and the hidden. All these attributes and qualities react and struggle against one another to create a lively "art field."

By the artist's creativity the art image becomes a "special aesthetic sign" which concentrates and condenses in itself feeling, emotion, reason and experience. It is enlightened and reflected in the aesthetic sign as both a product of creation and creative in nature. It constantly corresponds to images created from outside, and adds flesh, blood and memories of life. This provides the vitality of art and therefore the explosive energy of its creative potential. Such images have great capacity to spread, awaken and discover.

ART'S CAPACITY TO EVOKE CREATIVITY

From the nature of art and its original structure, psychologist Vygotski has uncovered in art a great force for creative suggestion. He illustrated its impact in the form of a funnel: the funnel's stalk being the expressed content and the rim being the wider field of hidden implications.[1] A.K. Jonkovski also experimented with the art work as a "great magnifier": "The principle of art's magnification is its mode of creating circumstances in which what is normal could generate a great and exceptional result."[2]

The art image is lively and carries great power because in our consciousness the images evoke feelings, emotion and intelligence. The active elements here are: organization, stimulation and aesthetics.

The operative principle of this is a small "force" which opens channels for a broader perception: a small stimulation that could create a volume of energy many times larger than itself. It was as if we glued our eyes to a small window gap and suddenly saw open before us an endless space, a spiritual world seeming to fly out from the window.

The picture "in the hospital" by a French painter described an old worker who came to see his daughter at the hospital. Looking at the picture, we see only the worker's grayish back sitting by the bed of his daughter, but the worker's whole life of hardwork exuded from his naked grayish back. Similarly, by the bark of the dogs in the dark of night writer Ngo Tat To, in his work *Lights Off*, led us by the tense circumstance of people being hunted down, to the oppressive plight of the Vietnam peasantry in the '30s under the French colonial regime.

British poet William Blake described the force of poetry as follows:

To find the eternal in an instant
Find the immense world in each grain of sand
Find the inexhaustible in your hand palm

And find the firmament in your flower vase

The impact of the organization-stimulation-aesthetic element in art is the total mobilization of man's spiritual force. When we look at a design in decorative art which is taken by many as of little artistic value we might find a similar image emerging in our consciousness. Sometimes the image is first suggested by association with a memory or with a current happening which spreads to our whole spiritual life. They turn into incentives and are kneaded into a code of psychological signals. They regulate the emotional system and create emotions with varying degrees of heat and light. Such a process takes place only within the scope of art awareness, which suggests feeling and reason throughout.

In fact, when we read a verse from *Kieu* by Nguyen Du, we touch only three aspects of his music-poetry. As a result, however, a whole rich "symphony" vibrates in us. As analyzed above, that was the principle of building an art image: from countless signs in a man's life and soul, only a few signs were used. Such art is called a "miraculous tune," whose nature restores the force of life and the rich world of imagination.

Art has its impact through the original structures of the miraculous tune which left the door half open, connected, and waiting. Other art works continue to effect the sensitive person according to a special logic of art carried out in the world of the imagination and personal projects.

Finally, an entire symphony vibrates within us, with not 3 but 13, not 13 but 130 signs, and not merely signs but images, concepts and memories as well. This is extended further from images and art to ethics, politics and sciences -- all that had existed or never existed in the life of the spirit and whose creative projects accumulate in life. By way of association and imagination, everything which seemed to sleep at the bottom of our subconscience in a single moment wakes up and spreads out. All those thoughts which were not clear enough or did not help bring about accurate conclusions with their strong emotions are now lightened up.

Composer A.I. Serov wrote to his colleague V.V. Stassov when he attended a concert by Liszt:

> I cannot compose myself any more. I do not even know if it was reality or a dream? How happy I am. Today is such a solemn day. The whole world seemed to change. Miraculous things were made by one man and his music. That force of music was so great; it was an indescribable state of passion. I felt light-hearted in my own self. No bonds have exited since those new melodies vibrated.[3]

In the world of architecture Pierre Loti in his reportage "Smile on the Bayonne Tower" wrote:

> I arrived in Bayonne on a moon night. It seemed to be a temple of another world created by men of a strange world. I felt I was back to the time of legends when Genie Indra, to organize a wedding for her son to marry the daughter of Neptune, built up this temple in the form of a celestial world. As I looked up at the high tower, something new suddenly rose up in my soul, a rising force which brought me back to the world of imagination.[4]

Of the many people who visit museums, exhibition halls, theaters and conservatories, some come for entertainment and the enjoyment of art as a relief from work. But many came to art with a pressing need: to prepare for some research work, creation or conclusion they are not able to provide.

Not only does art stimulate its own creations and help with social work, the great physicist Einstein thought that music might have helped him concentrate while building his basic theory of space, time and movement. What the time and space structure provided to his physics was itself a stimulation from a certain organized force, which he got directly from one of those concertos for piano and orchestra by Mozart. They enriched his imagination when he succeeded in explaining how the curve of space and time was close to material attraction which was the nature of the universe. He further affirmed that, under the impact of the sound, he felt that he could concentrate more easily than by paying attention only to the curves of physical fields. The aspects and melodies of Mozart concertos had built up in his inmost feelings impressions of the thrust and curvature of straight lines.[5] As for the impact of literature on scientists, Einstein affirmed that Dostoevski benefitted him more than any other thinker, including the famous mathematician, C. Gauss.

Atomic physicist Kouznetsov used to visit the Tretiakovski art museum. The religious images of saints in the museum could not satisfy the severe logical character of scientific research, but vague conclusions needed to be shaped and perfected by symbols. He went to a room of ancient pictures of Saints by Rublev. Standing in passion and meditation among the medieval art works, Kuznetsov said he felt arise in his heart a strong stimulus which awoke in him a gradual tension, a sense of the well-proportioned, the coherent and the intimate; it was those very items which provided the necessary elements for his new conclusions regarding the character of physical laws.[6]

The strong inspiration drawn from art by artists, scientists and ordinary people showed that art had a special force in suggesting images to sensitive people. They turned the spiritual into material force and creative action. The reason for this is that in the final analysis art and scientific activity are of the same united process of creative activity by man in general. In spite of the fact that both of these creative activities were different in quality, they have in common building a picture of the world. In this activity, the wholeness of art, thought and image, the harmony of the details with specific characteristics, the moving rhythm, the indispensability of each detail -- all were united into a world of wholeness and harmony. From his own experience, Kuznetsov affirmed that "both genuine science and genuine music demand the same thinking process."[7]Stolovitch also asserted that "aesthetics by nature exists in all creations -- even in the field of political reality, organization and control."[8]

In these circumstances, the contributions of the various art forms to scientists were not through philosophical thinking, ethics or the social thought expressed in novels, nor by the arrangement of any theory or scientific law imaged in terms of sound or color. The important thing was that scientists perceived in literature, music, painting, elements of scientific meaning of harmony and wholeness, whose character created the scientific laws. The stimulation arose not from logical consciousness, but from awareness of aesthetics and art. They were able to draw this not by logical impressions but by aesthetic-psychological impressions, not as a result of direct situation but from the kind of activity that suggested.

This creative psychology shows that artistic creation covers not only the layers of consciousness, but also those of the subconscious and the unconscious. Thus, art had its impact on the consciousness, the subconscious and the unconscious.

On the other hand, to reflect art was to reflect in images that develop into symbols -- the nearest link to intuition. For this reason, art and its activities bear the specific character of intuition which results from developments in the creative potential of the conscious, subconscious and unconscious. "Intuition was extremely important for Einstein in grasping scientific creation, making his scientific creation nearer to artistic creation."[9] The leap from a "vague project" to a "new project" took place by way of intuition. Within a single moment in art this enables the search to reach its goal.

CONCLUSION

The above analysis showed that art played a special role in the creative spiritual life. It contributes easily: to satisfying the aesthetic need, developing thinking and feelings and building for man a noble soul. The creative potential in art is a strong force of nature, usually predominant over other capabilities. Such force is needed not only for creators and researchers in art, but also for scientific workers, inventors and discoverers, and not only for social science but for natural science as well.

This does not mean, however, that each and every person experiences the impact of art. A wonderful piece of music has no value for the ears of someone who has no knowledge of music. Thus, for the force of art to have impact one should first be equipped with aesthetic knowledge and scientific theory as a basis for sensitivity to the art work and aesthetic sensitivity to the life of the real world. It is necessary to know art in its various forms. This brings man to a higher level of aesthetic knowledge and a progressive world outlook, assuring proper evaluation, sensation and creative orientation. A high degree of aesthetic sensitivity is a prerequisite for the spiritual and creative world. For this reason, the subject must build for him or herself a rich spiritual world, a pure and clean life, and form a capacity for delicate and sensible emotions on the basis of a pure and clean aesthetic ideal. To develop a creative heart is constantly to enhance the active character of individual creation for the noble purposes of society and for the development of human creativity.

As for art itself, i.e., the objective side of the aesthetic impact, to raise the capacity and the impact of art means raising the quality of the work not only in its content, but also in its form and method of reflection. Art should strive to create rich and noble art images of society and man, contributing in major part to the development of man's spiritual world.

Creation is of the nature of man; hence it is permanent and awaits only the proper conditions in order to be activated. The task of art is to create these conditions: to build original art works of high quality as special aesthetic signs which bear in themselves precious creative potential.

NOTES

1. Excerpt from I.A. Philipev, *Aesthetic Information Signals* (Moscow: 1971), pp. 80-81.
2. A.K. Jonkovski, "On Magnifying Character," in the book, *Research on Type Structures* (Moscow, 1962), pp. 168-169.
3. Letter to A.I. Serov. Stassov in his book V.V. Stassov, *Liszt, Schumann and Berlioz in Russia*. Collected works, pp. 13-14.
4. "Smile on the Tower of Bayonne." *Art Research* (Hanoi: 1975), no.6. P. 75.
5. B.G. Kuznetsov, *Essays on Einstein* (Moscow: 1965), p. 119.
6. Excerpt from I.A. Philipev, *Aesthetic Information Signals* (Moscow: 1971), p. 100.

7. B.G. Kuznetsov, *Einstein* (Moscow: 1963), p. 88.
8. L.N. Stolovitch, *Life, Creation, Man* (Moscow: 1985), p. 300-301.
9. E.G. Kuznetsov, *Einstein* (Moscow: 1963), pp. 86-87.

CHAPTER XIV

FROM GLOBAL INTERESTS TO CULTURAL VALUES

A. T. DALFOVO

1. VIEWS ON GLOBALIZATION

Globalization refers to the interconnection of human activity on a global scale, to the unprecedented flows of capital and labour, technology and skills, ideas and values across State and national boundaries, but in a way that neither States nor nations can adequately control.[1] An appraisal of globalization is problematic and controversial as its meaning is rather elusive. The views on globalization seem to be locked in unresolvable dichotomies for and against it.

According to many economists, globalization is a natural process which is greatly increasing prosperity around the world. Both developing and industrialized countries benefit from the effects of the shake-up that it involves.[2] Globalization provides more and better means to defeat poverty, ignorance and desease at world level. The massive production of standard products at global level reduces their cost and allows an increasing number of customers to be reached. Global competition propels a vaster technological progress and more attractive conditions for employment, fostering better living conditions in the world at large. Communications have become easier and faster increasing the possibility of information, learning, education, and development. P. Martin states that positions hostile to globalization are profoundly immoral because they are based on suppressing the aspirations of the Third World in order to preserve the advantages of a specifically Western model of working.[3]

According to other analysts instead, globalization is deepening the economic disparities, widening the gap between rich and poor and fostering a lopsided development. Statistics are produced to show that unemployment and inequalities are rising, individuals and groups are marginalized, basic social services are restricted or suppressed.[4] These negative effects of globalization seem to be hitting Africa in particular. "Globalization is not working for the benefit of the majority of Africans today".[5] Many people in Sub-Saharan Africa tend to see globalization as the latest form of expansion and consolidation of a "world order" that has the western political and economic powers as its driving force. The impact of globalization has been felt as a renewed colonial aggression in the "logical" line of slavery, colonialism and neo-colonialism with the added danger of being vested in apparently innocent words and ideas such as "global responsibility", "global family", "one humanity" and "new world order".[6]

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Report for 1997 contains a sharp critique of the effects on the poorest countries of "unbridled" globalization: a process occurring "without map or compass". The report underlines the human cost of globalization and points out that the bulk of the benefits accrue to a small and privileged minority. Two years ago, while ten Southern countries were "emerging", more than 100 others were effectively excluded from the development process. 45% of humankind lived in those poorest and most marginalized countries. Of the remaining 55% of the global population, 20% (broadly, the middle classes of emerging countries) were progressively becoming rich consumers while 35% (workers in Northern countries) were experiencing ever-increasing social divisions.[7]

Hence, the advantages of globalization are spread very unevenly. Some countries and regions are losing out, notably Sub-Saharan Africa where many countries are becoming more and more marginalized globally.[8]

2. PHILOSOPHICAL REACTION

2.1 The Human Dimension

The discourse on globalization appears to be predominantly narrative. It is the kind of narration (or myth in the language of Aristotle) by which what has been heard is unquestionably accepted and passed on to others. Globalization is likewise narrated, namely heard and spoken about or read and written about without a sufficient scrutiny of its meaning and implications.

For Aristotle, philosophy begins with the stance of reason against myth. Today, philosophy needs to challenge the mythical dimension of globalization with its critical approach to reality and to do it with some urgency. In fact, the very Greek term *KRINO* at the etymological origin of both "critique" and "crisis", recalls that philosophy's task is both critical and crucial.

The critical reaction of philosophy returns the person marginalized or instrumentalized by globalization, to the centre of this phenomenon where the person should, after all, be as globalization is ultimately a human creation. Globalization is repeatedly censured for fostering an exclusive attention to the economic dimension of existence disregarding the human side of it. By returning the human being to globalization, the latter is humanized implying maximum attention to the whole person and to all persons with particular focus on human rights.[9]

A critical scrutiny of globalization leads to the vision or the thinking that sustains it. It is only the perception of such vision or thinking that can help to suggest, if need be, an appropriate alternative for humanizing it as suggested, for instance, by the following quotation: "Such vision should spring from a conscience (the conscience of humanity) in which the prevailing propelling force should be neither money nor power, but the good of man. The inspiring idea ought to be moral and human rather than economic or political. There is a need to refine the moral conscience of humanity."[10]

Some people consider the global onslaught not a myth that can be tamed by reason but a fact that is unavoidable and irreversible. "Quit the whining! Globalization isn't a choice."[11] Such stand may easily lead to the belief (myth) that globalization is driven by some kind of hard determinism. Such belief in turn may persuade that the entire globe is wrapped in this determinism as globalization is global. The conclusion would then be that, as we are "globalized", we are not free. Therefore, one has no alternative but to note this relentless and elusive trend and to just let it take its course. But if philosophy can help reinstate the person at the centre of the phenomenon, any alleged determinism can be reconsidered and human freedom can be safeguarded against it.

In the final analysis, however, the real threat to freedom within globalization is probably going to be not from determinism but rather from the manipulation by the economic and political powers like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, in their effort to bring about a *sound* world economy.

2.2 The Comprehensive Dimension

Philosophy is said to be the unification and systematization of all important knowledge within the realm of reason. It is preoccupied with the totalization of knowledge; it integrates the multiplicity of reality into a total and fundamental unity.[12] As "philosophy is concerned with everything, is a *universal science*",[13] it can foster a comprehensive analysis of the multifaceted phenomenon of globalization. Such analysis will result in an equally comprehensive vision that philosophy will propose for a renewed or human globalization. Such vision will thus extend, for instance, beyond the exclusively material or spiritual or the specifically economic or political, to encompass the whole dimension of life and existence for the person and for society.

Such comprehensiveness entails moving beyond the horizons of pure rationality to everything that constitutes the person. It also requires that philosophical considerations be not confined within pure theory. Practice is part of life and existence and philosophy is, after all, interested in all life and existence.

As G.F. McLean envisages, globalization points forward to a new philosophical agenda horizontally to broaden awareness to include all peoples and cultures, and vertically to deepen new metaphysical and religious dimensions of meaning and values. The philosophical challenges emerging from the widening of sensibilities to diverse cultures imply reducing the radical and exclusive focus upon reason and its abstractive power and expanding the consideration to other dimensions of human reality. The invitation is to consider not only theory, principles, pure research and abstract learning but also practice, applications, concrete and inductive considerations in order to involve and to develop the whole person and the entire reality.[14]

To conclude, the stance of reason against the narration of globalization returns the person to the heart of this phenomenon giving it a human and comprehensive dimension.

3. GLOBALIZATION AND CULTURE

3.1 Cultural Encounter

From whichever point of view globalization is looked at, a constant factor in it is that it moves across all boundaries. The boundaries being crossed are of many kinds: national, political, financial, educational, social, religious, generational and others. One of them is the cultural boundary which is usually added to the others as if it were just one of them. The proposition of this paper is that globalization is not *also* cultural but it is *mainly* so.

"Globalization is essentially an encounter of cultures."[15] Globalization becomes a problem when the crossing of the above mentioned boundaries is an intrusion trespassing on cultures rather than a friendly meeting among them. This means that the critical reaction of philosophy by which globalization is vested with human and comprehensive dimensions as described in the previous section, needs to occur within the context of culture. Culture is the meeting point of globalization and philosophy.

3.2 Inculturation

Globalization is an encounter of cultures. The first encounter a person has with culture, the one that conditions all others, is the one sociologically described as inculturation. Inculturation is the process by which a person is introduced into the culture of birth and by which the values, norms and attitudes shared by the members of one's society are transmitted to the person.

Inculturation coincides, in many ways, with socialization and education and like them it is divided into a first stage effected in the early years of life when the foundations of one's personality are established (primary inculturation), and a subsequent phase lasting through the rest of one's life and developing the foundation established in the early part of it (secondary inculturation). Primary inculturation is said to be substantially over by the time a person is three years old. After the age of six, a person is believed to resist anything that requires changing earlier acquisitions. Hence, primary inculturation occurs mostly at a time when one has not yet acquired the full use of one's reason and liberty. A person is introduced into culture before the person is even aware of the conditioning effects of that culture. Culture permeates the capacity to evaluate alternatives and to choose between them, thus conditioning the essence of freedom. It is at the heart of the social control to which every member of society is subjected.

The problem arising from the unconscious acquisition of cultural bonds is said to be solved, to some extent, by education. It is believed that the education of the mind to a critical appraisal of reality rescues the person from an unconditional decency from culture. The main aim of modern education is to impart, together with the ability to accomplish certain tasks, the critical insight related to such tasks and to the context within which they are to be effected. In other words, modern education aims at providing abilities and freedom.[16] The cultivation of this critical ability and, thus, of a person's freedom is the aim of philosophy too.

This educational and philosophical exercise occurs after a person has been fundamentally inculturated. It is thus a redemptive activity rather than a creative one. It does not simply edify. It has first to modify and then to re-edify taking stock of the pre-existing situation. Primary inculturation may be amended and improved upon but it cannot be cancelled. Its infrastructure remains and it emerges, for instance, when a person encounters different cultures later in life.

3.3 Acculturation

3.3.1 Pluralism of Cultures

The encounter with a different culture produces the phenomenon known as acculturation by which cultural elements pass over from one culture to another, giving rise to new cultural traits in the cultures that meet.

Today acculturation has intensified as cultural pluralism is extending to every society, dispelling the colonial belief in cultural monism by which culture was considered to be fundamentally one and identified with western culture. This latter posed to be the ultimate term of reference for the rest of humanity. Such illusory expression of cultural imperialism has now lost every credibility although it may still be found lingering on under different guise, as in globalization, for instance.

A widespread awareness has developed that single cultures exist in their specific space-time continuum according to the way various peoples react to their environment. Such awareness has induced some people to stress the autonomy of their cultures as self-sufficient units with a self-contained value system leading in some cases, to cultural isolationism and even radicalism. In some other instances, cultural pluralism has induced various degrees of relativism vis-a-vis cultures.

Cultural autonomy and cultural relativism question the possibility of a meaningful communication among cultures. Such query implies that cultural pluralism, generally considered to have been an evolution in human sensitivity, is to be considered instead an involution. It

amounts to the discovery that human beings cannot communicate among themselves and that they have no choice but to live isolated from each other. If this were to be the case, globalization would be a fallacy and the discourse on it would have to be ended here.

3.3.2 Cultural Universals and Particulars

Cultures develop "cultural particulars" as their geographical and historical contexts elicit different responses. At the same time, cultures establish communications among themselves through their "cultural universals". Acculturation blends "cultural universals" and it respects "cultural particulars".[17]

Kroeber e Kluckhohn recognize that the existence of universals after millennia of cultural history and in circumstances so diversified suggests that such universals correspond to something remarkably profound in human nature and to a necessary condition of social life. According to the two authors, anthropological evidence testifies that the expression "a common humanity" is in no way devoid of meaning.[18]

The movement of particular cultures towards their universal elements implies a movement across cultures, namely the possibility and, in fact, the need for particular cultures to meet both for what they have in common and for what each of them has as its specific element. Such meeting is part of their journey to the "universal" by discovering it in other cultures, enhanced by their very differences.

A particular culture develops within given limits of time and space. But no single culture can fulfil the entire human potential namely no culture is perfect thus allowing the possibility of further perfection. The limits of culture caution against idealizing one's culture thus subtracting it to the constant scrutiny of critical reason.

For philosophy, such critical analysis echoes the Socratic remark that the unexamined life is not worth living. This remark encourages once again the philosophical formation to critical evaluation vis-a-vis a passive reception of culture that would make of it an unquestioned myth. The critical evaluation of one's culture could eventually reach that fundamental and universal nucleus that could be described as metaphysical or, more pertinently here, as metacultural representing the ultimate meeting point of cultures.

3.3.3 Acculturation and Globalization

As cultures reconcile within themselves cultural particulars and cultural universals, they can likewise manage to reconcile the local and the global. They can cultivate a global vision without loosing sight of local complexities. Global thought and local action as well as local thought and global action can be harmonized giving rise, as Chaiwat Satha Anand puts it, to "glocalization", namely the local assimilation of global trends.[19]

Hence, being an encounter of cultures, globalization ought to lead to acculturation.[20] This, however, does not always occur, as indicated in the case of Africa that has experienced globalization more as a cultural onslaught than as an acculturating process.

In this connection, a diagnosis of the positive and negative aspects of globalization may be effected by referring to the movement of specific cultures towards their universal dimension. If globalization extends cultural particulars to the global level as if they were universals or if it extends one single culture to the universal level disregarding the existence of other cultures, then this would not be universalism but imperialism. If globalization is interested in single aspects

like the economic, or the political, then this would exclude it from universalism. If universalism gathers all that is common in humans constituting them as such, then all of it pertains to all of them. It is a "given" which globalization has to take if it wants to be universal, as also its name suggests.

3.3.4 Social and Personal Contexts

The acculturation exercise is not occurring in an ideal or abstract situation. It is socially contextualized implying that the specific condition of a society is made to bear on its culture and on its meeting with other cultures. Encounters between societies and their cultures may be balanced, generating a smooth acculturating process. But there may be cases when such encounters are lopsided such that the cultural elements of one society do not blend with, but rather overpower those of another society. Such unbalanced social and cultural relations are usually due to the power of a society, not of a culture, over another derived from its territorial and demographic size, its economic and organizational assets, and similar social aspects.[21] This unbalanced relation provokes quite often cultural imperialism, by which stronger societies impose or try to impose their culture on weaker ones.

Another challenge to a proper acculturating process derives from the fact that acculturation occurs among persons already inculturated in their respective culture. This implies the possibility that the acculturation process may pose a threat to one's culture prompting the insurgence of defense mechanisms and the entrenchment in one's own culture. In some of these cases, considerations about the richness of acculturation and the sterility of cultural radicalism appear to make little way into the fear of loosing the foundations of one's identity. And yet, there seems to be no alternative in cultural growth than to practice dialogue and to respect freedom.

4. CONFRONTATION

4.1. Conflict

Globalization creates a conflicting situation particularly in Africa. It trespasses on cultures undermining acculturation and human relations. According to S. Huntington, the most significant distinctions between peoples are no longer ideological, political or economic, but cultural. Future conflicts will see civilizations in opposition to one another over this.[22]

Conflicts become cultural when the encounter of cultures is discordant, namely when there is dissonance in acculturation. Such disharmony derives from a disregard for the universalizing dynamism in acculturation and the consequent prevalence of particular interests over universal values.

At the same time, the possibility of cultural conflict is at the door of everyone as cultural pluralism is pervading all societies and cultural encounters are affecting everybody. All this is further stimulated by the very phenomenon of globalization.

The solutions of cultural conflicts need to refer to their causes which may be political, economical, historical, psychological, demographic or otherwise.[23] Both the causes and the solutions of conflicts need to blend into an overall vision and strategy which can only be effected, as indicated, within a cultural context. Having argued that in dealing with conflicting situations it is necessary to have the contribution from various experts in disciplines like sociology, diplomacy, administration and particularly politics, M. Rocard concludes that

"democracy, sound leadership and peace are products of a culture which can only yield returns in the long term". Thus the multifaceted approach in dealing with situations of conflict is ultimately to be referred to culture.[24]

In line with this, all skill and talents deployed in the management of conflict have to converge into one's own culture and extend to other cultures as well. All steps from the inception of the analysis of a conflicting situation to its final solution need to be culturally contextualized for them to be feasible.

Such contextualization implies, among the rest, that in the case of Africa, for instance, African themselves provide the definitions of the criteria necessary to deal with conflict, together with the supporting structures needed to prevent, manage and resolve conflicts in Africa.[25] Foreign actors in Africa may fail to address "the local capacity for peace", neglecting the realities on which past peace rested and future peace can be built. The local capacity for peace must be empowered.[26] At the same time, Africa needs to consider the wider context of the world community and foreign actors could help such journey to “otherness” in culture.

The redress of conflictual situations caused by globalization cannot be reconciled by the simple awareness and due recognition of an injustice trusting that some "natural", "necessary" or "invisible" solution may occur. Any lopsided relation among cultures needs to be addressed first. If, for instance, globalization continues to be perceived as an onslaught or aggression, defense mechanisms will be devised and the danger of open conflict will increase. A simple call for collaboration between sides that have had tense and sour relations for centuries is idealistic, if not paradoxical.

4.2. Reconciliation

4.2.1 Desire and Possibility

The solution of conflicting situations aims at establishing a condition of harmony where differences are set aside, interests are balanced and a stable peace is created once for all. The Christian ethos moves beyond this, aiming at reconciliation by which differences are realistically evaluated in their dynamic and enduring potential and the elements of tension are allowed to unfold their mutual fruitfulness.[27] Reconciliation implies having a realistic grasp of the conflicting situation including the possibility that reconciliation may be resisted and conflict may be continued. An unlimited desire for reconciliation must be increasingly brought to coincide with the limits of human possibility, gradually reducing the distance and the tension between desire and possibility for reconciliation.[28]

Such realism implies being clear about the ideas and the facts involved in the reconciliatory act involved. In this connection, W.K. Frankena remarks that what one needs in such perplexing situations is, quite often, not a particular ethical instruction but simply more factual knowledge and greater conceptual clarity. "The two besetting sins in our prevailing habits of ethical thinking are our ready acquiescence in unclarity and our complacence in ignorance - the very sins that Socrates died combating over two thousand years ago." The disposition to find out and respect the relevant facts and to think clearly is not limited to the moral life but it is nevertheless morally desirable and even rather imperative.[29]

Concerning the clarity of ideas, the logical suggestion of this paper is that they be those bearing on the cultural dynamism unfolding in cultural encounters. But as the conflicting situations considered here are those deriving from globalization and as globalization pivots

practically on the economy, a specific set of ideas that needs realistically to be clarified is the one bearing on economics. One may not agree with the overwhelming role plaid by the economy in globalization, but one has nevertheless to admit it and deal with it accordingly and realistically.[30] One needs therefore to be clear about the language, the laws, the formulas and other paradigms used in economics and carried over into globalization. As these ideas are clarified, their practical application has to be considered too, since there is a need for a stronger and better organized network between theory and praxis.[31]

With regard to the factual knowledge related to globalization, one should be clear about the actual facts related both to the positive and to the negative aspects of globalization. The facts related to globalization are particularly and crucially needed because of the very elusiveness of globalization.

4.2.2 Values

S. Huntington remarks that conflicts among cultures will be over their values being viewed as antagonistic. Values, more than interests, will be the reason for violence. As value systems crumble, introversion will increase resulting from a world without frontiers (globalization) and from a world without references (values).[32]

History indicates that a rapid and impelling movement across cultural boundaries provokes introversion of values, particularly of those bearing on behaviour and morality. A meaningful example of this in the history of philosophy is found in the post Aristotelian period when Greek political and social life was shattered by the Macedonian and the Roman conquests that widened the areas of political and social interests beyond traditional boundaries. But the reaction of many people to that outward movement took the opposite direction of introversion. People moved from being organic members of their society to becoming individual persons within their world. Philosophy turned to individual ethics and the main schools of thought converged on epicureanism, stoicism, hedonism, scepticism and eclecticism that centered on the individual.

Today as globalization widens the social and political horizon across all boundaries, people could react by withdrawing into narrower confines where values cannot be shared. With no common terms of reference for mutual communications and understanding, the very solution of conflicts becomes problematic. In fact, the prevention and the solution of conflicts is dependent on the value assumptions of the people involved.

For instance, as D. Mieth points out, it is very important to know whether the value determining the prevention or the solution of a conflict is social integration or social innovation. Social integration is suggested by the idea that society is fundamentally a properly structured whole into which the parts, including its members, need to integrate to preserve society. In this case, conflicts are mishaps of the system, negative events to be prevented or eliminated. If instead society is considered to be a system in constant need of reform, conflicts are part of the system and they become instrumental to social innovation. Hence, depending on the value assumptions, conflicts endanger the system and the conflicting parts must be integrated into it, or conflicts develop the system and produce innovation.[33]

The journey from conflict to reconciliation and then to cooperation is the one from individual interests to shared values. These values, as related to the issue of globalization, are those bearing on human relations and behaviour, on freedom and reconciliation, on “otherness” and respect, and on similar ones that can be generally described as moral. Hence, the movement from cultural particulars to cultural universals prompted by acculturation is, in many ways, an

outward journey from individual to social ethics, the latter tallying with "cultural" ethics, namely with ethics encompassing both the particular and the universal, the local and the global. As attention to ethics means attention to the person, the presence of ethics in globalization entails the presence of the person in it. The contribution of philosophy to the human dimension of globalization is thus effected specifically through ethics.

Ethics (social and "cultural") postulates solidarity as also globalization does, or should do, by its very name and meaning. In fact, the challenge of globalization can only be met on the common ground of solidarity which, in a pluralistic society, can only be around reason, advocated by philosophy as the only common denominator of humanity.

5. PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE

5.1 Meaning of Culture

A clarification is added here concerning the meaning of culture and its relation to philosophy. In Western tradition, culture referred initially to the improvement and refinement of the person. In recent times, a new understanding of culture developed the social dimension of it.[34] Both meanings meet in the perception of culture that refers to the characteristic manner in which humans relate to their environment. They consider and interpret it, developing explanations and elaborating values that reorganize and, to some extent, re-create their environment. Human beings relate with it through the set of elements that they have placed between it and themselves, elements that constitute the new universe in which they live. This universe moulded with language, art, religion, behaviour, ideas, values and other elements is the universe of culture. Culture is the network of human behaviour, thought and relations created in accordance with the human interpretation of the reality surrounding human beings as the objective "other".[35]

The person is within culture and it is, in a way, part of it. At the same time, the person can ponder on culture. Hence, philosophy operates within culture but also upon culture.[36]

5.2 First and Second Order Philosophy

Contextualizing philosophy within culture facilitates an understand of it as a dynamic relationship between first and second order philosophy and thus having a more comprehensive view of philosophy.

First order philosophy starts when people seek motivations to nourish their identity, to justify their behaviour, to preserve their coherence and, generally, to fulfill their existential ends. Such motivations have to be supported by reasons that develop into a discourse with arguments for and against one's stand or statement.[37]

Second order philosophy ponders on first order philosophy, questioning its answers and systematizing its thinking into a structured whole. Second order philosophy goes on to organize its own experience and it becomes a discipline in which people are trained to the task of a rational, critical and systematic approach in philosophy.

Second order philosophy meets with culture and such analysis of culture leads ultimately to the person who constitutes the core of culture and in whom cultures find their unity in and among themselves.[38] If the person is the core of culture, then one would seem justified to conclude that the critical study of culture tallies with the critical study of the person and thus the

philosophy of culture is the philosophy of the person or philosophical anthropology. In this latter case, one would feel justified to conclude that philosophical anthropology could cater for a philosophical study of culture.

5.3 Philosophy of Culture

But the contention here is that such conclusion is not justified in the sense that philosophical anthropology does not sufficiently cater for an appropriate study of culture. In fact, philosophical anthropology is motivated, to a great extent, by the need to study the person in his/her entirety. The study of the person by other disciplines has been generally partial or fragmented resulting in a scattered knowledge by which aspects of the person have sometimes been exchanged for the whole of it. Hence, philosophical anthropology goes beyond the particulars of life and culture, considering the relationship of the person with nature, its metaphysical, physical, psychic and spiritual origin, the forces controlling and being controlled by the person, the fundamental laws of the person's biological, psychic, spiritual and social development.[39]

As philosophical anthropology moves beyond the particularity of culture to focus on the generality of the person, the person could be severed from the cultural context within which he/she is understood. A universal consideration of the person detached from his/her specific context could lead to a totalitarian objectivity and to a disregard for what is different. The consideration of the universal has to remain constantly linked to the particular and vice versa, as encouraged for instance by the constant relationship between first and second order philosophy.

Such contextual concern provides one with the reasons why contemporary studies of the person turn to culture rather than to nature. Human beings are not considered to be prefabricated by nature, so to speak, but to be they themselves inventing and accomplishing their own existence, facilitated by the anthropogenic dimension of culture. Several projects have emerged to help in this, like fenomenology, existentialism, structuralism and neopositivism.[40] But here too, their limitation seems to have been in having focussed on the person without an equally adequate attention to the cultures within which persons exist.

Cultural studies and pluralism increasingly reveal that cultural traits have a determining influence on the metaphysical, epistemological, ethical, aesthetical and other philosophical views in peoples' minds and lives. Hence, perception and meaning, principles and behaviour, values and judgement have to be culturally contextualized. Cultural diversity recognizes that a people's culture is the matrix of their identity, a matrix constituted by the "webs of significance" spun by them to construct their life. To understand a person and a people it is necessary to grasp such configuration of meaning and life that constitutes their vital context, which is what the philosophy of culture tries to accomplish.[41]

NOTES

1. Conference on *Globalization, the perceptions, experiences, and responses of the religious traditions and cultural communities in the Asia Pacific region,* Radisson, Shah Alam, 4-6 July 1997 (Organizers: JUST Malaysia with Pax Christi Australia).

2. D. David, "The Development Perspective", in *The Courier*, No. 164, July-August 1997, p. 63.

3. P. Martin, in D. David, "Alternatives or Criticisms", in *The Courier*, No. 164, July-August 1997, p. 65.

4. We are moving towards the "20:80 Society" in which 20% of the population will steer the remaining 80% that will be practically marginalized. H.-P. Martin and H. Schumann, *La trappola della globalizzazione*, Bolzano, Edition Raetia, 1997, pp. 9-12.

5. P. Henriot, "Globalization and Africa", *New People*, March 1998, p. 15.

6. W. Sachs, "One World", in W. Sachs, *The Development Dictionary*, Johannesburg, Witwatersrand University Press, 1993, pp. 102-115. What is universalism for the West is imperialism for the rest, Samuel Huntington comments (B. Ryan "Spiritualities", in *The Courier*, No. 164, July-August 1997, p. 82).

7. D. David, "Alternatives or Criticisms", op. cit., p. 65.

8. Africa's share of overall capital flows to developing countries fell from 33% in the 1970s to only 6% in the period 1985-95. The same trend can be observed in foreign investments and trade, as shown in the following table.

	1980	1993
Exports	0.7 %	0.4 %
Imports	1.1 %	0.7 %
Direct foreign investments	0.9 %	0.4 %
GNP	0.6 %	0.4 %

E.N. Mbekou and G. Nziki, "The Challenges Facing Sub-Saharan Africa", in *The Courier*, No. 164, July-August 1997, pp. 80-81.

9. Transnational corporations "ignore, if not destroy, local cultural and spiritual values with impunity. ... Africans see themselves valued, not for who they are as humans, but as what they have to become to fit into the plans and expectations of donor countries and UN agencies." (B. Ryan "Spiritualities", op. cit., pp. 82-83).

10. Paul VI, *Allocuzione alla Conferenza Internazionale del Lavoro*, 10.6.1969.

11. T.L. Friedman, *Herald Tribune*, 30.09.97.

12. N.A. Horvath, *Essentials to Philosophy*, Woodbury, N.Y., Barron's Educational Series, 1974, pp. 4-5.

13. J. Maritain, *An Introduction to Philosophy*, New York, Sheed and Ward, 1930, p. 103.

14. G.F. McLean, Presentation of the Theme of the Conference on *Philosophical Challenges and Opportunities of Globalization*, Leaflet of the Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, Washington, January 1998, pp. 5-6.

15. YAB Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim, Speech at the Conference on *Globalization, the perceptions, experiences, and responses of the religious traditions and cultural communities ...* , op. cit.

16. Education should aim at an "integral formation by means of a systematic and critical assimilation of culture. . . It must develop persons who are responsible and inner-directed, capable of choosing freely in conformity with their conscience." *The Catholic School*, Rome, The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, 1977, No. 26, 31.

17. Kwasi Wiredu has developed an interesting analysis on the existence of cultural universals and particulars within an African context in his *Cultural Universals and Particulars, An African Perspective*, Boomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1996.

18. A.L. Kroeber e C. Kluckhohn, *Culture, A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, New York, Vintage Books, 1963, pp. 351, 353.

19. Conference on *Globalization, the perceptions, experiences, and responses of the religious traditions and cultural communities ...*, op. cit.

20. Globalization is said to bring about cultural integration and cultural osmosis across the world. Integration describes the joining of different parts to form a whole in which the parts may retain their original nature changing only their mutual relation. Osmosis refers to the passage of a liquid from one side of a surface to another without alteration in the liquid. In acculturation, there is neither integration nor osmosis (according to the above meanings) in the sense that cultural elements do not simply pass from one culture to the other (osmosis) nor are such elements combining to form a simple aggregate of new relations (integration). In acculturation, cultural elements meet and generate new elements in both cultures.

21. To say that a culture is superior or stronger than others prompts the question as to the paradigms used to assess such superiority or strength. The often quoted case of the Romans being overcome by the culture of the Greeks whom they had overcome politically needs to be assessed within the wider context of Hellenic culture, at the same time bearing in mind that Roman "openness" to the culture of the peoples they conquered was meant to be a better way of dominating them.

22. D. David, "Globalization: Some Key Questions", op. cit., p. 54.

23. K. Karl, "Conflict Prevention", M. Rocard, "Towards Better Prevention", in *The Courier*, No. 168, March-April 1998, pp. 65, 68-69.

24. M. Rocard, op. cit., p. 69.

25. J.d.D. Pinheiro, "Europe's Response to Conflicts in Africa", in *The Courier*, No. 168, p. 66; M. Rocard, op.cit. p. 69; W. Ossay Leba, "Conflict Management in Africa", op.cit. pp. 76-78. Conflict prevention and settlement in Africa has its highest institutional means in the OAU. In June 1993, the 29th Conference of Heads of State and Government meeting in Cairo set up a "Mechanism for the prevention, management and settlement of conflicts" within the OAU.

26. Conflict today has been, so to speak, "democratized" and there are several actors who have a role to play in preventing or solving conflicts. John McDonald distinguishes nine categories of actors in what he calls *Multi-Track Diplomacy*, namely governments, professional organizations, the business community, Churches, the media, private citizens, training and educational institutes, activists, funding organizations. To these, Kumar Rupesinghe adds United Nations (*'Second-Track Diplomacy'*), eminent persons, women's movements, youth groups, artists. Some analysts stress the contribution of NGOs and religious organizations due to their familiarity with the local situation. P. van Tongeren, "Exploring the Local Capacity for Peace", in *The Courier*, 168, March-April 1998, p. 70.

27. For instance, Mt. 10.34; 11.12; Lk. 13.22; 1 Cor 9.24 ff. D. Mieth, "Conflict", in B. Stoeckle (ed.), *Concise Dictionary of Christian Ethics*, London, Burns & Oates, 1979, p. 51.

28. K. Demmer, "Forgiveness", in B. Stoeckle (ed.), op. cit., p. 106.

29. W.K. Frankena, *Ethics*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963, pp. 11-12, 51.

30. According to J. Joblin, an original feature in the social teaching of John Paul II is in his demand that people confront the economic system in which they live in order to understand its mechanisms and the philosophy that inspires it and thus acquire the expertise to deal with it competently. J. Joblin, "Chiesa e Mondializzazione", in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 17 Jan 1998, Year 149, N. 1/3542, pp. 129-141.

31. "Reflection without action is verbalism and action without reflection is activism." Paulo Freire in "Globalization: economy challenges the gospel", in *New People*, March 1998, p. 1.

32. D. David, "Globalization: Some Key Questions", op. cit., p. 54.

33. D. Mieth, op. cit., p. 50.

34. A.T. Dalfovo, "Culture: Meaning and Relation to Philosophy", in J.M. Nyasani (ed.), *Philosophical Focus on Culture and Traditional Thought Systems in Development*, Nairobi, Konrad Adenauer Foundation, 1994, pp. 66-75. C. Kluckhohn and A.L. Kroeber, op. cit.

35. E. Cassirer, *An Essay on Man*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1944. D.A. Masolo, "Philosophy and Culture: A Critique", in H. Odera Oruka & D.A. Masolo (eds.), *Philosophy and Culture*, Nairobi, Bookwise Limited, 1983, p. 48.

36. "Philosophy is crucially, even fundamentally a cultural phenomenon and any attempt to view it abstractly independently of its cultural environment is bound to be an unrewarding, futile exercise -- a poor, speculative product." J. Olu Sodipo, "Philosophy in pre-colonial Africa", in *Teaching and Research in Philosophy: Africa*, Paris, UNESCO, 1986, p. 74.

37. K. Wiredu, "Philosophy in Africa Today", March 1981 (mimeo), in H.O. Oruka and D.A. Masolo (eds.), op. cit., p. 23.

38. According to J. Olu Sodipo, first order philosophy is "the general intellectual temper of a culture, its characteristic mode of thought, its pervasive world outlook", while second order philosophy is moulded by "some members of that culture (who) attempt to give a systematic expression to its world view or to analyze and modify some of its aspects." (Op. cit., p. 75).

39. B. Mondin, *Dizionario Enciclopedico di Filosopfia Teologia e Morale*, Milano, Massimo, 1989, pp. 40, 41, quoting A. Heschel and M. Scheler.

40. *Ibid.*

41. L. Outlaw, "Philosophy and Culture: Critical Hermeneutics and Social Transformation", in H. Odera Oruka & D.A. Masolo (eds.), op. cit., p. 25. "Believing.. that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning". C. Geertz, "Think Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York, Basic Books, York, 1973, p. 5.

CHAPTER XV

CREATION OF NEW PHILOSOPHY IN THE AGE OF GLOBAL VILLAGE

KIRTI BUNCHUA

The global village in our age needs a philosophy, not only for survival, but to enable it to live in a better condition than humanity has ever before experienced. This paper suggests a "contextual philosophy" which has no determined content, but offers a method to be used as the common attitude for all schools of philosophy. Contextuality plays the role of metaphilosophy for all philosophies and of meta-studies for all branches of human knowledge.

Metaphilosophy employs a critical mind to analyze and evaluate all philosophies and classify them into five paradigms according to the value of each. Each paradigm can play its role in a process of globalization if and only if it accepts its limitation in order to collaborate with all others in a pluralistic spirit. By the same token, all the meta-studies may contribute and collaborate as parts of the common heritage of one and the same humanity. In this way, each and everyone may have a role to play in our global village.

This is the indispensable basis for the peaceful coexistence for which our global village yearns.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A METHOD FOR PHILOSOPHICAL WORK

As a Catholic who taught philosophy and Christianity in state universities where most instructors, students and administrators were Buddhists, my first problem was how to render myself and my thoughts acceptable to my students. I could not use the method of Matteo Ricci -- explaining Christianity in Buddhist terms -- because such method had been strongly objected to by some intellectual Buddhists. The Neo-Hindus had used such a method to interpret Buddha as the last incarnation of Narayana and some of the earlier interpretations of the Vatican Council looked upon Buddha as a forerunner of Christ. Intellectual Buddhists had protested against both interpretations and I have always opposed such a mixing of religious beliefs.

At first I held the attitude of a compromising philosopher with a vague idea of a compromising philosophy. I was criticized that this was not a happy term as it suggested that religions were quarrelling and I was making myself a reconciler; it would be too much to accept such an honor. In response I changed my policy into a philosophy of mutual understanding. This too was criticized, this time for the danger of seeming to be a new religious movement combining all religions, which, of course, was unacceptable. Another solution, drawing upon the phenomenological method of Husserl, was to bracket (*epoche*) the faith of each inquirer in order to gain the unbiased understanding of philosophy and religions. Some worried that such methodical doubt would advance into real skepticism.

Finally, I arrived at a contextual method. However, the Christian context is not a simple one, but a cluster of contexts, because Jesus Himself was open-minded enough in the matter of philosophy, though He urged each person to commit himself to the works of charity. With this religious and pluralistic open-mindedness, I am developing a contextual method and using it as the leit-motif of my teaching and administrative activities. Finally, being sent by the Assumption University to study the philosophy for civil society at the Center for the Study of Culture and Values

of The Catholic University of America, I adapted civil society as the purpose of the contextual method.

As the pioneer in teaching Western philosophy, or rather teaching philosophy in the Western way in Thailand, I probably taught in all the state universities in Thailand established before 1990. I had to write the first manuals of philosophy in the Thai Language, and in so doing had to invent the vocabulary needed for the purpose. I drew on Greek, Latin, Pali, and Sanskrit languages, beside Thai language in its profundity, as well as comparative literature and have written so far about 40 manuals of philosophy and religions, mostly in the Thai language. Based on my research on oriental philosophy His Majesty King Bhumiphol of Thailand appointed me Professor in Philosophy and Fellow of the Royal Institute for life. As Chairperson of Philosophical Departments of Chulalongkorn University I developed its courses up to the doctorate degree in philosophy and former students, including many intellectual Buddhist monks, are teaching philosophy in all universities and colleges of Thailand.

Retired from Chulalongkorn State University, I was asked to organize the Philosophical and Religious Studies Department in Assumption University where there is now a Ph.D. program in philosophy and an M.A. in philosophy and religious Studies. These emphasize the teaching of Thai Buddhism, professional ethics and the Bible for spirituality.

As the study of philosophy and religions is not complete without exposure-immersion, I learned Buddhism seriously (together with the Pali and Sanskrit languages) while teaching in the Buddhist Mahamakut and Mahachula Universities. My vacations were spent practicing Buddhist meditation with several Masters in many schools of meditation. With the collaboration of some volunteers, at our Spirituality ashram, I and my wife regularly organize courses of Buddhist Meditation for the Buddhists, Oriental Meditation for the Christians, Bible Study for the quality of life, and consultations for healthy and happy families, regardless of traditions and faiths.

Many Christians interested in Buddhist meditation go directly to Buddhist masters and then become hostile to Christianity, and vice-versa. With some preparation and introduction, they could go with more confidence and with a clearer idea of what they are seeking. Christians interested in Buddhism should not feel that the Buddha is against the spiritual values in Christianity, especially Divine Grace for each person. By the same token Buddhists who are interested in Christianity should not feel that Christ is against any spiritual value in Buddhism, especially the teaching of *Metta* and the tactic of enhancing the quality of life through *Samadhi* and *Vipassana*.

For all the above-mentioned programs, I have tried to formulate a methodology of teaching philosophy and religion at Assumption University. This I call "the contextuality method," that is, to teach and evaluate each philosophy and religion in its context. I divide the intellectual and spiritual context into five paradigms. The fifth paradigm has two phases: deconstructive and the reconstructive. We are trying to reconstruct civil society from all the good elements of past and present philosophies.

The Basis of Values in a Time of Change

From the foregoing experiences in a life of research, I have come to a philosophy of globalization as follows.

The time of change calls either for a changing value base (which means values without a fixed standard for common judgment) or for a change of the value base (which means establishing a new standard for the common judgment of values). A critical mind cannot accept a changing value base,

because a changing base cannot be a standard of valuation. The only option, therefore, is for a change of value base.

Each age needs an appropriate base for its values according to the characteristics of the age. Our age is unanimously proclaimed as the age of globalization. The appropriate value base must respond to the characteristic needs of globalization.

Globalization means not only that we can use today's technology of mass media to communicate throughout the world as in a village of old times, but especially that we must learn how to live in the globalized world as our ancestors lived in a village. Surely we need an appropriate philosophy -- a philosophy for the global age, or global philosophy -- having at least some of the following characteristics:

1. It opens the gate to all humane philosophies.
2. It has humanity as its object.
3. It aims at preparing all to live appropriately in the age of globalization.
4. It supposes the whole world to be one village in the hi-tech information system.
5. It considers all human values of equal rank.
6. It considers all cultures as belonging to the culture of humanity.
7. It has the ambition of bringing all human knowledge and experience into one perspective and explains all human interest under one perspective: global philosophy or philosophy of globalization.

The philosophy of globalization needs a meta-philosophy to guarantee growth and development.

ROLES OF META-PHILOSOPHY

Philosophy as the love of wisdom started with questions about the external world -- questions that ended with somewhat satisfactory answers which sooner or later generated further questions and further answers. Once philosophy had developed subjects of knowledge, it could not help asking about its role in human knowledge. Several satisfactory answers have been established, each fit for the context of each period in which it arose. Each answer is one meta-philosophy. The one fit for the age of globalization is the meta-philosophy of the globalized world which I would like to appropriate as the foundation of Philosophy.

1. At the start of human inquiry, philosophy played the role of mother of all branches of knowledge. This was the role of philosophy in the Primitive Age.
2. When branches of knowledge separated themselves to form independent subjects, philosophy had to be content with the remaining questions and answers. This is more or less the age of antiquity.
3. When only metaphysics and epistemology challenged philosophers, they began to follow up the conclusions of all subjects and developed applied philosophies for them all, using metaphysics and epistemology as pure philosophy to question any conclusion and to propose possible answers. This latter role began with Hegel.
4. When the various subjects had their own philosophers who could practice the applied philosophy of each particular subject better than the pure philosophers themselves (as today many scientists can do the philosophy of science better than the professional philosophers, for example),

philosophers were forced back to the ghetto of pure philosophy to practice at best the history of philosophy. This phenomenon took place between the two World Wars.

5. Presently pure philosophy is deemed meaningless and useless, as has already happened in many intellectual circles. It is time for professional philosophers to come out from the ghetto of pure philosophy to reflect seriously upon the roles of philosophy. It is time to take the philosophy of philosophy or meta-philosophy seriously, as well as the philosophy of history of philosophy or the meta-history of philosophy. Philosophy must now take an independent role, trying to state its own identity aiming to collaborate with all branches of human knowledge to promote peace and human welfare. This vision was initiated by the first post-modernist philosophers and continues to exist as what we would like to call globalized philosophy or globalizism in philosophy.

The Nature of Metaphilosophy

First, meta-philosophy is the philosophy that questions the origin, development, nature and roles of philosophy in each individual and in society.

Second, meta-history of philosophy is the philosophy that questions the relation between one philosophical conviction and other philosophical convictions, between philosophers and philosophical schools and various trends, between philosophy and history and between philosophy and other phenomena in society.

Methodology

First, the methodology of meta-inquires treats all knowledge of philosophy as raw material.

Second, it questions and answers along the above guidelines.

Third, it questions the current philosophy in new ways.

Fourth, it concentrates on questions that are within the scope of our current trend.

Fifth, it emphasizes teamwork, e.g., the mutual sharing of knowledge, opinions, understanding, supporting and developing.

Globalization

Taking all the foregoing development of philosophy into account, we are trying to develop a trend that may serve humanity in this age of globalization. It may be similar to postmodernism, but may have characteristics of our own. We prefer to call it a globalizational philosophy. Its main characters are as follows:

1. It is based on the self-criticism.
2. It offers to be the liaison of all human phenomena and creativities.
3. It promotes the training and education of the mind toward unbiased judgements.
4. It enhances human dignity.
5. It uses the most up-to-date hermeneutics as the main tool for analysis and human values as the final aim of evaluation.
6. It recruits resource people with a critical mind who know how to analyze and evaluate with some degree of rightness.

PHILOSOPHICAL PARADIGMS LEADING TO A GLOBALIZED CULTURE

The contextual method in teaching philosophy seems successful in creating the atmosphere of understanding and sharing needed for our country, which is developing with a global prospective. For this purpose we divide human intellectual development vertically into five philosophical paradigms and horizontally according to the main source of cultures and inquiries.

Homo Sapiens continuously has developed creative capacities since the beginning of the species. That development in the past can be divided roughly into four steps, with the present development of a contextual capacity as the fifth step. We shall call them the "Five Paradigms of Human Thought." It is to be noted that in the world of paradigms, while new ones rise up, the old ones do not cease, but continue side by side with the new ones.

1. *Primitive Paradigm*. This paradigm occurred in the mind of primitives as soon as humans appeared on earth. It is as old as humanity. We can, therefore, assume that this paradigm began to exert its role not less than 2,000,000 years ago and has never died.

The first humans who lived on earth lived in pure nature, at the mercy of nature, often threatened by natural forces, and sometimes victims of natural disasters. Animals, when danger is at hand, are pushed by the instinct of fear to flee for their life. When the danger disappears the animals are unworried, because they do not reflect. Humans are different. Though they have the fear-instinct like animals and run for their life in a time of danger, after several experiences of threatening dangers they reflect upon their past experiences during times of peace. Primitives, wishing safety for themselves and their families, faced such questions as: "Whence came the natural disasters and how could they be eliminated?" Though there were many possible answers, what appeased the anxiety of the primitives was that natural disasters together with all natural events were caused by the manipulations of mysterious powers. All believed them to exist and to manipulate all natural happenings capriciously. They were called different names by different groups of peoples.

From such fundamental belief, the primitives concluded that they could avoid natural disasters only by complying with the will of the mysterious powers and that they could gain advantages over other creatures by pleasing those powers. These mysterious powers were called by various names; generally they were the "On-Highs" above all visible realities. The primitives tried hard, therefore, to know the will of the On-Highs and to know how to please them. Those who professed to know these techniques were considered the knowers or "the seers" among the primitives and enjoyed many privileges. They were indeed benefactors of the other primitives, because if no one could offer satisfactory answers, the fright-stricken primitives would have been in an inescapable state of fear. Though physically still victims of disasters, at least psychologically they could be convinced that they were not destined or doomed to unpredictable destruction. They believed that they could survive because they knew how to please the On-Highs; those who fell as victims to natural disasters were presumed to be negligent in pleasing the On-Highs.

As to why the primitives were so easily satisfied with the above answer and did not try to solve their problems through the understanding of the laws of nature, it would seem that they did not believe in laws. They experienced changing nature and saw the dissimilarities rather than the similarities, the changes rather than the laws. For them the universe was in chaos. This is their pure philosophy or metaphysics. Under the terms of such a philosophy the above answers were satisfactory and one hardly had reason to be interested in finding the laws of nature. On the contrary, one put all one's efforts into inquiry about problems one believes to exist: how to know and how to please the will of the On-Highs. This form of thought was the only trend in human

thinking for more than two million years. Surely with such a paradigm, humanity could hardly make progress in knowledge, except when people happen by chance upon rare and unintentioned inventions. However, the creative capacity of man could not help advancing to the ancient paradigm about 3,000 years ago.

The highest ideal for the devotees of the first paradigm is: "If the will of the On-Highs is not actually expressed, follow the customs", because the customs expresses the will of the On-Highs, until further informed by some believable technique. "You can violate anything except the customs" is the universally accepted criterion of conduct. Even the will of the On-High is accepted on the basis of some custom.

2. *Ancient Paradigm*. The people of this paradigm believe that the world has its own law. It is the cosmos, not the chaos of the Primitives.

There might have been some geniuses before the Ancient time who believed that the World had its own law, but as they did not transmit their belief to others, so it disappeared at the time of their death without affecting any change. If they did communicate it and no one believed it, they would have been denounced as crazy unbelievers and might have been put to death as a cursed person. Those, therefore, who first discovered the orderly cosmos and could safely convince others to join them in their beliefs were indeed great geniuses. We do not know who those were in human history. The oldest document that shows this belief is the first page of the Bible. It is the written record of oral traditions among the Hebrew tribes even before Moses. It had been transmitted orally from generation to generation and was put into the written Bible about 3,000 years ago. The Bible told us how God put an order into the universe, thus changing the status of the universe from chaos (the universe without laws) to cosmos (the universe with laws). Since then the Universe has evolved according to those given laws. Though God, as the law-giver, has the right to change any law at will, He would not have done it without necessity, because, generally, it is necessary to stress the importance of the laws He Himself has established.

In the Greek historical record, *Thales* (640-545 B.C.) has been called the first who thought of the world (meaning the universe) as cosmos. In Indian culture, *Buddha* was the first to teach that the universe and everything in it strictly follow the*Laws of Dharma.* In the Chinese culture we find Confucius presenting *Tao* as the laws of conduct for private as well as social life, while Lao-Tzu presented it as natural law.

Since man came to believe that the universe has fixed laws, he has had a great interest in discovering them. While Western people in the Middle Ages had to pass through a phase of interest in the law of nature before developing an interest in the law of the Spirit, Eastern people jumped over the interest of the law of nature to grasp immediately the law of the Spirit. Eastern people have grasped the law of the Spirit since the time of Buddha and became interested in the law of nature only when they came into contact with Western education two centuries ago.

The Metaphysics of the Second Paradigm is the belief that the universe has its own law. Man must know it and use it as the basis for his happiness in this life. For this reason, the Greeks and the Romans constructed great palaces, great theaters and great baths, but small temples. If they agreed to construct some great temples, it was for the sake of their own fame and pleasure rather than for the benefits of their future life, which belongs to the Third Paradigm starting in the Middle Ages.

During ancient time, only very progressive people had the Ancient Paradigm in their hearts. Many others still clung to the Primitive Paradigm, that is, they still believed in the mysterious powers that controlled nature, accordingly they both hoped and feared at the same time. If they used the facilities offered them by the inventions of more progressive people, they used them with the

mentality of the Primitives. For example, they might attend the theaters created by the Ancient writers which taught some natural laws, but the people of the Primitive Paradigm would attend it with the hope of magic to gain the favor of the mysterious powers.

The supreme standard of conduct for the Third Paradigm is "to follow the laws." Kings have authority because they guarantee peaceful coexistence. Their words are laws, not because they express the will of God, but because they express the Kings' will to guarantee peaceful coexistence. By this token, one can transgress anything but the laws promulgated by the will of the Kings or the leaders of societies.

3. *Medieval Paradigm*: In Western culture this paradigm started about 2,000 years ago, with the beginning of Christianity. In the East it started at the beginning of the Buddhist Era, about 500 years before the West. The Ancient Paradigm of the East started about the same time by the School of Caravaka, but it did not develop very much and soon died out. This paradigm believed that the universe follows fixed law, but held that the laws of this world cannot give man real happiness. Medieval men who had this paradigm in their hearts devoted all their worldly resources to paving their ways for the happiness in the next life. They used to be parsimonious for their own living but lavish in accumulating merits for the life-to-come. There were plenty of examples of those who lived a strictly mortified life. They constructed great and sumptuous cathedrals and religious objects, but poor houses -- just enough for their own survival. Their ideal was different from those of the ancient paradigm who constructed temples just big enough for their greatest profit; but for their own residences, nothing was spared to make them as useful and luxurious as possible.

Meanwhile, some in their midst lived by the Primitive or the Ancient Paradigms and were considered by them as gentiles (uneducated) and unbelievers. Therefore, it is not surprising to see, in all religions of that time, manifestations of all three paradigms. The supreme criterion of goodness in this paradigm is conscience according to the teaching of each religion. One could transgress anything except the rules laid down by the religious authority.

4. *Modern Paradigm*: Since the beginning of the natural sciences around the year 1500, the scientific method stands as a fixed and clear method for advancing the human knowledge of the Universe. After establishing itself as an independent subject, natural science invented and progressed so rapidly that many people hoped it might solve all problems of man. People hoped that one day it might cure and prevent all diseases, and eliminate death and old age. They hoped all men might remain young for eternity, fearing neither sickness, old age nor death. They imagined that the scientific method might be applied to social organization, so that men might share their happiness with equity and justice; and that men would share their responsibility by each of working as little as possible. Most of their time would be spent in recreation and enjoyment, without any mixture of fear and worry of any kind. Live would become "a Paradise on the Earth" without any need for a future life.

This Paradigm believes that the universe follows fixed laws. By knowing enough Laws of the universe, we may transform our earth into a real paradise. The believers of this paradigm would devote their resources to promoting scientific research, so that their expectation might become true as soon as possible. The fundamentalists of this paradigm set policies to undermine all kinds of religious belief and hopes for the happiness of the after-life. Nevertheless, people of the Primitive, Ancient and Medieval Paradigms continued to live among them. In all aspects of life, there remain manifestations of the four paradigms competing with each other. The same phenomenon can be found in the beliefs and the practices of the members of all religions.

The supreme criterion of goodness in the modern paradigm is reason, which is used to convince people according to the epistemology of pure philosophy. This is the criterion for all kinds of judgment and evaluation. "Reasonableness is always right, and unreasonableness is always wrong".

5. *Contemporary Paradigm*: We come now to the critical mind, which characterizes the fifth or contemporary type of human capacity and comprises analysis and evaluation. The aim of our project is to train our students in these two valuable capacities during their undergraduate education, so that they may develop and effectively use the critical mind in their further study and especially in their daily life. In so doing they can act responsibly in all they do or think of doing, this will lead them to the authentic happiness according to reality, both for themselves and for all their neighbors.

With the critical mind as our tool, we shall proceed to analyze how to use the adaptive capacity to control our creative capacity which, though very dangerous, is not bad in itself. Under appropriate control, it yields marvelous benefices, if we can control the creative capacity so that it can create safely and beneficently, instead of cutting short the creative endeavor for the naive reason that "it is dangerous," it can proceed to consider the following points:

- Effects of the creative capacity
- Causes of war and peace
- Formation of detachment.

For our present purpose, we shall limit our considerations to the second point. Once we come to the conclusion that another world war would risk the total destruction of humanity and the earth, we must find a way to prevent it effectively because we cannot allow even one more risk. We must immediately identify the sufficient cause of war so that we may tackle the right problem. By the capacity of our critical mind we find that it is attachment. We find further that all the four previous paradigms belong to the same category -- philosophy of attachment -- that is, when an opinion is confirmed right, then all the others must be wrong. The followings are the sequences of attachment:

Attachment	begets	*Division*
Division	begets	*Competition*
Competition	begets	*Distrust*
Distrust	begets	*Annihilation*
Annihilation	begets	*Fighting and War*

It is not surprising, then, that the whole course of the history of mankind is full of wars and fightings. It is a pitiful observation that the whole of human history has seen only one fortnight of global peace -- only fourteen days with no record of any fighting between nations. It was the special fortnight after the explosion of the atomic bomb over Nagasaki.

So, if we could eradicate attachment from human minds, it would be like throwing the cause of war into the flames, or cutting the invading fire at the wind head, as a Thai motto says. By so doing, we hope to end wars, fightings and quarrellings from the roots. Detachment will replace attachment, thus:

Detachment	begets	*Division of Responsibility*
Division of Responsibility	begets	*Collaboration*
Collaboration	begets	*Trust*

Trust	begets	*Mutual Understanding*
Mutual Understanding	begets	*Peace*

We conclude, then, that if we want peace we must eradicate attachment.

CONSEQUENCES

1. After the two World Wars, philosophy paid special attention to dissolving the attachment in human mind. It tried to present a variety of topics to plant doubts in the mind of the new generations. Kant's philosophy has been presented largely as an analysis that leads to doubting the truth-value of our experiences and knowledge. Other ideas have also been proposed, for examples, that the straight line may be longer than the curved one, the rocket that runs straight away may come to the starting spot, etc. Our actual curricula seem to persuade our students to doubt and shun attachment.

2. After some time, the campaign seems to be too successful: the new generation becomes more and more detached, but as a side effect, many become skeptic about the new education. There are signs of longing for the old days and the utopia of a paradise lost. However, philosophically speaking, we can by no means return to and promote the philosophy of attachment; the consequences would be so disastrous that it is worth risking a new way out.

The important side effect of extreme detachment is the confused mind whose symptoms are worrying without reason, dissatisfaction with life, spleen, and finally suicide. There is a great gap between generations. The old generation, understanding neither itself nor the new generation, blames the new generation and tries to draw it back to the old standard. The new generation, likewise understanding neither itself nor the old generation, perseveres with obstinacy. Both generations, misunderstanding the real causes of the gaps, and misunderstanding each other, regretfully miss the solution of the problems. As the primary cause of all these affairs is philosophy, so the authentic solution must be philosophical.

3. Some suggest transcendental intuitionism as the solution, reasoning that as we are not clever enough, but have to believe the clever persons who reach transcendental intuition. We have to accept them with devotion, commit ourselves to them and put all their teaching into practice with a firm conviction that our masters are correct. This way, in fact, helps many to cure themselves from confusion and hesitation, but it cannot solve the problem of society. If the schools remain small, usually they have no problem, but as soon as the schools become great, they beget jealousy and panic. The reason is that this way leads back to attachment, trading attachment to persons for attachment to thoughts. The consequences repeat the same process: attachment, division, competition, distrust, annihilation and war.

4. Some suggest pragmatism as the solution, that is, competing for practical efficiency. Many in our days can avoid being worried by becoming competing salesmen. They try to reach the target and even to go beyond the target. They can, in fact, avoid being worried, but after some time, many of them become stressed and have to cure themselves. This surely is not the right way to solve the problem of stress.

5. Some suggest solving the problem by the "Three Dares Principle": 1) dare to encounter the problem, 2) dare to evaluate the solutions, and 3) dare to act with responsibility. However this principle has to be implemented humbly, otherwise one may lack human relationship and fall out with others.

6. The last and the best way is dialogue. This way is slow but sure. It opens the way to all kinds of goodness. It encourages the collaboration without requiring agreement, and it creates an atmosphere of detachment in place of attachment.

7. Peace is to be firmly established on the basis of mutual understanding, by accepting the fact that men have different gifts, different ways of doing good, different reasons for doing good. Following the principle of "Unity in Diversity," or better still "Diversity in Unity" means always to praise all forms and all reasons for doing good.

8. We hold the principle of detachment, but are not attached to it; in practice we hold:

In necessity, unity,
In contingency, liberty,
In totality, charity.

Philosophy: the Source and Center of Globalized Culture

There is a serious problem at the level of graduate studies for the topics of human knowledge are subdivided into so many tiny branches that the branches lose contact with one another. Many scholars may be compared to the foresters who, though walking in the forest, do not see the forest for the trees. Some see only one species of trees, some see only the leaves, some see only the trunks, some others see only the soil, etc. In reality all these topics are correlated. If all these scholars, while concentrating themselves on the tiny topics of their interest remember that each tiny topic forms a part of the whole and has relation with all other topics of knowledge, their dedication might bring more benefits to humanity and the human race might be safer.

Philosophy, being taught and learnt in a proper way, will help the students effectively to see the correlation of subjects in an easy way, for philosophy is the origin and source of all subjects of knowledge, either directly or indirectly. All the applied branches of contemporary philosophy follow up the progress of all branches of knowledge using pure philosophy as the common core of their investigations. As all branches of knowledge are derived from philosophy and all aspects of human civilization are influenced by the philosophy of their period, any change in philosophy also affects the development of every branch of knowledge from their roots. In the opposite way, the difficulties that arise from the field of application may inspire new question leading to philosophy and finding a better way out.

Question
Answer
Question
Answer
Question
Answer

This figure tells us that philosophy of humanity progresses through questions and answers. Each new answer leads to the change of all human activities, resulting in progress in all aspects of a culture.

CONCLUSION

Humanity has come a long way through trial and error. We have tried every mode of distrust only to see it fail time and again. Still, it is not easy to convert people from distrust to trust. Only by deliberately engaging in breaking down the walls of distrust can we open the way to the trust on which friendship is based. History has brought us to the brink of a "high-tech" global society. In the past those focused on worldly powers competed among themselves for the upper hand. Those dedicated to the Kingdom of the Good in the name of a true love are the very contradiction of such competitiveness. How did the former manage to awaken to the error of competitiveness before the latter? They learned how to join forces to exploit those dedicated to the good. The latter still are so divided, so bent on competing with each other, that they make themselves easy prey and even collaborate in the destruction of others who should be our allies. How can this be?

The pressing task is to learn how to collaborate with sincerity rather than to continue to compete in building the Kingdom of God (which I equate with the Kingdom of the Good, or in Thai expression, the Kingdom of Dharma). We need both a *kenosis* and a *metanoia*. *Kenosis* means emptying oneself of the "old man" with its timeworn way of loving what is like us and competing with what is different from us. This emptied self can then be filled up through a *metanoia* to open eyes to a new way of seeing: the contemporary way or paradigm. With this new outlook, we can become a "new man" that sets no limits on love. "If you love only the people who love you why should God reward you? Even the tax collectors do that" (Matt. 5:46).

Only in this way can a truly enriching sharing come about, for

Detachment begets Division of Responsibility
Division of Responsibility begets Collaboration
Collaborationbegets Trust
Trustbegets Mutual Understanding
Mutual Understandingbegets Real Peace in all levels

Only then can we expect true and internationally mutual understanding which is, without doubt, the most valuable fruit that education for peace can bear. We must begin now to educate the next generation internationally by the Fifth Paradigm, that is, to rejoice in and for the happiness of others without discrimination?

All the above considerations cannot be otherwise than a serious program of education for preparing humanity for the culture of the global village.

CHAPTER XVI

RELIGION AND SOCIAL HARMONY

MARGARET CHATTERJEE

Introduction

The consideration of the relation between religion, social harmony, and globalization marks out a sphere where there have been tendencies toward both universalization and differentiation. My initial response is to suggest that religion on its own is not something that can work either for or against social harmony because it cannot be divorced from economic and political factors and the day -- today commerce between persons. So in separating religion and social harmony for discussion, we are in fact isolating one strand in a very complex fiber. My second caveat is that people interact with each other and not religions *per se*, and that these interactions spring from a diversity of motives and contexts. Our tendency to identify people in terms of their religious affiliation is often misleading and moreover boundary-building. In this connection I may mention two comments which recently caught my eye. Voltaire wrote: "Enter the Exchange of London, that place more respectable than many a court, and you will see there agents from all nations assembled for the utility of mankind. There the Jew, the Mohammedan and the Christian deal with one another as if they were of the same religion, and give the name of infidel only to those who go bankrupt."[1] It has been said that this remark was influenced by Spinoza's high opinion of the city of Amsterdam and its economic freedom which he expressed as follows:

> In this most flourishing state, and most splendid city, men of every nation and religion live together in the greatest harmony and ask no questions before trusting their goods to a fellow-citizen, save whether he be rich or poor, and whether he generally acts honestly or the reverse. His religion and sect is considered of no importance.[2]

I mention these two rather startling passages not in praise of mercantile activity so much as to underline the point that amicable relations among people of different faiths seem to hinge on a focus outside religion itself, a healthy communication which prospers through trust, honesty and operations according to unwritten rules of fair dealing. Trade, over the centuries, has provided such a focus. So also have scholarly activities and interchanges. To suggest the mediated nature of amicable relations as I do contrasts with the current interfaith or dialogic alternative which tackles religion head-on.

In what follows, two thinkers hide behind my back as it were, urging me in contrary directions. They are a most unlikely pair: Alexis de Tocqueville and Mahatma Gandhi. They come to mind because, whereas de Tocqueville believed that family, religion and democratic political participation serve to moderate individualism in American life, Gandhi thought that certain elements in the religious impulse could serve to moderate not self-conscious individualism but its opposite, the incipient hostility of competing solidarities. This way of setting up the debate may be of some interest not only *vis-à-vis* the ongoing communitarian/liberal debate, but also in the context of controversy over the `privatization' of religion and the claim that privatization is the only way that religion and social harmony can be reconciled. In order to embark on these perilous waters the

conflictual potentialities and actualities of religious life need to be faced squarely before we can proceed further.

Cohesive and Conflictual Roles of Religion

At least two generations of sociologists have analyzed for us in some detail the role of religious adherence in promoting self-identity and self-affirmation and, on the other hand, providing a social nexus and social cohesion through establishing practices which bond groups. Religion, moreover, is seen to offer opportunities for life-enhancing experiences both at the individual and group level. The religious community establishes a mode of existing that lies between the intimacy of dyadic relationship of the kind that Martin Buber wrote about and the more distant relationships belonging to the public realm. Put in this way, a religious community, at least of the ecclesia type, sits somewhere between the private and public domains. If it amounts to a voluntary association of a Rousseauesque or de Tocquevillean kind (and which as such cannot but have a legitimate place in civil society), a religious community nonetheless challenges both the private and public domains by reason of its claim to authority. Such authority, it must be said, may run counter to individual conscience or to state-administered law. The diverse opinions that can be held regarding these possibilities depend on which reading of particular histories one favors. In any case it would seem that religion both links and separates people, but such separation may bear rich fruit. For example the rise of dissenting sects in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, whether on account of infant baptism, or the varying dictates of scripture, individual conscience or ecclesiastical authority, bore a goodly harvest across the Atlantic. Out of affirmation of the right to dissent stemmed in due course a discourse of rights celebrated by Thomas Paine, to which, in our time, Martin Luther King could appeal in the civil rights campaign. Here we have an original religious stand passing over into the public domain, even becoming enshrined in the U.S. Constitution, and thereby producing an indispensable instrument for producing social harmony.

There was an additional twist to how matters of conscience were conceived and this became explicit in the eighteenth century. Not only should states not interfere with religious beliefs, but the state could not in fact succeed in doing so (even though they could restrict practice) since matters of belief were not controlled by the will. Rousseau's great contemporary David Hume had maintained that they were not controlled by reason. Given the faculty-psychology of the times, what remained were the "affections," a term used by both Jonathan Edwards and the Wesleys. Writing in the 1830s, de Tocqueville could use the phrase `habits of the heart' in the wider sense of mores, even so, the language chosen bears the mark of the period. For several decades the merits and demerits of `enthusiasm' had occasioned lengthy debate.[3] Those who spoke against it usually did so from an anti-Pietist, rationalist perspective, who, like Kant, warned against the transience of the affections. There was also, some thought, a certain unseemliness about dithyrambic behavior in places of worship. Hasids met similar responses from non-Hasidic Jews around the same time and have since then. Could untamed passions perhaps spill over onto the streets? This may have been a passing thought in the minds of those who recalled the *sansculottes*.

What I have said so far suggests that religious conflict, and indeed conflict of other kinds as well, can be contained and even tamed by a neutral state that shows partiality to none, and by due process of law, which can ensure that lawful property is protected and harm to others prevented. That harm can be done within isolated enclaves bearing religious labels, with the state either unaware of what is going on or committed to non-interference by the Constitution. This was

illustrated in recent years by events in Waco, Texas. The debatable harmony created in an ostensibly religious enclave resulted in disastrous consequences for all living there.

This would suggest that the apparent social harmony attained in a religious microgroup is by no means self-legitimating. An authoritarian leadership that excludes any possibility of inner dissension can bring about a social harmony, which on closer inspection is markedly Fascist. To see religion as indispensable glue, in other words, is far too simplistic. The Waco phenomenon shows a development contrary to what I earlier described as the development of an ethos of dissent into a secular discourse of rights to which all could appeal. It in fact indicates one possible outcome of dissent cut loose from the public domain, namely promotion of a lifestyle that abrogates rights enjoyed by those who live in the public domain.

This points to two hazards. One is the hazard of isolation, of an in-group religion becoming a collective private domain phenomenon. The other is the hazard involved, especially for minorities, if religion percolates the public domain, and most dangerous of all, enters the arena of state policy. This would be a dilemma if these were the only alternatives, but I do not believe that this is the case. For one thing it is wise to recall the variety of organizations deemed religious or quasi-religious. But I shall not detail this here. It is time to examine individualism, cast as it often is in the role of bogey by those who seek to find in religion a prospect of social harmony.

IS INDIVIDUALISM A BOGEY?

It cannot be any part of my limited agenda to say much about the libertarian/communitarian debate which ping-pongs across the Atlantic. My comments must be selective. When F. de Lamennais uses the word `individualism' in 1829[4] he does so (and I paraphrase) to identify what he thinks destroys the very idea of obedience and duty and as such destroys both power and law. A no less vigorous defender of the ancient regime, Edmund Burke, with the rumble of gunfire audible across the Channel, speaks woefully of the dust and powder of individuality.[5] De Tocqueville, musing on both individuality and individualism, laments the way both break the `woof of time' and `efface' the track of generations. That individualism has been criticized from the standpoint of conservative lobbies is evident. De Tocqueville's angle is perhaps more moderate, bearing in mind what he sees as the untrammelled growth of individualism in the context of American democracy. He looks upon religion as a tempering influence on what he regards as a tendency towards obsession with `well-being,' a word which in recent times has been more extensively analyzed. By contrast, his contemporary John Stuart Mill can see the oppressive role played by those who sought to control the individual. Publicly approved `habits of the heart' can impact painfully if not disastrously on particular individuals whether in a small New England town or anywhere else. As an admirer of what he called `experiments in living' and one who had borne the brunt of public criticism of his own personal life-style, Mill was well placed to defend individualism.

Contemporary critics of individualism, who turn their fire on one or another of the many versions of liberalism available, target a variety of phenomena between which they often fail to discriminate. The ragbag includes features belonging to late-capitalist economies, urban life, employment patterns, (especially the entry of women into the work force), loss of authority, loss of values, and so forth. Frequent references to the pantechnicon term, "post-modernity," surface in recent writing.

The implied remedies are various. Fukuyama's latest analysis[6] pinpoints loss of family life. Much of what he includes under this is really a lament that women now claim the individuality hitherto assumed by men. Those who idealize past rural communities forget that those communities

were historically embedded in feudal economies controlled by unconstitutional monarchies. The intermediate institutions beloved of a Rousseau or a de Tocqueville and now strongly recommended by Amitai Etzioni are hard to promote when the locus of work, family and local community are all at a distance from each other. A fatigue-driven society finds it difficult to find time or energy for the community-centered activities of citizenship. Since they have no address they can scarcely be expected to identify with the very communities that marginalize them. Leaving these considerations to one side for the moment, I turn to the Indian scene.[7]

Individual and Society in India

Hindu society is often regarded as communitarian to a fault. Grounds for such a view are usually found in kinship patterns and caste. Part of the analysis of these characteristics concerns the distinctive way in which religious traits are embedded in Hindu culture, Western analogies for which would have to be identified in the medieval period, especially in the guild system, i.e., in the idea of a non-competitive economy.

Until relatively recently one might have cited caste as a particularly successful example of religion, or rather more properly, of quasi-religious elements of a cultural complex, promoting social harmony. A parallel for such a view might be found in the idea of `my station and its duties.' In practice, caste organizations at their best, whether at the village level or otherwise, provide a social safety net, supporting individuals who, as happens increasingly these days, move from their places of origin, so that they are not without resource in unfamiliar surroundings. For example, a `*Pahali*' or human moving from the hills to a town in the plains will come with an introduction to the local `*biradali*' or brotherhood, which will help him to find work and a place to stay. Caste is playing an increasingly important role at election time, and while on the one hand this may seem to run counter to the individuality which the franchise celebrates, the difficulties of mobilizing opinion in a vast electorate are in fact met by an appeal to a range of interests of which caste is only one. Religious identities compete with a host of others, such as linguistic and regional affiliations.

Some recent developments that have mitigated the importance of caste also need mention. First, there has been a flattening out of hierarchies consequent to a rise in the standard of living since Independence. A similar trend is noticeable in Britain where the power of money tends to be the chief marker of status. However, in the long run, old stratifications tend to be succeeded by new ones, but only over time. Legislative policies can supersede social boundaries and create new opportunities. These can give rise to new conflicts,[8] some of which appear in the guise of religion but which on closer inspection are not really such. Secondly, the electoral mechanism plus the government policy of reserving a quota of government posts[9] for the so-called "Scheduled Castes and Tribes" have jointly led to the sudden promotion of those at the bottom of the social scale to positions of status.

One might ask what religion has to do with this cluster of issues. To begin with, policies at the top, which seek to remedy injustices through legislation, often fail because of the lack of supporting facilities, such as training, to improve the qualifications of the underprivileged. Resentment is felt among other minorities, e.g., Muslims, Christians and Buddhists, if special privileges are accorded to a particular section of society. What results is only too often an unseemly competition in backwardness. The so-called *Dalits* (meaning `the oppressed') mostly "Scheduled Castes" in south India, overlap with Christians; in fact a large number, especially in Tamil Nadu and Karnataka are Christian. They are currently in a conflictual relation with caste Hindus, suffering as they still do from the prejudices of the latter especially in rural areas far from towns. Christians find themselves

in an anomalous position in the country as a whole, a large proportion, whether in the South or in Orissa, Chhota Nagpur or the North East being originally of "Scheduled caste or tribe" origin. *Qua* Christians, they technically have no caste. However, they wish to claim the privileges of their original communities, including eligibility for the reserved quota of government posts.[10] To this day the government has not seen fit to agree to any such request. While the truly able are absorbed into the coveted cadres on grounds of merit through open competition, the less able have to seek other avenues of employment.

One obvious way out would be to make economic deprivation the criterion of positive discriminatory measures and to remove any hint of a religious or quasi-religious element creeping in. The reason this has not happened so far is that the Indian Constitution singles out Scheduled castes and tribes (SC+ST) for special treatment. It is noteworthy, however, that the largest minority of all, the Muslims,[11] have succeeded in making their way in the multicultural society without any such protection and without asking for any. There would in any case have been no rationale for singling out Muslims for special affirmative action since those who wanted any such thing went to Pakistan at the time of Partition. Sikhs, Buddhists and Jews likewise make their contribution to Indian society and compete for cadre posts on equal terms with everyone else.

This rather long excursion into caste prefaces what I wish to say about individuality in Indian society, for as I see it, the Hindu life-world lays particular emphasis on individuality in at least three ways. The first of these is provided by the concept of*swadharma*, literally one's own particular path of ethical living. This idea affirms and legitimates individuality to the extent of reconciling it with the institution of the *guru*, which might seem to pull in a different direction. A *guru* does no more than to set a pupil on a path of self-discovery, a path which he must discover for himself. Lest this be taken to amount to relativism, it must be said that the word *dharma*, from which *swadharma* is a cognate form, indicates what could be called "righteousness," as such. So like some strands in Greek thought, we find herein the notion of a conflation of path and goal and a value set on stability and equilibrium. *Dharma* is not regarded as a religious notion although ironically enough the only word that serves in any role like that of "religion" is *dharma*. *Dharma*, strictly speaking, operates at the level of *samaj* or society, that is the*vyavahalika* or behavioral level.

The second way that Hindu life recognizes individuality is through the notion of *istadevata* which literally means one's own god. This neatly rules out trying to influence others to opt for a different god or convert to a different path. In fact the very concept of belief, as of conversion, sits uneasily within such a framework. What it does accommodate, interestingly enough, is multiple allegiance,[12] and this is why in temples one often sees that the image of more than one deity installed. It is not uncommon in Bengal, for example, for a *Vaishnava* (a devotee of *Vishnu*) living in Calcutta to attend discourses at the*Ramakrishna* Mission, listen to recitations of the *Ramayana* or *Gita* in the local park and go for holidays at the *Aurobindoashram* in Pondicherry. All of these are quite compatible. It is as if the diversity of practices provided multiple entry points into a single mansion. Here is an example of choice, providing not an exclusive principle but rather an inclusive one. Such an approach sees truth as inexhaustible and recognizes that human attempts to enter therein are but partial and inadequate.

The third feature of the Hindu way of life relevant to this part of our inquiry is the concept of *moksa* or liberation seen as an individual quest. There is a paradox here for the quest of *moksa* involves above all leaving the self behind. The successive stages of life move from the life of the young aspirant to knowledge to the householder stage, followed by withdrawal from the world and eventually the attainment of complete renunciation. These indicate the values appropriate at different times of life, mapping a journey, which passes through the phase of solidarity, seen in

mid-life as involvement in *samaj* (society) through the family. However the final stage is not to return to the cave where others dwell, but to enter into the cave of the heart.

The paradox remains because the high point of the self comes when it loses itself. This is symbolized in the folk tale of the salt doll who longed to see the sea, but of course melted away as soon as she entered it. Put in a more academic way, the message is that *stadhana* is related to what one is, and so plurality of *sadhanas* is taken for granted. The appropriate question to ask a Hindu, therefore, is not what he or she believes, but what is their *sadhana*. Even this would be a strange thing to ask one who was not evidently following a particular *ascesis* (a *sadhu* for example), about which one wished to know more.

What Gandhi does with what I have identified as individualistic elements in the Hindu tradition is to extend the soteriology of *moksa* into an understanding of liberation which includes transformation at the economic, social and political levels. The quest for *moksa* is traditionally embedded in a way of thinking which looks upon bondage in the shape of suffering as something which human beings inherently desire to get rid of. Gandhi's study of law and Western political thought enables him to graft onto this primal branch the concept of rights, especially the right to freedom on a national scale, and to forge the non-violent weapon of *satvagraha* which enlists self-suffering in order to reveal injustices at the collective level. The multiple solidarities at the level of *samaj* could in this way be mobilized in order to promote solidarity in the nation. A national struggle could become a vehicle for nourishing social harmony. This is why I initially suggested that while de Tocqueville might have had reason to speak of the restraining role of religion in the context of American individualism, Gandhi was concerned with a different need, the need to transform the individual impulse towards a transcendental goal into the desire to transform society, and furthermore transform competing solidarities into the wider solidarity of the nation. The latter aspect takes us to a new theme, that of multiculturalism and how very diverse religious heritages can contribute or fail to contribute to social harmony.

THE MULTICULTURAL SITUATION AND THE POSSIBILITY OF SOCIAL HARMONY

In this present century, fast approaching its end, many countries hitherto unfamiliar with the presence of people from other places have awakened up to the fact that `strangers' are in their midst, not merely as visitors, but as those who intend to stay. Such `new citizens' may or may not look different. While such `otherness' may he exotic and attractive when one is abroad it can be a different matter when `otherness' intrudes in the form of strange smells and loud noises emanating from the third floor back and those responsible represent rivals in the job market. We need to distinguish, however, between the situations, (1) in India where the multicultural nature of society is a fact of history (2) in America as virtually a society of those who first came as immigrants (the original inhabitants remaining as drastically diminished enclaves and (3) in societies where the influx of immigrants in large numbers is a relatively recent phenomenon.

Religion as a cultural trait manifests itself in the third example in the form of beliefs and practices cut loose from their previous moorings in territoriality. What, in the overall view, looks like a vast moving caravan of globalizing processes, is at the micro level, rather different i.e. an impinging of multi-parochialisms upon each other. This is what one might expect when people confront the difference between immigration to an expanding frontier or to a densely populated urban center. The same is the case when we consider the diverse motivations for immigration, e.g., persecution in the country of origin, flight from famine and/or rural indebtedness, desire for

economic betterment, or invitation of the host country. The religious component within such diversities can only be assessed on a case by case basis. I shall restrict myself to a few comments on what I have noticed about the contemporary situation in Britain.

Since the last of the various motivations mentioned may be surprising, I shall say a little about Afro-Caribbean immigration into the host country, for this took place at the invitation of the British government. The person charged with the task of recruiting a work force after the war in order to make up for sustained losses of manpower was Enoch Powell, who later became notorious for spearheading a "Go home" campaign which was at the center of a far-right, racist lobby that sporadically surfaces to this day. Several decades have gone by, and the new immigrants are no longer necessarily at the bottom of the heap. What is of interest in relation to our present discussion is the enormous proliferation of churches and chapels within the black community in Britain and the networking function that these provide. The charismatic style of worship predominates, and if the churches originally provided a `haven' in an often hostile world they now serve as foci of social life, but not in a culturally affirmative and provocative way. My impressions at this point are derived from what I hear from the students who come to study theology. As we would expect, residence in enclaves means that occasions of friction arise versus `others' on the fringes of the areas concerned. Moreover, Afro-Caribbean religious life, a few cults apart, falls within the received `faith' of the host country. In the event of inner city violence, the church network is active in campaigning on behalf of the victims as is the case in America and South Africa. Church membership is rarely `mixed.' Most see herein a racism which Christian allegiance seems to leave untouched, while others see no harm in opting to be with one's own kind. Cultural `sampling' takes place when a black choir is invited to sing in a white church as a special event.

The conflicting elements at the wider societal level are very familiar, e.g. economic competition with the factor of race added, housing shortages, overreaction of the police, etc. No doubt religious institutions provide foci for community identity. At a more intellectual level rapprochement in pastoral or theological contexts is hampered by the fundamentalism prevalent in the churches concerned. However, this is not a matter confined to the black caucus churches. The degree to which church organizations are hierarchical or otherwise and also the interesting question of women's involvement in ministry are all relevant to `social' harmony but cannot be discussed here.

My second example concerns Hindu communities in urban Britain. The immigrants from deprived rural areas, who came directly from the sub-continent, arrived without their families. Those who came from East Africa, and who were relatively well-off and had a more privileged background, came with their families. A large proportion of the latter were *Gujerati* who hailed from a variety of *sampradavas* or religious traditions. The need for establishing places for community worship or for social occasions became more pressing once the families of the former immigrants, in large part from Punjab, arrived. Without such centers, the womenfolk in particular would have had virtually no social life at all. Three matters catch the eye at the moment as far as Hindu life in Britain is concerned. First, the facilities used accommodate a variety of activities, e.g., *havan*[13], recitations and discourses. Secondly, attempts are made to formulate[14] matters of belief in the interest of satisfying adult inquirers and helping children to answer queries raised by their peers in school. The third feature is the presence of `white' converts to groups such as Transcendental Meditation, the Hare Krishna movement, and the Divine Light Mission. Family requirements and a variety of sources of funding can be detected on the scene both in India and in Britain. The large temple complex at Neasden in Britain is a showpiece for the community, its sectarian provenance (*Swaminarayan*) being no bar to the variety of devotees it attracts. The temple

also reveals the extent of Hindu diasporic links without which the vast outlay could not have been met. While such a temple expresses cultural affirmation on a very conspicuous scale, what goes on in hundreds of converted flats, rooms and even former churches is perhaps more revealing.

Although religious education in British schools is compulsory and world religions are taught, the government has ruled that Christianity has to have priority on the syllabus. The various Hindu meeting places fill a gap felt by Hindu families and serve a kind of Sunday School function in addition to their other functions, with a view to passing on their own tradition to the next generation.

As far as the white followers of `Eastern traditions' are concerned they illustrate what it is like when practices are cut loose not only from territoriality but also from a whole cultural matrix. Boundary crossing is not just a matter of opting, but of being accepted. The presence in Britain of Western Hindus and Buddhists can be regarded as evidence either that these are `world religions,' which require no ethnic affiliation, or that the phenomena should be looked upon as features of `British religion,' along with `New Age,' paganism and the like. I cannot see any particular relation between these latter day phenomena and the promotion of social harmony. Compliments are returned with a vengeance, for example when an unused church in Golders Green is turned over to Hare Krishna devotees. In a mainly Jewish locality, a few interested observers watch processions go by, probably enjoying a splash of color on a grey winter morning and confirming their belief that Eastern practices are both exotic and quaint. Or should one regard the whole experience as an excellent exercise in toleration? It is to this latter and most difficult question that I must turn now.

Interreligious Conflict and the Ethics of Toleration

Any treatment of our theme would be unrealistic if one did not take into account the highly conflictual role of religion, albeit in association with politics, currently playing in various regions of the world. It is ironic that at a time when there are so many kinds of `otherness' outside the sphere of religion -- culture, gender, race, distinctions between rich and poor and privileged and underprivileged, to take just a few examples, religious otherness should obtrude to the extent it does. The ways in which de Tocqueville's three areas, i.e., religion, family and democratic participation, can conflict are very obviously manifold. For example, the entry of women into the public arena can conflict with any religious tradition that requires that women be restricted to the domestic sphere. Women in Pakistan, Algeria, Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Turkey currently fight for democratic rights and in the last two countries have achieved some small modicum of success. Theocratic states have shown themselves to be oppressive not only of women, but also of religious minorities. A very recent evidence of this is the failure of any punitive action being taken after the assassination of a Christian priest in one such country. Theocratic states can also subvert the family by forbidding women's entry into the labor market even though women may be the only earning members of their families. The examples could be multiplied. When toleration is advocated in such contexts, one encounters several difficulties which can be set out in a philosophical manner as follows.

Tolerance cannot be an uncontroversial good because there is much that we should not tolerate, e.g. the abuse of children, the torture of prisoners, the marginalization suffered by millions in a large number of countries. What, after all, is the core conception of toleration? One suggestion is that `it amounts to a deliberate choice not to interfere with conduct which is disapproved.'[15] Is disapproval always moral? If disapproval includes or overlaps with dislike, it could be said, quite possibly, to have a non-moral element. Then another concept usually surfaces in the discussion, that of entitlement to respect. Yet what is it exactly that we are called upon to respect? Entitlement to respect is surely contingent and relative. The *Gauleiter* who has just turned on the gas in the

concentration camp is not entitled to respect. Entitlement to respect is a contestable concept. Now we encounter a sheaf of arguments about the self and the elements that constitute it.

For example, Sandel[16] insists that the self is partly constituted by its attachments, and he would probably include sentiments as well. He further maintains that self and community are bound together in the `intersubjective self.' Taking both conditions together, on such a view the embedding of the self would be on a scale which precluded not only reflection or detachment, but also, even more seriously, precluded education.

Toleration, it may be recalled, was honed as a concept in the context of sectarian strife. Have we added to our armory in any way since then? Negotiation and compromise, and, in the very long view, education, might be seen as alternatives, and sometimes seem to replace a discourse of rightness and wrongness. The `strategically necessary' is often offered these days as the only resource which can defuse a conflictual situation. Contemporary political discourse ranges between the practical realism that lies behind the concept of the strategically necessary at one pole and the dilemmas of autonomous choice at the other. As an illustration of the latter, how would one choose between a society that subordinated young women but provided security in old age, and one which did neither? The example is highly theoretical for not many people are privileged either to choose the society in which they wish to live or to change the one in which they do live. All in all, the long debate on toleration which comes to a head in the 18th century and winds into our own times hardly provides much guidance through the thicket of 20th century horrors and tensions. If the core conception of toleration is as Horton and Nicholson say,[17] it can subvert positive intervention to stem practices which need stemming, regardless of whether they shelter under the cloak of religion or not. At this point in the discussion I would like briefly to turn to the thought and practice of Mahatma Gandhi who grappled for decades with the problem of reconciling religion with social harmony and for whom there were resources which could take us beyond the limited scope of the concept of tolerance.

Gandhi, `Otherness,' and Social Harmony

Gandhi lived in a country which had been subjected to many invasions, especially during the last thousand years, and so was well aware of the way religious `otherness' was identified through sources of authority (including scriptures and institutions), traditions (including dress, food, festivals, and educational systems), and more specifically, beliefs. He could see also that there were different kinds of otherness that could be more obtrusive, e.g. that between rich and poor, the otherness of a colonial power, and sectarian differences within a single community. However, the obstacles set up by religions were to be taken seriously. I set out the major ones as follows:

a. Doctrine, e.g., exclusivist accounts of truth, especially the notion of the Truth.
b. Provocative vocabulary, e.g., `heathen,' `pagan,' `idolaters,' `infidels,' `unbelievers.'
c. Provocative rituals: Does religious sentiment validate each and every practice?
d. Provocative situations, e.g., processions, music before mosques, cow slaughter.
e. Memories of catastrophic experiences, including inherited memories.

Hindus have never defined themselves *vis-à-vis* others, as belonging to the majority as they do, there has never been a need to do so. The two most common strategies in India have been either assimilation or resorting to water-tight compartments. However, over long periods of time,

composite cultural phenomena have developed, and this is shown in the spheres of dress, food, music, architecture, and language.

Common visits to shrines provide a particularly interesting illustration of the mutual accommodation of Hindus and Muslims in pre-Partition rural India and even now. Social harmony, as Gandhi saw it, had always been there at grassroots level. What was needed was an understanding of why things went wrong from time to time and thinking out how conflicts could be prevented.

Gandhi's experience in South Africa showed him how people from different regional and religious backgrounds who faced common disabilities could pool their talents and work together. His day to day campaigns brought Gandhi not only in touch with Hindus but also with Jains, Christians, Muslims, Parsis, and Jews. He found loyal associates among his Jewish friends,[18] made a special friend of a Sufi saint for whom he undertook legal work, noted that Zulus who converted to Islam entered the brotherhood on equal terms, and was befriended by Christians of various denominations. However, he was not permitted to enter a white church when his friend Charlie Andrews preached there. In his responses to concrete situations one sees his ways of tackling the challenges listed.

Gandhi's contribution to discussions about religious truth lies in his stress on the fragmentariness of human visions of the truth. He saw in this a very intelligible basis for democracy. Granting that each had a fragment of the truth, all had an obligation to strive for the larger truth, that is, the creation of a non-violent society. The obstacles presented by various kinds of provocation received his constant attention. Non-violence concerned speech, no less than action. On one occasion when Muslims complained about the noise created by Hindu processions passing outside a mosque his reaction was a revealing one. He took the Muslims to task, saying that if they were praying as they should they would not have even noticed anything happening outside. He also scolded the Hindus, saying they could easily have chosen another route for their procession.

Here are examples of different kinds.[19] When Gandhi went to East Bengal in the wake of communal riots, where Hindus had been at the receiving end, he told the remaining Hindus that they should not run away but should try to rebuild their lives in spite of what had happened. In another locality he set up joint peace-keeping committees among those who were left. When he was criticized by some of his associates for choosing people from very lowly walks of life, he asked them, `Do you think they can be represented by those who have run away?' Gandhi always had a sense of situation and an awareness of whom he was addressing. In speaking to a group of Jain shop-keepers, for whom the notion of purity would have provided a powerful metaphor, he suggested that when they criticized others they should be sure they had put their own house in order, in particular, that they should not adulterate their own products.[20] To his close friend Herman Kallenbach, the architect, who had written woefully that his plans had been appropriated by a rival architect, he replied that he should `remember the lesson of last Yom Kippur.'

But on a more general level, how could social harmony he brought about? First, Gandhi advised that our own imperfections must be recognized, as well as the imperfections contained in religious traditions. For example, if *Brahmins* had not traditionally done manual work, then that did not mean that they should not do so now. Since all religions were finite human creations, there was no ground for ranking one as superior to another. All people have unexplored capacities for good, especially capacities for self-sacrifice. If the capacity for good rather than possession of the Truth, were cultivated, there would be no clash between adherents of different faiths. Just as the sense of ego was a barrier to humility, so also communities had a similar failing, believing that their own identities were defined by their traditions.

Traditions were to be selectively appropriated, shedding much that, with new insight, could be seen to be not worth passing on to the next generation. In this respect, although Gandhi's appearance and demeanor may seem highly traditional to some, he was by no means a man who wanted to preserve a heritage unthinkingly. All were capable of growth: a further reason for looking to the future and planning for it. Free India would need Hindus who were better Hindus, Muslims who were better Muslims, and so on. It should also be said that, although as a national leader, Gandhi was anxious to enlist people of all religious persuasions. He did not see nationality as something which divided people from each other. Nationality was the basis of a free and equal polity of nations, in fact of an international order.

Two further matters regarding Gandhi are worth noting. It was essential that grievances should be dealt with, including the grievances of neglected members of one's own community, e.g. the Untouchables as they were called in his day. Sympathy with Muslim sentiment and a desire to enlist the community in the struggle for independence led him to encourage pro-Caliphate agitators. In this his judgment failed him, for encouraging Pan-Islamic affiliation nurtured a separatism that culminated in the creation of Pakistan.

The second matter takes issue with Gregory Baum over a misgiving he has whether solidarity with the oppressed can be said to be a genuinely religious activity, in that this might amount to a loss of inwardness, a loss in fact of the very *fons et origo*of the religious impulse. In Gandhi's own case, of course, any such criticism would misfire. His own *ascesis* included an attentive listening to the `inner voice,' a rigorous daily discipline almost Ignatian in its demands. I believe that Gandhi's way of relating religion and social harmony was to see in the sense of aspiration that there is in religion an impetus of priceless value that could be enlisted to bring about social harmony. This human endowment was not set apart from the ethical sense or its core, the will to non-violence. When he locates his fundamental ontology in *Satya* (Truth), he virtually overturns the familiar vocabulary of Being and Becoming, putting in their place an understanding of *dharma* which makes it both the presupposition and goal of endeavor. The selfless individual would be an instrument of service, such service would resonate and this would bring about social harmony. Music, after all, was the art form which appealed to him most. The word *dhvani*, a key term in the Indian aesthetic of music, means resonance.

CONCLUSION

There can very evidently be no conclusion about the relation of religion and social harmony during the course of an ongoing debate. Moreover, there are vast differences in the situations prevailing in various parts of the globe. A state may be secular and society, not. On the other hand, a state may have an established church while society may be on the whole secular. Social harmony is not impossible to attain in either of these. Perennial values centering on health, family and personal well being do not seem necessarily to hinge on any religious provenance. Some may wish to argue that even where this appears to be the case, the original provenance of such values may be a `social' capital deriving from an earlier religious source.

Thomas Luckmann[21] suggests that religion continues to be an important and indeed universal part of human life, but that there has been a shift in emphasis between `little,' `intermediate' and `great transcendences,' with religious significance now located in the intermediate transcendences of our relations with human beings and the `minimal' transcendences of `modern solipsism.' He describes such a shift in terms of a shrinking span of transcendence which evidences the privatization of religion. However, I tend to see the growth of moral conscience as a breaking into

transcendence in the ethical-religious sphere and to see this showing itself in concern for future generations and a sense of responsibility towards the animal world and the environment. Another feature of our times that strikes me is the way a certain religious ambiance can impart an unmistakable flavor to secular consciousness.

I have referred to this as identifiable in the `mentalité' of the educated Jew and Hindu.[22] An ambiance of this kind is reflected in values such as respect for elders or for the institution of marriage, observances that bond the generations and in a commitment to live justly. If such features of contemporary life appear to be a shift from ultimate reality to ultimate concern, there may yet be an intimate connection between the two.

Finally, the aesthetic connotation of `harmony' built into the phrase `social harmony' prompts a concluding reflection. The *aleatoric* appears to be the keynote of postmodernity, ambiguous as this term is. The positive side of *aleatoric* music is its openness, its paradoxical implicit element of surprise, its improvisatory mode. Harmony after all came late in the history of music. The music of the spheres was probably never thought to be akin to the sound of the shepherd-boy's flute. Nature, whether in Heraclitus or later writers, is recognized as accommodating contending powers. There is perhaps no better musical example of this than Debussy's *La Mer*. When Walt Whitman insisted that morality and religion were related to aesthetics, he was not, I believe, making a plea for naturalism as it may be understood today. The resources of religion are as wide as the ocean, and so there may yet be a hope that religion may make a contribution to the social harmony that has for so long eluded us.

NOTES

1. "Lettres Philosophiques," *Melanges* (Paris: Pleaide, 1961), pp. 17-18.

2. *Theologico-Political Treatise* (Dover, New York, 1951), p 254.

3. There is an odd chiming in of opinion on this in Patanjali's writings where, from a *yogic* standpoint, he speaks of the need to control `the wavelets of the mind.'

4. *Des Progres de la revolution et de la guerre contre l'Eglise*. This appears to antedate by a small margin of time de Tocquevile's use of the word `individualism' in *L'ancien regime et la revolution.*

5. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, O.U.P., p. 96.

6. In lectures in Oxford last year.

7. I use this term since `communal' in Indian usage has a judgmental connotation, signifying abrasive and conflictual attitudes displayed by one community towards another. A `communal situation' means a riot.

8. Analogous processes seem to be at work with respect to affirmative action in other countries too.

9. This has caused great resentment among caste Hindus who tend to he more qualified but overnight find themselves at an enormous disadvantage in the job market. This, within my own memory of the university concerned, sparked the self-immolation of a student in protest against what was seen as an unjust government policy.

10. As a former member of selection committees for appointments to such posts, I have listened to arguments on both sides. The posts are coveted because of their favorable . . . service conditions.

11. 120 million.

12. *Vide*, `The concept of multiple allegiance' in my *The Religious Spectrum* (New Delhi, Allied Publishers 1984).

13. *Puja* (worship), *havan* (a simple ritual involving fire).

14. This has generated pamphlets and other basic literature often couched in the idiom of the host country rather than of the `tradition.'

15. *Toleration: Philosophy and Practice*, eds. (John Horton & Peter Nicholson, Avebury, 1992), p. 2.

16. Michael J. Sandel, *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice* (Cambridge University Press, 1982).

17. See *supra*, p. 17.

18. See my *Gandhi and his Jewish Friends* (London, Macmillan, 1992).

19. I was told these anecdotes by Nilmal Kumar, anthropologist, who accompanied Gandhi on his tour of Noakhali which is a Bengali speaking area.

20. His specific reference was to the adulteration of *ghee* or "unclarified butter."

21. See his article `Shrinking Transcendence, Expanding Religion,' *Sociological Analysis* 1990, SC: 2pp. 127-l3X.

22. See my *Studies in Modern Jewish and Hindu thought* (London: Macmillan, and St. Martin's Press, 1997).

CHAPTER XVII

THE PROMETHEAN MAN EASTWARD OR WESTWARD?

MIHAELA POP

It is already known that the problems which mankind is now facing, at the end of a century and of a millennium, hardly could be considered simple. Europe is trying to find solutions to the consequences of the fall of communism, and especially to the difficult problems of reintegration of the ex-communist countries into the free-market economic system and into the Western-type civilization.

The enthusiasm and satisfaction generated by the destruction of one of the most oppressive totalitarian systems were amazing and strongly motivated. However, the changes the civic way of thinking, the mentalities especially the economic system as well as their evolution towards requirements of the Western system have proven to be more difficult and complicated than they were initially thought to be. Moreover, certain countries, such as Romania, have not yet succeeded in harnessing the initial enthusiasm and energy. Economic reform, as well as administrative and social reforms, are encountering difficulties with long periods of stagnation and various obstacles.

There is also a significant reactionary, conservative force that persists not only on economic levels but also among the intellectuals and thinkers. This conservative attitude is supplied, unfortunately, by significant errors made by political leaders unable to make important decisions and to assume the risks. One could ask oneself why this conservative attitude exists and how it could be diminished in the near future? A possible answer could be given by the modern and contemporary history of Romania.

HISTORICAL CONSPECTUS

Looking attentively in historical studies I found that crises and the problem of connecting to the Western civilization existed during the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century. The 19th century was marked by the revolutionary movement in 1848 which had a significant consequence for Romanians: the union of two Romanian provinces in 1859 and the foundation of a national State based on the European model. Economic consequences as well as cultural and social changes marked the end of that century.

In the 20th century, after World War I, the necessity of a more accentuated capitalist development became obvious. Then as now most intellectuals were oriented in two important directions of thinking on the national problems:

(1) those who desired a rapid integration of the new national state into the community of the Western nations; and

(2) those who were interested in maintaining national identity and in promoting the rural way of life that was considered the only one capable of preserving the ancient Romanian traditions. The sympathizers with the latter cause considered that the Romanian State could be manifestly present in the European context only by its national specificity, an idea inherited from the romantic period of the 18th and 19th centuries and initiated by the German thinking about *Der Volksgeist*.

As a consequence, the 1920s and 1930s were marked by the publication of numerous studies trying to define this national specificity. The studies were written by important thinkers who became, at the end of the 30s, spiritual leaders of a social movement that gained a political status and much sympathy among the people. It was an extremist movement of the political right, Legionarism. In the beginning, it was a cultural movement, understood as an extension of Romanian traditionalism.

One of its spiritual leaders was Nichifor Crainic (1889-1972) who elaborated the theses of orthodoxy and published them in the cultural journal, *The Thinking (Gandirea*). Another spiritual leader was Nae Ionescu (1888-1940), philosopher and professor at the University of Bucharest. He was one of the leaders of the anti-rationalist movement and had a great influence on the generation of young intellectuals who started their carrier at the end of the 20s. Ionescu proclaimed the destruction of positivism and asserted firmly that the world must be led by forces that should reject man's cognitive capacities. Reality was, for him, action. It is religion or a mystic attitude that realize the purpose of all humankind; through them, one can understand the world. Orthodoxy was, in Ionescu's thinking, the real religion and the only one adapted to the way of life of the Romanian peasant. He considered that anybody could become Catholic or Protestant; but he had no doubt that, if somebody is really a Romanian, he was born Eastern Orthodox. Orthodoxy is "a natural way of being in the world" that cannot be acquired by various types of religious practices. The real Romanian citizen lives in a village which is the center of the orthodox spirituality; he should avoid town life because it denaturalized the spontaneous, natural way of living.

Nae Ionescu succeeded in gathering around his personality a group of outstanding young people who afterwards became famous as cultural personalities: Emil Cioran (1911-1995), the philosopher of man's tragic destiny, M. Eliade(1907-1986), the famous historian of religions and Mircea Vulcanescu (1904-1952), philosopher and sociologist. Many of them collaborated on the cultural journal, *Criterion.*

They had no doubt that they were the missionaries of a new spirituality. They cited Swedenborg, Kierkegaard, Sestov, Heidegger, Unamuno, Berdiaev; they were interested in orphism, theosophy, Oriental mysticism and ancient religions; they talked about the providential mission of their generation; and they criticized capitalist mediocrity and materialism with all its forms. Their mission was to realize the unity of the Romanian soul and to determine the spiritual reconstruction of Romania even as their forerunners had achieved the political union. Their desire to push Romania away from its lethargic state of inactivity was obvious. E. Cioran[1] wrote that he felt humiliated by the fact that he was a citizen of a country living like a plant, in a vegetal manner. Romania had nothing to say to Europe for a thousand years. Like Ionescu and Crainic, they were attracted to the Romanian village, the place of the Romanian spirituality; they, too, appreciated the role of Orthodoxy in the modelling of the national experience.

During the 30s, Crainic and Ionescu changed the emphasis of their movement from a religious and cultural attitude to a political one. They expressed their admiration for Fascist politics, especially in the Italian form, and made "autochthonism", defined as a combination of ethnicity and religion, the spiritual product of their personal version of a corporatist state, named "ethnocracy".

The accent on ethnicity and the admiration of the Fascist movement made Carainic change his focus from the venerated East to Rome. In Mussolini's Italy he found the model of an active state based on Christian spirituality that could efficiently combine historical tradition and political experience without the exaggerations of capitalist liberalism. Byzantium was replaced

by Rome. This new type of orthodoxy attracted the younger generation, who "became activists by desperation", as Vulcanescu named them. Ideologically they opposed the main group who were looking for interior harmony in an almost idyllic atmosphere. An interesting aspect of this cultural and political movement is the fact that they wanted, in the same measure as their antagonists, to connect Romania to the coordinates of Western civilization. Its solution was based on emphasizing national specificity and posturing as if afraid of losing the national identity while integrating into the European realm through a process that seems quite similar to our contemporary false problems concerning globalization. The problem discussed so much at this turn of the millennia is that of the danger of losing national identity during the process of globalization; this problem also concerned our forerunners. They did desperate things not because they believed in what they did but because they wanted to believe in them, says Vulcanescu.[2]

The opposition, having liberal conceptions and sympathies, promoted and supported the idea that all sorts of traditionalisms should be abandoned because they were considered the main obstacle against modernization. To maintain at any cost a rural culture, to eulogize the peasant life, to idealize it as well as the Orthodox religion, which was declared to be the unique preserver of Romanian specificity, were not aspects not appreciated by the non-traditaionalists.

Among the representatives of interwar cultural life, who joined together in order to attack the extremist position led by Crainic and his Orthodoxist colleagues, we can mention: Eugen Lovinescu (1881-1943), the main literary critics of that period, and Mihai Ralea (1896-1964), who was the leader of an influential cultural journal, *Viata Romaneasca (Romanian Life)*, one of the spiritual leaders of the moment and a supporter of the pro-European movement. They denounced Orthodoxy as a serious obstacle to express the national specificity just because of its fundamental Byzantine-Slavic characteristic. Another liberal personality of the period was Stefan Zeletin (1882-1934), a philosopher and sociologist.

Lovinescu and Zeletin, as well as Ralea, believed that Orthodox Church did not serve the national interests because it would have denied its proper Romanian substance. Lovinescu named it "the most active ferment of the orientalization of Romania" and considered it an "obscurantist religion stuck in dogmas and formalism"[3] which had imposed on the Romanian people a foreign language, (Slavon) and had thrown the people into the "Slavic sea" which had almost swallowed them. Into this situation came the first Romanian thinker on the European level: Dimitrie Cantemir (1673-1723).

> Enclosed in our dogmas, nothing that was happening in Europe could reach our territory. While the world was rebuilding its bases, nothing was growing in our country; we kept staying hidden in our small pit-houses of wood and reed.[4]

The author discovered the positive influence on our culture and civilization caused by foreign representatives of the Catholic and Protestant Churches. The first religious translations were published in Transylvania, at Brasov (1482) by Protestants.

In Moldavia, the eastern province of Romania, the political, economic and cultural relations with Poland from the 15th to 19th centuries allowed a more profound penetration of the Catholic way of thinking. The Moldavian historiographers visited the old and famous Polish universities such as the Jagellonian University in Cracaw and learned the Latin language. By doing so, these intellectuals were able to understand and to interest themselves in proving the Roman origin of

the Romanian people. At the same time, they promoted the colloquial written Romanian language among the Moldavian *boyars*.

During the 18th century, the Romanian people in Transylvania united with the Roman Catholic Church and, under the influence of the European Enlightenment, they proved and increased their interest in knowledge and the scientific proof of the Latin origin of our language.

Taking into consideration these aspects, as well as others, E. Lovinescu considered that Romanian society has the obligation to re-direct the political, economic and cultural axis from the East towards the West which is a radical change from *ex oriente lux* to *ex occidente lux*.[5]

In order to make this significant change, Lovinescu considered that a modification of the mindset should be performed before making any economic changes. His main idea was that the ideological revolution precedes the economic one. However, today, our actual situation seems to tend the other way. A group of people from political associations and civil society consider that first a changed mentality is necessary, but under the pressure of time the first step should be economic, followed or accompanied by a cultural one.

Lovinescu considered that the only chance to achieve this purpose was to synchronize Romanian society to the West through a process of imitation. The process should take place first at a psychological level. The author used Gabriel Tardes's conception of imitation.[6] The end of the 19th century demonstrated that imitation was useful and successful. It was implemented from the higher to lower levels. It is based on the main sociological idea: imitation of a superior civilization followed by an assimilation process. In this situation, the economic and political forces that effected the change and synchronized the Romanian society to the West, were the liberal forces and the liberal bourgeoisie.

Another pro-Occidental thinker was S. Zeletin.[7] In *The Romanian Bourgeoisie*[8] Zeletin offered an applied, rational and well-argumented study of the imperative of developing the Romanian capitalist society. Zeletin was an advocate of modernization with his vision of corresponding to the facts. He observed that even inside the peasantry changes had been made which were seen as natural and irreversible. The only solution for Romania is to increase and stimulate development of life in all domains.

Zeletin also noticed the existence of a paradox at the psychological level: if the liberal economy promotes a renewed Western spirit within the economic domain, the cultural one is significantly anti-bourgeois. Thus, during the interwar period, a relationship could be achieved between the progressive economic and the conservative cultural processes. Zeletin was referring to the forms of nationalism and xenophobia which he considered real and dangerous obstacles to the effort of "building a modern capitalist nation".

These suggestions point out the Romanian situation during the interwar period which seem similar, *mutatis mutandis*, to the situation at the move into the next century. There is, of course, a significant distinction: the current economic situation is disastrous, causing serious cultural and ideological consequences. The great similarity between these two periods is based on the wish of the majority that Romania be reintegrated into the European civilization in order to be able to participate in the process of globalization.

UNIVERSALISM OR INDIVIDUALISM

In analyzing the cultural ideas and their evolution, I consider Romania to be passing through a period of crises where major political phenomena make it necessary to rethink certain ideological and cultural aspects.

What roles should Romania play? What attitude should it adopt? These are actual political problems. But how does the Romanian citizen respond to the need of adapting to the Western mentality? How much is he or she prepared for this harsh impact of a significantly different civilization and mentality? These are questions which the cultured man should answer if interested in the formative aspect of cultural interaction.

A possible answer can be found, once again, by studying our forerunners. In the following pages, I will refer to the cultural thought of Tudor Vianu, namely, on the cultural condition and its civilizing role in our century.[9]

Vianu was interested not only in the philosophy of culture, but also in its sociological dimension, teaching the first courses of the sociology of culture in Romania at the University of Bucharest in 1933. Culture is a dynamic force which he recognized as a force that activates the spirit and has a teleologic role. Culture promotes man in "his role of self-creator of his destiny".[10] Therefore, culture is an act of human freedom; the man of culture does not accept passively the society in which he lives, but he tries to change it; thus, culture becomes a social phenomenon. It is necessary to assimilate, transmit and change culturally. As these phenomena take place only inside society, it is obviously necessary to know the situation of culture at a certain moment: its characteristics, the basic ideas which govern it and the direction of its progress.

It is necessary to know and analyze the cultural values, how they act, and evolve their rank in a hierarchy. Approaching culture from a philosophical point of view, one can also understand certain past phenomena as well as predict the future.

At 32 years of age, Vianu wrote *About Rationalism and Historism*,[11] in which he described the entire evolution of philosophical and cultural ideas between the 17th and the 19th centuries. He remarked that the passage from the 17th to the 18th century brought Europe a significant change of philosophical perspective from the general and universal to the particular and individual. This passage is not sudden and is specific to all the domains of spiritual life.

From Rousseau to Hegel, European thinking traverses several peaks. The author, Vianu, critically analyzed the role of reason. Starting with Kant and Rousseau, the supremacy of reason established by 17th century Cartesian classicism is strongly eroded. This type of thinking, structured on the universal, which is static, narrows during the following century. Rousseau and Condorcet change the focus towards a certain dynamism which points up the role played by the particular individual.

Herder and Humboldt preached a new cultural ideal -- *the individual soul*. Until that time, humankind had been the only bearer of culture, the Romantics considered that man as an individual to be the cultural agent. Kant considered humanity to be a bearer of culture. For Kant humanity encompassed a quality had by every man; the purpose of humanity was continual progress. On the contrary, Herder considered the individualizing process to be very varied and to cause various individual cultures. Humanity was, for him, a harmonious fulfillment of all possibilities; the purpose of the whole of humankind should be what each man is and can become. Herder stressed that the human purpose is not only the progress of rational thinking, but also a harmonious development of all human qualities and values. If at a political level the state was for Kant the framework where the individual could live according to the rational imperatives. Herder rejects the universalism in nature that demands that life should be harmoniously developed under local, individual conditions.

Humbold deepens the meaning of these ideas. He agrees with the liberal attitude on an almost negative influence of the state which is supposed to assure the protection and safety of its

citizens, but he rejects any interference to the privacy of each person. "The highest ideal of men's co-existence is the one which would assure each man the possibility to fulfil himself from himself and only for himself."[12]

The new idea that dominated in the early 19th century was that mankind divided into particular cultures without obvious connections among them. This new historicist concept of culture was Herder's most important innovation.

But Hegel is the one who achieves the accord between the two conceptions which had been on opposite sides until then: the universalist rationalism and the individualizing historicism. Reason (Spirit) is, for Hegel, a principle immanent not only to general reality, but also to history. Considering that Reason should be autonomous and its substance is freedom, Hegel obtains the interiorization of the idea of freedom which is not a social but interior and metaphysical. When the Spirit, passing through a step-by-step self-awareness, realizes itself in the form of the State, this social form is the embodiment of spirit or freedom.

The individual becomes free when the reasons of his will coincide with the reasons of the Spirit as it is manifested in the form of the State. Thus, Hegel succeeds in combining rationalism (which gives a unique and progressive sense to history) with historicism (individual appreciation of originality at certain moments). The rationalist philosophy of culture supposes a unique progress of humankind towards a universal ideal of domination. Historicism distinguishes among various cultures due to their originality; the ideal is not the progress of humanity, but a harmonious development of individuality.

Nietzsche criticized the historicist and etatist Hegelian vision as it appeared at the end of the 19th century in the studies of certain thinkers, like David Strauss. The basic idea was that reason completely develops itself throughout history, thereby clarifying in this way the sense of culture. The result was an agreement on the status of facts, a satisfaction that could cause non-activism and the consent for the idea of sure and continuous progress. Strauss becomes, in Nietzsche's opinion, the model of the cultural Philistine (*Bildungs Philister).* The only solution for Nietzsche is the super-historical attitude after having taken an ahistorical position.

The super-historical man does not accept his fulfillment as a continuous becoming, but considers that the world ends and reaches its purpose in each particular moment. As a consequence, life is considered from an absolute point of view. An historicism assures us of the universe in which the super-history is possible; it gives us the belief in the absolute value of creation. This super-historical attitude can be achieved only in art and religion, for science can study only processes of becoming. Hence, Nietzsche established an artistic and religious ideal for culture.

Nietzsche definitely exceeded the progressist rationalism of the 18th century. He also opened the modern cultural crisis which had long been evolving. The sense and purpose of culture would no longer depend, for Nietzsche, on the fulfillment of reason, but on the intensification of the creative forces oriented towards the absolute and eternal being. Each people and period have their ideal generated by the specificity of their metaphysical conscience. Each culture is an individual totality.

By the end of the 19th century the conclusion was that modern culture as a whole could be systematized in a plurality of types, but it did not tend towards an accomplished unity from the historical point of view. In Nietzsche's view real cultural creation aims at the absolute through an ahistoricism; only when reaching the immobility of the eternity, can we discover the mystery of absolute creation. A logical consequence, remarks Vianu, would be that the human creation should belong to an ontological vision and not to a vision submitted to the process of becoming.

But Nietzsche had another view: he considered that we could not feel the creative impulse in the position of eternity because human creation loses its sense in comparison to the Absolute Being. The self-knowledge, diving into the depth of our particularity, should represent the basis of culture when desiring to achieve such creativity; self-knowledge should be a premise as well as a result.[13]

The transition from Rousseau's thinking to Nietzsche's is a dialectical process. Where Rousseau doubts the existence of a value of civilization and requires the rules of human nature, Herder considers that natural laws do not operate in human society, but only at the level of individual cultural existence, marking thus the rise of historicism. Nietzsche has another conception of culture which is based on the philosophical category of action. Cultural action (deed) is a creative human supplement by which thereby reality completes its meaning. Culture completes nature, which receives human qualities. Nietzsche stimulated cultural originality by stressing an activist conception in which culture is the completion of nature.

AUTONOMY OF VALUES OR CRISIS OF MODERN CULTURE?

Nietzsche's vision of human society is based on the idea of a large crisis. In fact, a series of thinkers (Nietzsche, Kierkegaard, Marx) thought that human thinking confronted a period of crisis.[14]

Vianu finds an explanation even at an axiological level which receives and develops the fundamental idea analyzed in the above-mentioned article. He discovers[15] that an obvious differentiation of values takes place in modern culture, generating a real autonomy of values. In fact, this is the great conquest of modern culture. If certain values had been potentia hierarchy during the Medieval Age, with Classicism and Enlightenment imposing a subordination of the other values, then during the modern period the consciousness of the irreducibility of values caused can increase of their individual freedom and autonomy. The consequences of this autonomy were:

1. the impossibility for the values-bearer to cover the totality of life: Each individual has the liberty to live under his proper value;
2. the suppression of the center of culture: The modern man has always a peripheral position as he subordinates to an autonomous value. He seems to live in an inner vacuum as he is not oriented towards a significant center.

Analyzing the trials to get back to a centered culture (the theories proposed by Comte, Berdiaev, Maritain), Vianu draws the conclusion that this return is no longer possible because "irreversibility is a fundamental characteristic of the historical evolution". If processes are reversible in nature, they are not in history. Any summing up of values makes impossible any return (which supposes the elimination of those values summed up afterwords).

This idea should be taken into account even now. There are thinkers who propose a reorganization of civil society, a moral behavior based on the ideas prevalent before World War II. This process would suppose the elimination from the psychological data of the post-communist society of all the aspects accumulated during the fifty years of communism. It is really an illusion to think that somebody could wipe out such an accumulation, nor am I convinced that it would be a good idea! This experience of a part of the world did affect the psychic structure in a certain manner; it is an experience that should not be forgotten. Besides its

tragedies and bad influences, it offered new visions on human existence, namely, special psychological attitudes that have to be recorded. They belong to the history of mankind for certain geographical regions.

Coming back to Vianu's conception, he wonders if the cultivated man subordinated to a unique value can or cannot express and reflect the entire unity of life. The Romanian thinker believes that distinction and differentiation can contribute to regaining the totality.

The creative act, Kant considered, does not come from outside; it is an inner, spiritual, creative excess; it is a psychic synthesis. In addition, the soul is a teleological structure in Dilthey's vision. Thus, the unity of purpose assures the form of the life of the soul. That purpose is a value. The teleological structure of the soul, in the gestalt vision, is in a hierarchy and is led by a super value but is capable of cooperating with other values. Taking into account all these aspects, Vianu proposes a new activist attitude towards culture. Cultural activism proposes as many aims as it can assume; it understands culture as a deed of human freedom; the creative act is an expression of freedom.

Having in mind Max Scheler's conception of human types specific for various cultural periods, Vianu considers that the type of man who thinks responsibly should be the model for this new activist moment of culture. The Promethean myth and type of man would be, in Vianu's vision, the embodiment of this active and creative attitude.[16]

Vianu discovers the presence of the Promethean motive in Romantic poetry and modern philosophy and makes an analysis from the perspective of this motive. He thus discovers that Prometheus himself, as a mythological god, appears in works of some of the romantic poets: Shaftesbury who compared the artist to Prometheus, Goethe who did not finish his*Prometheus* , Rousseau, Shelley and Byron or Goethe again with his *Faust*, because even the pact with evil contains obvious Promethean elements. There are also Promethean aspects in Kant's and Fichte's philosophy. The latter insisted on the Promethean dimension of the theory of culture. This is the practice of all our spiritual abilities in order to reach a complete freedom. To make the world conform to man, to change things according to human conception -- this is a Promethean vision.

In this way, Vianu's activism is not limited to an ethical value, but is governed by the religious value of love for others, by the Promethean aspiration towards the fulfillment of human destiny. That is why, in his opinion, the Romanian culture has been in a continuous process of adaptation. Revolutionary and democratic rationalism proposed the ideal of national freedom for the Romanian Provinces; the process of occidentalization took place as a result of this cultural rationalism, doubled through the process of becoming conscious of creative freedom. Vianu considers that the need to find and maintain national identity is not solved by a continuous theoretical redefinition -- "We are what our deeds are". It is not the historicism which offers us definitions about our own national identity, but the facts which the cultural deeds can represent.[17]

I consider this conception as a plausible answer even for our current situations. The model of Promethean humanity has been actualized for two centuries especially at a global level. The problem of cultural and national identity in the context of globalization takes us back to a historicist and individualist vision that Vianu suggested we overcome even in 1944. We must consider that the interwar period was a kind of negative, catastrophic example of violence and brutal individualist definitions that dominated Europe, encouraging political extremist actions and imposing totalitarian governments.

The individualist definitions of separation and opposition are dangerous any time and anywhere as they generate extremist movements. An opposite attitude, based on collaboration and mutual understanding, could be supported by the activist model and the Promethean man.

NOTES

1. E. Cioran, *Schimbarea la fata a Romaniei* (*The transformation of Romania)* (Bucharest: Publishing House Vremea, 1936), pp. 7-58.

2. M. Vulcaescu, *Tendintele tinerei generatii (Tendencies of the young generation), Lumea noua (New world),* nr. 14 (Bucharest, 1934).

3. E. Lovinescu, *Istoria civilizatiei romane moderne (History of Romanian modern civilization),* vol. I (Bucharest: Publishing House Ancora, 1924-1926), pp. 5-10.

4. *Ibid*., p. 10.

5. This problem is also our contemporary problem after the political events of December 1989.

6. G. Tardes, *Les lois de l'imitation (The laws of imitation)* (Paris, 1890).

7. He received a Ph.D. in philosophy at Erlangen, Germany; specializing in English philosophy and also in economics; he wrote a great many articles on the economics.

8. Stefan Zeletin, *Burghezia romana (The Romanian Bourgeoisie)* (Bucharest: Publishing House Cultura National, 1925).

9. Tudor Vianu (1897-1964) is one of the most valuable personalities of our culture during very different political periods of our history. He was an aesthetician, a philosopher of culture and values; he worked as a professor at the department of Aesthetics at the University of Bucharest. After World War II and especially during the first period of the communist government, he was Director of the Library of the Academy and an official representative in various international structures. Having received a Ph.D. from Germany, Vianu was one of the important cultural voices in the Romanian culture for a large period of the 20th century.

10. T. Vianu, *Sociologia culturii (Sociology of Culture),* in *Opere (Complete Works),* vol. 8 (Bucharest: Publishing House Minerva, 1979), p. 351.

11. T. Vianu, *Conceptia rationalista si istorica a culturii (The Rationalist and Historicist Conception of Culture),* in*Arhiva pentru stiinte si reforma sociala* (*Archive for Sciences and Social Reform*) (Bucharest, 1929).

12. Apud. T. Vianu, *op. cit.* in *Opere (Complete Works)* vol. 8 (Bucharest: Publishing House Minerva, 1979), p. 35.

13. *Ibid.,* p. 42.

14. H. Arendt, *Between Past and Future,* (*La crise de la culture)* (Paris: Gallimard, 1972), pp. 58-121.

15. T. Vianu, *Introducere in teoria valorilor (Introduction in the Theory of Values),* lin *Opere (Complete Works),* vol. 8 (Bucharest: Minerva, 1979), pp. 60-130.

16. T. Vianu, *Sociologia culturii (Sociology of Culture),* in *Opere (Complete Works),* vol. 8 (Bucharest: Minerva, 1979), pp. 410-427.

17. T. Vianu, *Filosofia culturii (Philosophy of Culture),* in *Opere, (Complete Works),* vol. 8, p. 311.

CHAPTER XVIII

ON THE HISTORY, THEORETICAL DIFFICULTIES AND PROSPECTS OFSUBJECTIVITY IN WESTERN THOUGHT

DUAN DEZHI

Since modern times the theory of subjectivity has been one of the fundamental issues and significant achievements of Western philosophy. It has faced many difficulties in its development; and though declared dead, it still has bright prospects.

SUBJECTIVITY IN WESTERN THOUGHT

The Historical Development of Subjectivity in Western Thought

The word "subject" comes from the Latin word "*subjectum*", which means something under or constituting the foundations of other things. In Greek philosophy, at least in Aristotle, "subject" is not a philosophical category which belongs especially to a human being or person. Rather it is the opposite of an attribute or of the predicate of a sentence. A subject, such as Socrates, a dog or a stone, is also a substance for Aristotle.[1] Up to the age of Descartes, the conception of subject as a philosophical category belonging to the human being does not overshadow the general conception of substance.

In Descartes's philosophy, a subject is ego, soul or mind. Like a material body, they are a kind of substance, but are different from the latter in essence. The essence of material substance is extension, whereas the essence of ego, soul or mind is thinking. Ego is not only different from the material substance in essence, but also does not come from the latter. This is the meaning of his *Cogito*, "I think, therefore I am."[2] Up to Descartes, the conception of subject as a philosophical category belonging to human being does not predominate over the general conception of substance.

Because Descartes put forward his theory of the subjectivity of human being within the framework of his mind-body dualism, his conception of the subjectivity of the human being as such could not contain any further and deeper intention. It would be up to Leibniz, Kant and Husserl and others to do this.

The monadology of Leibniz not only calls the monad a "soul" or "entelechy", and considers the perceptive activity to be the essential content of a monad, but it also clearly declares that a monad is a center of metaphysical force. Leibniz held that the soul has no windows but intrinsically possesses a kind of force, which promotes the transition of a monad from the state of less clear perception to that of clearer perception; thus it is a mirror of the whole universe. All of this enables the ego (the subject) in Descartes's philosophy to acquire a new, active quality.[3] It clearly raises the question of the subjectivity of the human being.

But for Leibniz, the subject still is a kind of substance, and in a certain sense it is even a kind of subject of the same type as Aristotle's. There is no radical change in the notion of subject until Kant. Within the framework of solving the question of "how a synthetic *a priori* judgment is possible," Kant examines "subject" or "ego," and develops new understanding of subject or self beyond Descartes and Leibniz. He creatively develops Leibniz's thought of apperception, and considers subject or self as a kind of ability or activity of synthesizing perceptual data or

constructing experiential objects. This turns the Cartesian-Leibnizian substantiated subject (ego) into an *a priori* function of consciousness, or grounds for the possibility of all knowledge.[4]

Husserl admired this effort of Kant, but did not approve of Kant declaring subjects, selves or egos as "things-in-themselves". For Husserl, subject, self or ego are not unknowable "things-in-themselves", but might be a matter of absolute evidence; thus he puts forward a slogan, "to the things themselves". The method by which Husserl gets to the things themselves is called "phenomenological reduction". In this process Husserl not only systematically reveals the structures of the intentionality of the subject or ego, but also exposes the quality of givenness of the subject as the transcendental ego.[5]

The Theoretical Difficulties of Subjectivity in Western Thought

Subjective Western thought contains some intrinsic contradictions and problems which are resolved with great difficulty from the very beginning. These contradictions and problems are not eliminated or resolved, but sharpened and made manifest in the process of the development of the thought.

The first problem confronting the Western subjective thought is the contradiction between the possibility of knowing extrinsic objects and the absolute givenness of the knowing subject or ego. Generally speaking, Western thought always considered the problem of knowing extrinsic objects. Descartes and Husserl discuss the subjectivity of the human being in the context of seeking unquestionable certainty for knowledge. This leads to acknowledging existence-by-itself, and the self-sufficiency of a subject or ego, and to emphasis upon the absolute internality and givenness of a subject or ego. That produces the knotty problem of how the subject or ego can reach or correspond to external things, since it is absolutely intrinsic and absolutely given. To deal with the problem, Descartes theorizes about the function of the "pineal gland"; Leibniz distinguishes between truths of fact and truths of reason; Kant puts forward "things-in-themselves" or "noumenon" besides the "phenomenon"; and Husserl distinguishes the scientific world from the "lived world". In a sense all of these may be considered varieties of Hume's fork. They do not resolve the problem of knowing the external things, but expose the limitations of the Western thought.

The second problem confronting Western thought is the dualistic antithesis between the empirical and the transcendental egos. Descartes's maxim, "I think, therefore I am", projects the existence-by-itself or self-sufficiency of the self or ego. What he emphasizes in the formula of the thinking "I" is some psychological activities such as sensing, perceiving, or willing; he had not question further the possibilities of these psychological activities. Further questioning is necessary to resolve the problem of the possibility of knowing. Because of this Kant and Husserl put forward the theory of transcendental ego, beyond Descartes's empirical ego (psychological ego). He was the first person to do so in his so-called "Copernican revolution." After Kant, Husserl further stresses its activity in his phenomenological suspension or reduction as prior to the empirical ego. His transcendental phenomenology essentially is a doctrine of the transcendental ego,[6] which carries Descartes' subjectivity principle to the extreme.

The third problem confronting Western subjective thought is to confirm "the other self". As stated above, the fundamental requirements and content of Western subjective thought are the existence-by-itself, self-support, self-sufficiency, absolute intentionality and the absolute givenness of a subject, self, or ego. This theory is inevitably solipsistic. Descartes and Kant reconcile the contradiction by casting the subject or ego against the dualistic background of mind-

body or phenomena-noumena. Husserl, however, makes the problem more serious for the transcendental ego as a "phenomenological residuum" corresponds to the noumena which for Kant is something one can think of, but not know. As inevitably this threatens to lead Husserl into solipsism, he discusses the problem of inter-subjectivity after having fundamentally finished the theoretical construction of a transcendental phenomenology. The essence of inter-subjectivity is not to recognize the existence of "other things" or "other bodies," but to recognize the existence of a kind of "other-self" as co-existent with the "self" or "ego". Husserl successively puts forward several categories, such as "Appresentation", "*Paarung*", "empathy *Einfuhlung*," "to understand each other", in order to open up a window for Leibniz's monad.[7] Though Kant and Husserl emphasize the priority of the transcendental ego, they do not entirely eliminate Descartes's theory of the empirical ego. Indeed, their doctrine of the transcendental ego does not allow them to do so because then their transcendental ego would have neither actual apperceptive activity nor intentional activity. The presupposition of the empirical ego, in principle, is a kind of negation or threat to the absolute givenness or the absolute self-sufficiency of the transcendental ego and its activities.

The Contemporary Development of Subjectivity in Western Thought

Western thought on subjectivity is connected closely with Western epistemology, not only logically but also historically. Indeed, the formation and development of Western subjective thought are almost synchronous with the latter. Therefore philosophical reflection of Western subjective thought also almost always is closely connected with philosophical reflection on modern epistemology. Consequently, many philosophers pay it special and extensive attention.

Many contemporary philosophers consider that the difficulty of Western subjective thought is derived from the direct and inner connection between it and epistemology. Those modern philosophers consider the question of the subjectivity of human beings mainly from the position of epistemology. For them there are dualistic antitheses between subject and object, mind and body, the empirical ego and the transcendental ego, the "I" and the "other" as selves, the absolute givenness of subject and the possibility of knowing external things. In order to eliminate the contradictions and the antitheses, the decisive step is to enter into the field of ontology and to leave the field of epistemology. Many famous contemporary philosophers and thinkers, such as Heidegger, Sartre and Buber, have actively attempted to do so.

The fundamental category of Heidegger's philosophy is "*Dasein*," whose fundamental intention is "Being-in-the-world". Hence, the subject and object, the mind and external things, in other words, the *Dasein* and the world, ideas and actuality, are united and identical in the existence mode of the "*Dasein*". Sartre distinguishes between "in-itself" and "for-itself". When he declares human consciousness nothing, the independence and identity of human consciousness or for-itself from in-itself is self-evident. Moreover, Sartre declares that the fundamental characteristics of human consciousness are its "nothingness" or "negativity" and "existence precedes essence." This, too, reveals the dynamic and dialectical unity or identity between "in-itself" and "for-itself".

Neither Heidegger nor Sartre completely resolved the relation between the self of the I and the other in Western subjective thought. On the contrary, they make the relation more tense. Heidegger speaks of "co-existence" or "men," but he understands them as "inauthentic existence" which is the opposite of *Dasein* as "authentic existence". Sartre attempts to surmount the obstacle of solipsism and to acknowledge the existence of others and the existence of us as a wholeness engaged in common activity, but in the end he can only express the view that the "other is

hell."[8] The monad with windows is no longer the monad of Leibniz; the self of being in the inter-subjectivity-relation loses its inherent subjectivity. This shows that Western subjective thought must be revamped in order to avoid solipsism.

Among contemporary philosophers some consider the problem of human subjectivity from an entirely opposite position, such as Buber, the author of *I and Thou*. Martin Buber, like Heidegger and Sartre, gives a great deal of attention to the self-understanding of human beings, and he refuses to seek the answer to the question of the nature of human being in divine revelation. Instead, Buber emphasizes that one should not seek it from the individual (a single person) himself, but one should seek it from "the relation between one person (I-self) and another (you-self)," from "the between" of a person and a person, or from the inter-human. As Heidegger distinguishes *Dasein* from co-existence and Sartre distinguishes for-itself from in-itself, Buber distinguishes two kinds of basic words, two basic modes of existence and two worlds. These are: "I-Thou" and "I-It". "I-Thou" mode of existence and "I-It" mode of existence; the world of relations and the It-world of alienation. Contrary to Heidegger and Sartre, for Buber the individual belongs not to the spiritual world of relations, but to the inhuman "It-world". For Buber the natural world also is not the place in which the *Dasein* is thrown (as in Heidegger), or the object ("in-itself") would be denied (as Sartre), but should be a relation of "I-Thou" with human beings.[9] These show that it is impossible to deal appropriately with the relation between the "I" and the "other" as selves from the position of individualism.

Suggestions and Reminders from Eastern Philosophy

In truth, Buber's relation theory does remedy and rectify some theoretical defects and errors of traditional Western subjective thought and the related thought of Heidegger and Sartre. However, it also has some serious drawbacks. For example, Buber asserts that the capacity and energy of advancing humanity must come not from within the individual, but from the relation between person and person; it must be inter-human. He even stresses that one becomes a person by grace and not by works.[10] This clearly colors his theory of a kind of fatalism, which is far from the thought of the subjectivity of the human being, and runs in the opposite direction. It shows that to develop Western subjective thought, one should pay more attention to the problem of reconciling the relation between the autonomy of the individual and inter-human relations by moving deeper into ontology (metaphysics) and away from epistemology. Heidegger and Sartre emphasize the autonomy of the individual and exclude the inter-human; Buber emphasizes the interhuman but excludes the autonomy of the individual. None of these seems to answer the question of the subjectivity of the human being.

The subjectivity of the human being is an important question concerning the condition of human existence which for the development of our species needs to be handled appropriately by a combination of theory and practice. Therefore, in the process of inquiring into the question of the subjectivity of the human being, it is possible, necessary and instructive that Western and Eastern scholars draw on the results of each other's research. In fact, just as Western scholars have a series of significant achievements regarding human subjectivity, so too Eastern scholars have a series of remarkable achievements in the same field. The Eastern theory of subjectivity has a series of theoretical characteristics distinct from that of the West.

The first distinct characteristic of the Chinese thought on subjectivity is that Chinese philosophy has investigated the subjectivity of the human being from its very beginning. As stated above, strictly speaking, in the West inquiry concerning human subjectivity is the product of

modern philosophy. In this Descartes may be seen as the first philosopher who clearly and distinctly puts forward a theory of the subjectivity of the human being.

In contrast, Chinese philosophy has advanced a theory of human subjectivity of the human being from its very beginning and always consider it a central philosophical theme. In some sense, Chinese philosophy largely concerns the theory of the subjectivity of the human being. For example, as early as the foundation age (called "the axial age" by Karl Jaspers) of Chinese philosophy, the study of human subjectivity had constituted a theme of the Chinese philosophy. Mencius, one of the classical figures of Chinese philosophy, asserted that one can know and understand his own nature, the nature of all things, and Nature and its necessary laws so long as he or she reflects seriously upon him or herself and gives full realization to his or her heart-mind.[11] *Centrality and Commonality*, another of the classical works of Chinese philosophy, further asserts that human beings can promote the transformation and nourishment of all things in the Universe, and form a trinity with Heaven and Earth.[12]

The second distinct characteristic of Chinese subjective theory is that it always stresses inquiring into the subjectivity of the human being from the theoretical ontological level. As stated above, in the early developing stage of the Western subjective theory, such Western philosophers as Descartes, Leibniz and Kant inquired into the subjectivity of the human being mainly from the level of epistemology. Only in the present age have Western philosophers, such as Heidegger and Sartre, begun to inquire into the subjectivity of the human being from the level of ontological theory. In contrast with the West, Chinese philosophy stresses the subjectivity of the human being from the theoretical level of ontology. *The Centrality And Commonality* not only discusses the subjectivity of the human being from the theoretical height of the trinity of human beings with Heaven and Earth which are considered as the highest noumena of all things, but also prominently emphasizes the ontological rootedness of the human being. It makes clear the purpose and main theme from the very beginning. In the first chapter, it says, "What Heaven imparts to man is called human nature. To follow human nature is called the Way. Cultivating the Way is called teaching." This sets a precedent for discussing the subjectivity of the human being from the theoretical height of an anthropocosmic vision.

The third distinct characteristic of Chinese subjective thought is that it emphasizes the wholeness of the subjectivity of the human being. A great weakness of Western subjectivity theory is its one-sidedness where the subject is usually "one-dimensional". For example, "the psychological ego" of Descartes and "the transcendental ego" of Husserl fundamentally belong to a kind of "knowing subject;" whereas "the solitary individual" of Kierkegaard is fundamentally a subject of "religious belief who refuses and excludes "the knowing subject," "the aesthetic subject" and "the ethical subject". In contrast with the West, Chinese philosophers consider that an authentic subject should be an overall or comprehensive person. He should be both a sage and a king, who is not only a knowing subject, but also a moral, ethical, political, social, historical-cultural subject and a subject of religious belief. According to Chinese philosophers, the relationship among these branch-subjects of an overall subject is not the kind of "either this or that" relationship, such as the "either-or" relationship of Kierkegaard. Rather, it is a kind of compatible and complementary relationship, in other kind of "both-and" relationship.*The Great Learning*, another of the classical works of the Chinese philosophy, considers that there are eight aspects or steps in the life of the human being. They are: (1) "investigation of things", (2) "extension of knowledge" (a knowing subject), (3) "sincerity of the will", (4) "rectification of the mind", (5) "cultivation of personal life (a religious belief subject and a moral subject), (6) "regulation of family", (7) "bringing order to the state" and (8) "bringing peace throughout the world" (an ethical subject, a political subject and

a social subject). This is a typical treatment of the subject, for Chinese philosophy stresses the wholeness of the subjectivity of the human being.

The fourth distinct characteristic of Chinese subjectivity theory is that it emphasizes the mutual independence and mutual promotion between selves of the "I" and the "other". As stated above, there has been a tense, opposite or even antagonistic relation between these selves in the Western doctrines of subjectivity, from Descartes, Kant and Husserl to Heidegger, Sartre and Buber. In contrast, the Chinese doctrines of subjectivity emphasize their mutual independence and their mutual promotion. The reason for this difference is that, according to Chinese philosophers, the I-self and the other-self share an universal nature from the natural necessity or the Mandate of Heaven, so that there is some possibility of mutual penetration, mutual connection and mutual transition. The other reason is that, according to Chinese philosophers, a person becomes an I and realizes its self-transformation and self-transcendence only if the person (the I-self) is in a dialectical relation of both opposition and relatedness with the other-self.[13] This is the fundamental reason that the Chinese philosophers emphasize not only "sincerity of will", "rectification of mind" and "cultivation of personal life", but also emphasize "regulation of family", "bringing order to the state" and "bringing peace throughout the world". Because of such deep and dialectical understanding of the relation of the I and the other, the subjectivity theory of China appears comparatively sound, comprehensive and moderate. It should be noted that Confucius, who lived at almost the same time as Heraclitus, had considered loving others as an essential to the definition of the authentic person or "the profound person"; the *Analects* says, "humanity means to love others." Confucius also advanced "the principle of reciprocal loyalty" of analogy from I to the other as the fundamental code, intrinsically unifying "what I want to have" and "what I want others to have." He emphasized "let one establish his own character, and also establish the characters of others" and "what you do not want done to yourself, do not do to others". All of these are significant, difficult of attainment and commendable in the history of the doctrines of the subjectivity of the human being.

The Chinese subjectivity theory also has its own weaknesses as well as contradictions and problems that are difficult to resolve and eliminate. However, undoubtedly all the characteristics or merits stated above can help us to deal appropriately with the problems confronting the subjectivity theories of the present age, especially the relationship of the autonomy of the individual and inter-human relations.

There are now a series of knotty problems in Western subjectivity theory but, as some Western scholars have asserted, it will never die. Western thought on the problems of subjectivity may be able to broaden so long as Western scholars continue their reflection and engage the related achievements of the Eastern scholars. Similarly, Eastern scholars need actively to understand, absorb and use the achievements of Western scholars in order to promote the modernization of their own subjectivity theory. As an essential human attribute subjectivity will continue to exist and advance. Thus, the prospects of human subjectivity theory remain ever bright. Although in Western thought this theory has encountered a variety of difficulties and setbacks, its prospects remain exceedingly bright.

NOTES

1. Aristotle, *Categories*, 2a11-17.
2. Descartes, *Discourse on Method*, Part IV, Meditation II.
3. Leibniz, *Monadology*, §18, §19.

4. Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason* (translated by Gongwu Lan, Beijing, Commercial Press, 1997), pp. 276, 287.

5. Husserl, *Die Idee der Phanomenologie*, Part 2-4, and *Cartesian Meditations*, IV.

6. Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations*, IV.

7. *Ibid.*, V

8. Sartre, *Huis Clos*, V.

9. M. Buber, *I and Thou* (New York: Scribner, 1958).

10. *Ibid.*

11. Some ancient Chinese literature: Confucius's *Analects*, *The Works of Mencius*, *The Great Learning*, *The Centrality and Commonality*.

12. *Ibid.* Tu Weiming, *Centrality and Commonality -- An Essay on Confucian Religiousness* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York, c1989).

13. *Ibid.*

CHAPTER XIV

FROM GLOBAL INTERESTS TO CULTURAL VALUES

A. T. DALFOVO

1. VIEWS ON GLOBALIZATION

Globalization refers to the interconnection of human activity on a global scale, to the unprecedented flows of capital and labour, technology and skills, ideas and values across State and national boundaries, but in a way that neither States nor nations can adequately control.[1] An appraisal of globalization is problematic and controversial as its meaning is rather elusive. The views on globalization seem to be locked in unresolvable dichotomies for and against it.

According to many economists, globalization is a natural process which is greatly increasing prosperity around the world. Both developing and industrialized countries benefit from the effects of the shake-up that it involves.[2] Globalization provides more and better means to defeat poverty, ignorance and desease at world level. The massive production of standard products at global level reduces their cost and allows an increasing number of customers to be reached. Global competition propels a vaster technological progress and more attractive conditions for employment, fostering better living conditions in the world at large. Communications have become easier and faster increasing the possibility of information, learning, education, and development. P. Martin states that positions hostile to globalization are profoundly immoral because they are based on suppressing the aspirations of the Third World in order to preserve the advantages of a specifically Western model of working.[3]

According to other analysts instead, globalization is deepening the economic disparities, widening the gap between rich and poor and fostering a lopsided development. Statistics are produced to show that unemployment and inequalities are rising, individuals and groups are marginalized, basic social services are restricted or suppressed.[4] These negative effects of globalization seem to be hitting Africa in particular. "Globalization is not working for the benefit of the majority of Africans today".[5] Many people in Sub-Saharan Africa tend to see globalization as the latest form of expansion and consolidation of a "world order" that has the western political and economic powers as its driving force. The impact of globalization has been felt as a renewed colonial aggression in the "logical" line of slavery, colonialism and neo-colonialism with the added danger of being vested in apparently innocent words and ideas such as "global responsibility", "global family", "one humanity" and "new world order".[6]

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Report for 1997 contains a sharp critique of the effects on the poorest countries of "unbridled" globalization: a process occurring "without map or compass". The report underlines the human cost of globalization and points out that the bulk of the benefits accrue to a small and privileged minority. Two years ago, while ten Southern countries were "emerging", more than 100 others were effectively excluded from the development process. 45% of humankind lived in those poorest and most marginalized countries. Of the remaining 55% of the global population, 20% (broadly, the middle classes of emerging countries) were progressively becoming rich consumers while 35% (workers in Northern countries) were experiencing ever-increasing social divisions.[7]

Hence, the advantages of globalization are spread very unevenly. Some countries and regions are losing out, notably Sub-Saharan Africa where many countries are becoming more and more marginalized globally.[8]

2. PHILOSOPHICAL REACTION

2.1 The Human Dimension

The discourse on globalization appears to be predominantly narrative. It is the kind of narration (or myth in the language of Aristotle) by which what has been heard is unquestionably accepted and passed on to others. Globalization is likewise narrated, namely heard and spoken about or read and written about without a sufficient scrutiny of its meaning and implications.

For Aristotle, philosophy begins with the stance of reason against myth. Today, philosophy needs to challenge the mythical dimension of globalization with its critical approach to reality and to do it with some urgency. In fact, the very Greek term *KRINO* at the etymological origin of both "critique" and "crisis", recalls that philosophy's task is both critical and crucial.

The critical reaction of philosophy returns the person marginalized or instrumentalized by globalization, to the centre of this phenomenon where the person should, after all, be as globalization is ultimately a human creation. Globalization is repeatedly censured for fostering an exclusive attention to the economic dimension of existence disregarding the human side of it. By returning the human being to globalization, the latter is humanized implying maximum attention to the whole person and to all persons with particular focus on human rights.[9]

A critical scrutiny of globalization leads to the vision or the thinking that sustains it. It is only the perception of such vision or thinking that can help to suggest, if need be, an appropriate alternative for humanizing it as suggested, for instance, by the following quotation: "Such vision should spring from a conscience (the conscience of humanity) in which the prevailing propelling force should be neither money nor power, but the good of man. The inspiring idea ought to be moral and human rather than economic or political. There is a need to refine the moral conscience of humanity."[10]

Some people consider the global onslaught not a myth that can be tamed by reason but a fact that is unavoidable and irreversible. "Quit the whining! Globalization isn't a choice."[11] Such stand may easily lead to the belief (myth) that globalization is driven by some kind of hard determinism. Such belief in turn may persuade that the entire globe is wrapped in this determinism as globalization is global. The conclusion would then be that, as we are "globalized", we are not free. Therefore, one has no alternative but to note this relentless and elusive trend and to just let it take its course. But if philosophy can help reinstate the person at the centre of the phenomenon, any alleged determinism can be reconsidered and human freedom can be safeguarded against it.

In the final analysis, however, the real threat to freedom within globalization is probably going to be not from determinism but rather from the manipulation by the economic and political powers like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, in their effort to bring about a *sound* world economy.

2.2 The Comprehensive Dimension

Philosophy is said to be the unification and systematization of all important knowledge within the realm of reason. It is preoccupied with the totalization of knowledge; it integrates the multiplicity of reality into a total and fundamental unity.[12] As "philosophy is concerned with everything, is a *universal science*",[13] it can foster a comprehensive analysis of the multifaceted

phenomenon of globalization. Such analysis will result in an equally comprehensive vision that philosophy will propose for a renewed or human globalization. Such vision will thus extend, for instance, beyond the exclusively material or spiritual or the specifically economic or political, to encompass the whole dimension of life and existence for the person and for society.

Such comprehensiveness entails moving beyond the horizons of pure rationality to everything that constitutes the person. It also requires that philosophical considerations be not confined within pure theory. Practice is part of life and existence and philosophy is, after all, interested in all life and existence.

As G.F. McLean envisages, globalization points forward to a new philosophical agenda horizontally to broaden awareness to include all peoples and cultures, and vertically to deepen new metaphysical and religious dimensions of meaning and values. The philosophical challenges emerging from the widening of sensibilities to diverse cultures imply reducing the radical and exclusive focus upon reason and its abstractive power and expanding the consideration to other dimensions of human reality. The invitation is to consider not only theory, principles, pure research and abstract learning but also practice, applications, concrete and inductive considerations in order to involve and to develop the whole person and the entire reality.[14]

To conclude, the stance of reason against the narration of globalization returns the person to the heart of this phenomenon giving it a human and comprehensive dimension.

3. GLOBALIZATION AND CULTURE

3.1 Cultural Encounter

From whichever point of view globalization is looked at, a constant factor in it is that it moves across all boundaries. The boundaries being crossed are of many kinds: national, political, financial, educational, social, religious, generational and others. One of them is the cultural boundary which is usually added to the others as if it were just one of them. The proposition of this paper is that globalization is not *also* cultural but it is *mainly* so.

"Globalization is essentially an encounter of cultures."[15] Globalization becomes a problem when the crossing of the above mentioned boundaries is an intrusion trespassing on cultures rather than a friendly meeting among them. This means that the critical reaction of philosophy by which globalization is vested with human and comprehensive dimensions as described in the previous section, needs to occur within the context of culture. Culture is the meeting point of globalization and philosophy.

3.2 Inculturation

Globalization is an encounter of cultures. The first encounter a person has with culture, the one that conditions all others, is the one sociologically described as inculturation. Inculturation is the process by which a person is introduced into the culture of birth and by which the values, norms and attitudes shared by the members of one's society are transmitted to the person.

Inculturation coincides, in many ways, with socialization and education and like them it is divided into a first stage effected in the early years of life when the foundations of one's personality are established (primary inculturation), and a subsequent phase lasting through the rest of one's life and developing the foundation established in the early part of it (secondary inculturation). Primary inculturation is said to be substantially over by the time a person is three

years old. After the age of six, a person is believed to resist anything that requires changing earlier acquisitions. Hence, primary inculturation occurs mostly at a time when one has not yet acquired the full use of one's reason and liberty. A person is introduced into culture before the person is even aware of the conditioning effects of that culture. Culture permeates the capacity to evaluate alternatives and to choose between them, thus conditioning the essence of freedom. It is at the heart of the social control to which every member of society is subjected.

The problem arising from the unconscious acquisition of cultural bonds is said to be solved, to some extent, by education. It is believed that the education of the mind to a critical appraisal of reality rescues the person from an unconditional decency from culture. The main aim of modern education is to impart, together with the ability to accomplish certain tasks, the critical insight related to such tasks and to the context within which they are to be effected. In other words, modern education aims at providing abilities and freedom.[16] The cultivation of this critical ability and, thus, of a person's freedom is the aim of philosophy too.

This educational and philosophical exercise occurs after a person has been fundamentally inculturated. It is thus a redemptive activity rather than a creative one. It does not simply edify. It has first to modify and then to re-edify taking stock of the pre-existing situation. Primary inculturation may be amended and improved upon but it cannot be cancelled. Its infrastructure remains and it emerges, for instance, when a person encounters different cultures later in life.

3.3 Acculturation

3.3.1 Pluralism of Cultures

The encounter with a different culture produces the phenomenon known as acculturation by which cultural elements pass over from one culture to another, giving rise to new cultural traits in the cultures that meet.

Today acculturation has intensified as cultural pluralism is extending to every society, dispelling the colonial belief in cultural monism by which culture was considered to be fundamentally one and identified with western culture. This latter posed to be the ultimate term of reference for the rest of humanity. Such illusory expression of cultural imperialism has now lost every credibility although it may still be found lingering on under different guise, as in globalization, for instance.

A widespread awareness has developed that single cultures exist in their specific space-time continuum according to the way various peoples react to their environment. Such awareness has induced some people to stress the autonomy of their cultures as self-sufficient units with a self-contained value system leading in some cases, to cultural isolationism and even radicalism. In some other instances, cultural pluralism has induced various degrees of relativism vis-a-vis cultures.

Cultural autonomy and cultural relativism question the possibility of a meaningful communication among cultures. Such query implies that cultural pluralism, generally considered to have been an evolution in human sensitivity, is to be considered instead an involution. It amounts to the discovery that human beings cannot communicate among themselves and that they have no choice but to live isolated from each other. If this were to be the case, globalization would be a fallacy and the discourse on it would have to be ended here.

3.3.2 Cultural Universals and Particulars

Cultures develop "cultural particulars" as their geographical and historical contexts elicit different responses. At the same time, cultures establish communications among themselves through their "cultural universals". Acculturation blends "cultural universals" and it respects "cultural particulars".[17]

Kroeber e Kluckhohn recognize that the existence of universals after millennia of cultural history and in circumstances so diversified suggests that such universals correspond to something remarkably profound in human nature and to a necessary condition of social life. According to the two authors, anthropological evidence testifies that the expression "a common humanity" is in no way devoid of meaning.[18]

The movement of particular cultures towards their universal elements implies a movement across cultures, namely the possibility and, in fact, the need for particular cultures to meet both for what they have in common and for what each of them has as its specific element. Such meeting is part of their journey to the "universal" by discovering it in other cultures, enhanced by their very differences.

A particular culture develops within given limits of time and space. But no single culture can fulfil the entire human potential namely no culture is perfect thus allowing the possibility of further perfection. The limits of culture caution against idealizing one's culture thus subtracting it to the constant scrutiny of critical reason.

For philosophy, such critical analysis echoes the Socratic remark that the unexamined life is not worth living. This remark encourages once again the philosophical formation to critical evaluation vis-a-vis a passive reception of culture that would make of it an unquestioned myth. The critical evaluation of one's culture could eventually reach that fundamental and universal nucleus that could be described as metaphysical or, more pertinently here, as metacultural representing the ultimate meeting point of cultures.

3.3.3 Acculturation and Globalization

As cultures reconcile within themselves cultural particulars and cultural universals, they can likewise manage to reconcile the local and the global. They can cultivate a global vision without loosing sight of local complexities. Global thought and local action as well as local thought and global action can be harmonized giving rise, as Chaiwat Satha Anand puts it, to "glocalization", namely the local assimilation of global trends.[19]

Hence, being an encounter of cultures, globalization ought to lead to acculturation.[20] This, however, does not always occur, as indicated in the case of Africa that has experienced globalization more as a cultural onslaught than as an acculturating process.

In this connection, a diagnosis of the positive and negative aspects of globalization may be effected by referring to the movement of specific cultures towards their universal dimension. If globalization extends cultural particulars to the global level as if they were universals or if it extends one single culture to the universal level disregarding the existence of other cultures, then this would not be universalism but imperialism. If globalization is interested in single aspects like the economic, or the political, then this would exclude it from universalism. If universalism gathers all that is common in humans constituting them as such, then all of it pertains to all of them. It is a "given" which globalization has to take if it wants to be universal, as also its name suggests.

3.3.4 Social and Personal Contexts

The acculturation exercise is not occurring in an ideal or abstract situation. It is socially contextualized implying that the specific condition of a society is made to bear on its culture and on its meeting with other cultures. Encounters between societies and their cultures may be balanced, generating a smooth acculturating process. But there may be cases when such encounters are lopsided such that the cultural elements of one society do not blend with, but rather overpower those of another society. Such unbalanced social and cultural relations are usually due to the power of a society, not of a culture, over another derived from its territorial and demographic size, its economic and organizational assets, and similar social aspects.[21] This unbalanced relation provokes quite often cultural imperialism, by which stronger societies impose or try to impose their culture on weaker ones.

Another challenge to a proper acculturating process derives from the fact that acculturation occurs among persons already inculturated in their respective culture. This implies the possibility that the acculturation process may pose a threat to one's culture prompting the insurgence of defense mechanisms and the entrenchment in one's own culture. In some of these cases, considerations about the richness of acculturation and the sterility of cultural radicalism appear to make little way into the fear of loosing the foundations of one's identity. And yet, there seems to be no alternative in cultural growth than to practice dialogue and to respect freedom.

4. CONFRONTATION

4.1. Conflict

Globalization creates a conflicting situation particularly in Africa. It trespasses on cultures undermining acculturation and human relations. According to S. Huntington, the most significant distinctions between peoples are no longer ideological, political or economic, but cultural. Future conflicts will see civilizations in opposition to one another over this.[22]

Conflicts become cultural when the encounter of cultures is discordant, namely when there is dissonance in acculturation. Such disharmony derives from a disregard for the universalizing dynamism in acculturation and the consequent prevalence of particular interests over universal values.

At the same time, the possibility of cultural conflict is at the door of everyone as cultural pluralism is pervading all societies and cultural encounters are affecting everybody. All this is further stimulated by the very phenomenon of globalization.

The solutions of cultural conflicts need to refer to their causes which may be political, economical, historical, psychological, demographic or otherwise.[23] Both the causes and the solutions of conflicts need to blend into an overall vision and strategy which can only be effected, as indicated, within a cultural context. Having argued that in dealing with conflicting situations it is necessary to have the contribution from various experts in disciplines like sociology, diplomacy, administration and particularly politics, M. Rocard concludes that "democracy, sound leadership and peace are products of a culture which can only yield returns in the long term". Thus the multifaceted approach in dealing with situations of conflict is ultimately to be referred to culture.[24]

In line with this, all skill and talents deployed in the management of conflict have to converge into one's own culture and extend to other cultures as well. All steps from the inception

of the analysis of a conflicting situation to its final solution need to be culturally contextualized for them to be feasible.

Such contextualization implies, among the rest, that in the case of Africa, for instance, African themselves provide the definitions of the criteria necessary to deal with conflict, together with the supporting structures needed to prevent, manage and resolve conflicts in Africa.[25] Foreign actors in Africa may fail to address "the local capacity for peace", neglecting the realities on which past peace rested and future peace can be built. The local capacity for peace must be empowered.[26] At the same time, Africa needs to consider the wider context of the world community and foreign actors could help such journey to "otherness" in culture.

The redress of conflictual situations caused by globalization cannot be reconciled by the simple awareness and due recognition of an injustice trusting that some "natural", "necessary" or "invisible" solution may occur. Any lopsided relation among cultures needs to be addressed first. If, for instance, globalization continues to be perceived as an onslaught or aggression, defense mechanisms will be devised and the danger of open conflict will increase. A simple call for collaboration between sides that have had tense and sour relations for centuries is idealistic, if not paradoxical.

4.2. Reconciliation

4.2.1 Desire and Possibility

The solution of conflicting situations aims at establishing a condition of harmony where differences are set aside, interests are balanced and a stable peace is created once for all. The Christian ethos moves beyond this, aiming at reconciliation by which differences are realistically evaluated in their dynamic and enduring potential and the elements of tension are allowed to unfold their mutual fruitfulness.[27] Reconciliation implies having a realistic grasp of the conflicting situation including the possibility that reconciliation may be resisted and conflict may be continued. An unlimited desire for reconciliation must be increasingly brought to coincide with the limits of human possibility, gradually reducing the distance and the tension between desire and possibility for reconciliation.[28]

Such realism implies being clear about the ideas and the facts involved in the reconciliatory act involved. In this connection, W.K. Frankena remarks that what one needs in such perplexing situations is, quite often, not a particular ethical instruction but simply more factual knowledge and greater conceptual clarity. "The two besetting sins in our prevailing habits of ethical thinking are our ready acquiescence in unclarity and our complacence in ignorance - the very sins that Socrates died combating over two thousand years ago." The disposition to find out and respect the relevant facts and to think clearly is not limited to the moral life but it is nevertheless morally desirable and even rather imperative.[29]

Concerning the clarity of ideas, the logical suggestion of this paper is that they be those bearing on the cultural dynamism unfolding in cultural encounters. But as the conflicting situations considered here are those deriving from globalization and as globalization pivots practically on the economy, a specific set of ideas that needs realistically to be clarified is the one bearing on economics. One may not agree with the overwhelming role plaid by the economy in globalization, but one has nevertheless to admit it and deal with it accordingly and realistically.[30] One needs therefore to be clear about the language, the laws, the formulas and other paradigms used in economics and carried over into globalization. As these ideas are

clarified, their practical application has to be considered too, since there is a need for a stronger and better organized network between theory and praxis.[31]

With regard to the factual knowledge related to globalization, one should be clear about the actual facts related both to the positive and to the negative aspects of globalization. The facts related to globalization are particularly and crucially needed because of the very elusiveness of globalization.

4.2.2 Values

S. Huntington remarks that conflicts among cultures will be over their values being viewed as antagonistic. Values, more than interests, will be the reason for violence. As value systems crumble, introversion will increase resulting from a world without frontiers (globalization) and from a world without references (values).[32]

History indicates that a rapid and impelling movement across cultural boundaries provokes introversion of values, particularly of those bearing on behaviour and morality. A meaningful example of this in the history of philosophy is found in the post Aristotelian period when Greek political and social life was shattered by the Macedonian and the Roman conquests that widened the areas of political and social interests beyond traditional boundaries. But the reaction of many people to that outward movement took the opposite direction of introversion. People moved from being organic members of their society to becoming individual persons within their world. Philosophy turned to individual ethics and the main schools of thought converged on epicureanism, stoicism, hedonism, scepticism and eclecticism that centered on the individual.

Today as globalization widens the social and political horizon across all boundaries, people could react by withdrawing into narrower confines where values cannot be shared. With no common terms of reference for mutual communications and understanding, the very solution of conflicts becomes problematic. In fact, the prevention and the solution of conflicts is dependent on the value assumptions of the people involved.

For instance, as D. Mieth points out, it is very important to know whether the value determining the prevention or the solution of a conflict is social integration or social innovation. Social integration is suggested by the idea that society is fundamentally a properly structured whole into which the parts, including its members, need to integrate to preserve society. In this case, conflicts are mishaps of the system, negative events to be prevented or eliminated. If instead society is considered to be a system in constant need of reform, conflicts are part of the system and they become instrumental to social innovation. Hence, depending on the value assumptions, conflicts endanger the system and the conflicting parts must be integrated into it, or conflicts develop the system and produce innovation.[33]

The journey from conflict to reconciliation and then to cooperation is the one from individual interests to shared values. These values, as related to the issue of globalization, are those bearing on human relations and behaviour, on freedom and reconciliation, on “otherness” and respect, and on similar ones that can be generally described as moral. Hence, the movement from cultural particulars to cultural universals prompted by acculturation is, in many ways, an outward journey from individual to social ethics, the latter tallying with "cultural" ethics, namely with ethics encompassing both the particular and the universal, the local and the global. As attention to ethics means attention to the person, the presence of ethics in globalization entails the presence of the person in it. The contribution of philosophy to the human dimension of globalization is thus effected specifically through ethics.

Ethics (social and "cultural") postulates solidarity as also globalization does, or should do, by its very name and meaning. In fact, the challenge of globalization can only be met on the common ground of solidarity which, in a pluralistic society, can only be around reason, advocated by philosophy as the only common denominator of humanity.

5. PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE

5.1 Meaning of Culture

A clarification is added here concerning the meaning of culture and its relation to philosophy. In Western tradition, culture referred initially to the improvement and refinement of the person. In recent times, a new understanding of culture developed the social dimension of it.[34] Both meanings meet in the perception of culture that refers to the characteristic manner in which humans relate to their environment. They consider and interpret it, developing explanations and elaborating values that reorganize and, to some extent, re-create their environment. Human beings relate with it through the set of elements that they have placed between it and themselves, elements that constitute the new universe in which they live. This universe moulded with language, art, religion, behaviour, ideas, values and other elements is the universe of culture. Culture is the network of human behaviour, thought and relations created in accordance with the human interpretation of the reality surrounding human beings as the objective "other".[35]

The person is within culture and it is, in a way, part of it. At the same time, the person can ponder on culture. Hence, philosophy operates within culture but also upon culture.[36]

5.2 First and Second Order Philosophy

Contextualizing philosophy within culture facilitates an understand of it as a dynamic relationship between first and second order philosophy and thus having a more comprehensive view of philosophy.

First order philosophy starts when people seek motivations to nourish their identity, to justify their behaviour, to preserve their coherence and, generally, to fulfill their existential ends. Such motivations have to be supported by reasons that develop into a discourse with arguments for and against one's stand or statement.[37]

Second order philosophy ponders on first order philosophy, questioning its answers and systematizing its thinking into a structured whole. Second order philosophy goes on to organize its own experience and it becomes a discipline in which people are trained to the task of a rational, critical and systematic approach in philosophy.

Second order philosophy meets with culture and such analysis of culture leads ultimately to the person who constitutes the core of culture and in whom cultures find their unity in and among themselves.[38] If the person is the core of culture, then one would seem justified to conclude that the critical study of culture tallies with the critical study of the person and thus the philosophy of culture is the philosophy of the person or philosophical anthropology. In this latter case, one would feel justified to conclude that philosophical anthropology could cater for a philosophical study of culture.

5.3 Philosophy of Culture

But the contention here is that such conclusion is not justified in the sense that philosophical anthropology does not sufficiently cater for an appropriate study of culture. In fact, philosophical anthropology is motivated, to a great extent, by the need to study the person in his/her entirety. The study of the person by other disciplines has been generally partial or fragmented resulting in a scattered knowledge by which aspects of the person have sometimes been exchanged for the whole of it. Hence, philosophical anthropology goes beyond the particulars of life and culture, considering the relationship of the person with nature, its metaphysical, physical, psychic and spiritual origin, the forces controlling and being controlled by the person, the fundamental laws of the person's biological, psychic, spiritual and social development.[39]

As philosophical anthropology moves beyond the particularity of culture to focus on the generality of the person, the person could be severed from the cultural context within which he/she is understood. A universal consideration of the person detached from his/her specific context could lead to a totalitarian objectivity and to a disregard for what is different. The consideration of the universal has to remain constantly linked to the particular and vice versa, as encouraged for instance by the constant relationship between first and second order philosophy.

Such contextual concern provides one with the reasons why contemporary studies of the person turn to culture rather than to nature. Human beings are not considered to be prefabricated by nature, so to speak, but to be they themselves inventing and accomplishing their own existence, facilitated by the anthropogenic dimension of culture. Several projects have emerged to help in this, like fenomenology, existentialism, structuralism and neopositivism.[40] But here too, their limitation seems to have been in having focussed on the person without an equally adequate attention to the cultures within which persons exist.

Cultural studies and pluralism increasingly reveal that cultural traits have a determining influence on the metaphysical, epistemological, ethical, aesthetical and other philosophical views in peoples' minds and lives. Hence, perception and meaning, principles and behaviour, values and judgement have to be culturally contextualized. Cultural diversity recognizes that a people's culture is the matrix of their identity, a matrix constituted by the "webs of significance" spun by them to construct their life. To understand a person and a people it is necessary to grasp such configuration of meaning and life that constitutes their vital context, which is what the philosophy of culture tries to accomplish.[41]

NOTES

1. Conference on *Globalization, the perceptions, experiences, and responses of the religious traditions and cultural communities in the Asia Pacific region,* Radisson, Shah Alam, 4-6 July 1997 (Organizers: JUST Malaysia with Pax Christi Australia).

2. D. David, "The Development Perspective", in *The Courier*, No. 164, July-August 1997, p. 63.

3. P. Martin, in D. David, "Alternatives or Criticisms", in *The Courier*, No. 164, July-August 1997, p. 65.

4. We are moving towards the "20:80 Society" in which 20% of the population will steer the remaining 80% that will be practically marginalized. H.-P. Martin and H. Schumann, *La trappola della globalizzazione*, Bolzano, Edition Raetia, 1997, pp. 9-12.

5. P. Henriot, "Globalization and Africa", *New People*, March 1998, p. 15.

6. W. Sachs, "One World", in W. Sachs, *The Development Dictionary*, Johannesburg, Witwatersrand University Press, 1993, pp. 102-115. What is universalism for the West is imperialism for the rest, Samuel Huntington comments (B. Ryan "Spiritualities", in *The Courier*, No. 164, July-August 1997, p. 82).

7. D. David, "Alternatives or Criticisms", op. cit., p. 65.

8. Africa's share of overall capital flows to developing countries fell from 33% in the 1970s to only 6% in the period 1985-95. The same trend can be observed in foreign investments and trade, as shown in the following table.

	1980	1993
Exports	0.7 %	0.4 %
Imports	1.1 %	0.7 %
Direct foreign investments	0.9 %	0.4 %
GNP	0.6 %	0.4 %

E.N. Mbekou and G. Nziki, "The Challenges Facing Sub-Saharan Africa", in *The Courier*, No. 164, July-August 1997, pp. 80-81.

9. Transnational corporations "ignore, if not destroy, local cultural and spiritual values with impunity. ... Africans see themselves valued, not for who they are as humans, but as what they have to become to fit into the plans and expectations of donor countries and UN agencies." (B. Ryan "Spiritualities", op. cit., pp. 82-83).

10. Paul VI, *Allocuzione alla Conferenza Internazionale del Lavoro*, 10.6.1969.

11. T.L. Friedman, *Herald Tribune*, 30.09.97.

12. N.A. Horvath, *Essentials to Philosophy*, Woodbury, N.Y., Barron's Educational Series, 1974, pp. 4-5.

13. J. Maritain, *An Introduction to Philosophy*, New York, Sheed and Ward, 1930, p. 103.

14. G.F. McLean, Presentation of the Theme of the Conference on *Philosophical Challenges and Opportunities of Globalization*, Leaflet of the Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, Washington, January 1998, pp. 5-6.

15. YAB Dato' Seri Anwar Ibrahim, Speech at the Conference on *Globalization, the perceptions, experiences, and responses of the religious traditions and cultural communities ...* , op. cit.

16. Education should aim at an "integral formation by means of a systematic and critical assimilation of culture. . . It must develop persons who are responsible and inner-directed, capable of choosing freely in conformity with their conscience." *The Catholic School*, Rome, The Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, 1977, No. 26, 31.

17. Kwasi Wiredu has developed an interesting analysis on the existence of cultural universals and particulars within an African context in his *Cultural Universals and Particulars, An African Perspective*, Boomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1996.

18. A.L. Kroeber e C. Kluckhohn, *Culture, A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, New York, Vintage Books, 1963, pp. 351, 353.

19. Conference on *Globalization, the perceptions, experiences, and responses of the religious traditions and cultural communities ...*, op. cit.

20. Globalization is said to bring about cultural integration and cultural osmosis across the world. Integration describes the joining of different parts to form a whole in which the parts may

retain their original nature changing only their mutual relation. Osmosis refers to the passage of a liquid from one side of a surface to another without alteration in the liquid. In acculturation, there is neither integration nor osmosis (according to the above meanings) in the sense that cultural elements do not simply pass from one culture to the other (osmosis) nor are such elements combining to form a simple aggregate of new relations (integration). In acculturation, cultural elements meet and generate new elements in both cultures.

21. To say that a culture is superior or stronger than others prompts the question as to the paradigms used to assess such superiority or strength. The often quoted case of the Romans being overcome by the culture of the Greeks whom they had overcome politically needs to be assessed within the wider context of Hellenic culture, at the same time bearing in mind that Roman "openness" to the culture of the peoples they conquered was meant to be a better way of dominating them.

22. D. David, "Globalization: Some Key Questions", op. cit., p. 54.

23. K. Karl, "Conflict Prevention", M. Rocard, "Towards Better Prevention", in *The Courier*, No. 168, March-April 1998, pp. 65, 68-69.

24. M. Rocard, op. cit., p. 69.

25. J.d.D. Pinheiro, "Europe's Response to Conflicts in Africa", in *The Courier*, No. 168, p. 66; M. Rocard, op.cit. p. 69; W. Ossay Leba, "Conflict Management in Africa", op.cit. pp. 76-78. Conflict prevention and settlement in Africa has its highest institutional means in the OAU. In June 1993, the 29th Conference of Heads of State and Government meeting in Cairo set up a "Mechanism for the prevention, management and settlement of conflicts" within the OAU.

26. Conflict today has been, so to speak, "democratized" and there are several actors who have a role to play in preventing or solving conflicts. John McDonald distinguishes nine categories of actors in what he calls *Multi-Track Diplomacy*, namely governments, professional organizations, the business community, Churches, the media, private citizens, training and educational institutes, activists, funding organizations. To these, Kumar Rupesinghe adds United Nations (*'Second-Track Diplomacy'*), eminent persons, women's movements, youth groups, artists. Some analysts stress the contribution of NGOs and religious organizations due to their familiarity with the local situation. P. van Tongeren, "Exploring the Local Capacity for Peace", in *The Courier*, 168, March-April 1998, p. 70.

27. For instance, Mt. 10.34; 11.12; Lk. 13.22; 1 Cor 9.24 ff. D. Mieth, "Conflict", in B. Stoeckle (ed.), *Concise Dictionary of Christian Ethics*, London, Burns & Oates, 1979, p. 51.

28. K. Demmer, "Forgiveness", in B. Stoeckle (ed.), op. cit., p. 106.

29. W.K. Frankena, *Ethics*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963, pp. 11-12, 51.

30. According to J. Joblin, an original feature in the social teaching of John Paul II is in his demand that people confront the economic system in which they live in order to understand its mechanisms and the philosophy that inspires it and thus acquire the expertise to deal with it competently. J. Joblin, "Chiesa e Mondializzazione", in *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 17 Jan 1998, Year 149, N. 1/3542, pp. 129-141.

31. "Reflection without action is verbalism and action without reflection is activism." Paulo Freire in "Globalization: economy challenges the gospel", in *New People*, March 1998, p. 1.

32. D. David, "Globalization: Some Key Questions", op. cit., p. 54.

33. D. Mieth, op. cit., p. 50.

34. A.T. Dalfovo, "Culture: Meaning and Relation to Philosophy", in J.M. Nyasani (ed.), *Philosophical Focus on Culture and Traditional Thought Systems in Development*, Nairobi, Konrad Adenauer Foundation, 1994, pp. 66-75. C. Kluckhohn and A.L. Kroeber, op. cit.

35. E. Cassirer, *An Essay on Man*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1944. D.A. Masolo, "Philosophy and Culture: A Critique", in H. Odera Oruka & D.A. Masolo (eds.), *Philosophy and Culture*, Nairobi, Bookwise Limited, 1983, p. 48.

36. "Philosophy is crucially, even fundamentally a cultural phenomenon and any attempt to view it abstractly independently of its cultural environment is bound to be an unrewarding, futile exercise -- a poor, speculative product." J. Olu Sodipo, "Philosophy in pre-colonial Africa", in *Teaching and Research in Philosophy: Africa*, Paris, UNESCO, 1986, p. 74.

37. K. Wiredu, "Philosophy in Africa Today", March 1981 (mimeo), in H.O. Oruka and D.A. Masolo (eds.), op. cit., p. 23.

38. According to J. Olu Sodipo, first order philosophy is "the general intellectual temper of a culture, its characteristic mode of thought, its pervasive world outlook", while second order philosophy is moulded by "some members of that culture (who) attempt to give a systematic expression to its world view or to analyze and modify some of its aspects." (Op. cit., p. 75).

39. B. Mondin, *Dizionario Enciclopedico di Filosopfia Teologia e Morale*, Milano, Massimo, 1989, pp. 40, 41, quoting A. Heschel and M. Scheler.

40. *Ibid.*

41. L. Outlaw, "Philosophy and Culture: Critical Hermeneutics and Social Transformation", in H. Odera Oruka & D.A. Masolo (eds.), op. cit., p. 25. "Believing.. that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning". C. Geertz, "Think Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture," *The Interpretation of Cultures,* New York, Basic Books, York, 1973, p. 5.

CHAPTER XX

THE PROBLEM OF SOVEREIGNTY IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

ERROL E. HARRIS

THE NATURE OF SOVEREIGNTY: JURIDICAL AND ETHICAL

Despite the appearance in international affairs of organizations such as the League of Nations and the United Nations, up to the present time, relations between states, have not really changed in principle from what they were said to be by Hobbes and Spinoza in the 17th century, or by Hegel and Clausewitz in the 19th, I propose to demonstrate in what follows that as long as the several nations claim to be, and are recognized as sovereign this cannot be otherwise. My thesis will be that national sovereign independence is a persistent obstacle to the rule of law in international affairs, to the maintenance of world peace and to the conservation of the global environment. The problem which it presents is rarely recognized, yet unless it is faced, the prospect for mankind in the 21st century is likely to be extremely bleak.

In the western world, theories of sovereignty were propounded by political theorists at much the same time as the rise of the nation-state in the 16th century. The relevant pervasive theoretical concepts and devices used were Natural Law and Original Contract, ideas inherited from the Middle Ages and derived from Roman Law. But they were not used by all thinkers to produce the same conclusions. There were two main types of theory: one which was espoused by the Royalists in the English Civil War was inspired by the Catholic tradition of Divine Right and embraced by the inheritors of the Holy Roman Empire; the other was the fruit of the Reformation and was advocated by those rebelling against the despotic rule of Spain in the Netherlands and the autocracy of the early Stuarts in England.

The first, typified by the writings of Jean Bodin and Thomas Hobbes, stressed the supremacy and absolute power of the sovereign; the second, exemplified by the work of Althusius, John Milton and John Locke, insisted on the rights of the subject and the need for the consent of the governed. Each theory drew attention to an essential factor of government in modern civilized society. The first stressed the indispensability of a supreme authority with unchallengeable power to enforce the law. The second stressed the requirement, if the rulers of the state were to retain the ability to govern, that the exercise of sovereign power be legitimized by its service of the common interest and authorized by the consent of the governed. These two aspects of sovereignty I have elsewhere referred to as the juristic and the ethical.[1]

Theorists who insist upon the juristic aspect of sovereignty all agree that the sovereign government of states under God are subject to no higher law, and thus in relation to one another are "in the state of nature," that is, mutually hostile, in a condition of potential or actual war. Hobbes maintained that:

> In all times, Kings and Persons of Sovereign authority, because of their Independency, are in continual jealousies, and in the state and posture of Gladiators; having their weapons pointing, and their eyes fixed on one another; that is, their Forts, Garrisons, and Guns upon the Frontiers of their Kingdoms; and continual Spyes upon their neighbors; which is a posture of War.[2]

Spinoza[3] likewise contended that "states are enemies by nature." Hegel was of the same opinion:

> Since the sovereignty of a state is the principle of its relation to others, states are to that extent in a state of nature in relation to each other. . . . It follows that if states disagree and their particular wills cannot be harmonized, the matter can only be settled by war.[4]

As Clausewitz expressed it, war is simply international politics conducted by other means. More recent theorists have maintained that international relations are always power politics[5] (i.e., war conducted by other means).

Thinkers of the other school, who gave precedence to the ethical aspect of sovereignty, limited the power of the state by what they saw as the natural rights of the subjects, as prescribed by Natural Law; and this, some considered, could also govern the relations between independent sovereigns. Hence, writers like Grotius, sought to formulate a system of law above and outside the state's authority. This is the origin of what, we, today, call International Law.

Unquestionably, any form of social organization implies the regulation of the conduct of its members by laws tacitly recognized or publicly promulgated, customarily observed or administratively enforced. In every such society there will be those who in their perception of their own interests seek to break the law, so some method of enforcement is essential to the good order of society. Moreover, laws are liable to different interpretations and resort is needed to an impartial authority whenever disputes arise. The maintenance of order and the settlement of disputes thus require a supreme authority to whom final appeal can be made and who has power, unchallengeable by private individuals, to enforce the law. This is the legal sovereign, and this is the *rationale* of the juristic theory. Sovereignty, so conceived, is indivisible, because if it were shared by different agencies there would have to be a superior body to adjudicate between them when their actions came into conflict -- and that would be the ultimate sovereign. It is also inalienable, because whoever is so vested is the supreme authority above whom there is none capable of transferring it to another.

On the other hand, power to govern a community always exceeds the physical capability of mere individuals, and those who wield it can do so only with the cooperation and consent of a large body of the people over whom it is exercised. What authorizes their rule over the social group must be their ability to maintain the welfare and retain the confidence and loyalty of their subjects. Political power is always derived from the community over which it is exercised and is justified by its protection of their rights as citizens and their welfare as persons. Even rulers who rely solely on military force can do so only as long as their soldiers remain loyal to them which will not be long if they are treated merely as cannon fodder and as long as their armaments and supplies can be provided by the industry of their subjects -- which can be ensured only if the majority are contented with their lot. The ethical aspect of sovereignty, therefore, cannot be overlooked, and the theories which highlight it must have a strong measure of truth. In fact, both aspects of sovereignty are combined in practice, and the soundest theories are those that reconcile them, as do Spinoza, Rousseau, and Hegel in a doctrine which sees the will of the people expressed through the organization of political institutions as absolute.

Not much has been written about sovereignty since the 1920s and 1930s. Contemporary writers, such as there are, have done little more than reaffirm in principle, one or other of the main theories, stressing either of the two aspects. The practice of states, meanwhile, bears out

very closely the principles enunciated by the major thinkers. Governments claim an absolute right to legislate and administer their own laws free from outside interference; even where individual liberties are demanded and conceded, they can be made effective only as recognized and protected by the law enforced by sovereign institutions, executive and judicial. Yet those who govern can retain power only as long as the people over whom they rule acquiesce and, in sufficient measure, submit. If *en masse* the citizens resist the party in government, it will forfeit its power: in democratic regimes this happens at election time; in totalitarian regimes by bloodless or violent revolution. The events of the 1980s in the Soviet Union and her satellite countries in Eastern Europe have borne witness to these facts, as have those in South Africa and Latin America.

Because sovereignty is indivisible, the allegation is fallacious that today the sovereignty of nations is limited by their treaty obligations under International Law and by the United Nations. Observance of International Law and deference to the United Nations are always conditional upon the policies and sovereign decisions of the governments in power.

In international relations, the juristic aspect of sovereignty predominant. Each nation claims independence, the recognition of which it demands from others. Each protests in the strongest terms against interference in its internal affairs and seeks to defend itself at all costs against interference of whatever kind. Over internal affairs each claims absolute jurisdiction; and all pursue exclusively and assiduously what they regard as their vital national interests. The common pronouncements of politicians daily confirm this assessment. One has only to read, listen to the radio or watch on television the speeches of British cabinet ministers regarding European integration, to say nothing of the Euro-sceptic members of Parliament, to be assured that British national interests, equated with the maintenance of British sovereignty, are uppermost in their minds. The same is true of politicians in all countries of Europe, even those who are in favor of closer unification. The statements of the American President and of members of Congress leave one in no doubt of their singleminded defence of American interests, be they national defence or economic prosperity. The developing nations are equally insistent upon being recognized as sovereign and independent; and the troubles in the former Yugoslavia, in the Commonwealth of Independent States, in the erstwhile Soviet Union, and the less menacing tensions in Czechoslovakia, have all been the result of claims to sovereign independence of the emergent states.

The ethical aspect of sovereignty is mainly confined to internal matters, where alone the common interests of the people seem to lie. In international relations these are referred to as the "vital interests" of the nation, the efficient protection of which is what entitles the government in office to exercise sovereign power. Whether nowadays the common interest of the people in the several nations actually coincides with what those states hold to be their national interests is a matter for further consideration; but in practice governments invariably behave as if they do. Independent nations seldom see their vital interests as coincident, and when they do it is within only a very restricted range. Over the world as a whole there is little consensus.

In international relations the deference given to the ethical aspect of sovereignty is confined to the doctrine of recognition, whereby a state is internationally recognized as sovereign only if, and as long as, it can command the loyalty of its subjects and exercise effective authority over them -- which (as we have seen) depends on their acceptance in practice of its government as maintaining civil rights and common wellbeing and on their consent to its supremacy.

SOVEREIGNTY AND INTERNATIONAL LAW AND PRACTICE

The definition of sovereignty in International Law is unequivocal. In the words of Dr. H. Lauterpacht, "The sovereign State does not acknowledge a central executive authority above itself; it does not recognize a legislator above itself; it owes no obedience to a judge above itself."[6]

In the judgement of the Palmas Case in 1928, Judge Huber asserted that:

> Sovereignty in the relation between States signifies independence. Independence in regard to a portion of the globe is the right to exercise therein, to the exclusion of any other State, the function of a State. The development of the national organization of states during the last few centuries and, as a corollary, the development of International Law, have established this principle of the exclusive competence of the State in regard to its own territory in such a way as to make it the point of departure in settling most questions that concern International Relations.

The Permanent Court of International Justice advised the League of Nations in the East Karelia Case in 1923 that recognition of the sovereign independence of states "was a fundamental principle of international law." Repeating a similar clause in that of the former Permanent Court, the Statute of the International Court of Justice stated that only sovereign states can be subjects of International Law. If sovereignty is defined as it has been by Dr. Lauterpacht, the authority of International Law is immediately cancelled out; the sovereign state cannot remain sovereign and acknowledge a superior legislation to its own and cannot, therefore, be subject to international law. Similarly, if the state owes no obedience to a judge above itself, it owes none to the International Court of Justice. In actual practice, this court can only deliberate on cases where the parties have consented to accept its decision; then, its judgement can in practice be rejected by any of them who consider it contrary to its national interests.

Consequently, the authority of International Law is fictional, even in theory, and its precarious nature is even more apparent when one notices that it is the product of no established legislature, but rests only upon treaties, such as the Hague Conventions, usually referred to as law-making treaties. Treaties are said to be sacrosanct and lawyers lay down the principle *pacta sunt servanda*, "treaties ought to be kept"; yet in practice they are kept only as long as they are believed by the states that have entered into them to be in their national interests. When "vital" interests are not served by the observance of their terms, treaties are invariably renounced or ignored. In any case, states being sovereign are at liberty to interpret a treaty in whatever way that best suits them, as they are also free to retract their commitments whenever they deem the circumstances warrant it. Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson both maintained that a nation could renounce a treaty at any time it thought fit; and W.E. Gladstone, speaking in the House of Commons in 1870, denied that "the simple fact of the existence of the guarantee is binding on every party of it, irrespective altogether of the particular position in which it may find itself at the time that the occasion for acting on the guarantee arises." Numerous other statesmen have expressed similar views, and the prevailing conduct of states bears them out.

The pages of history are littered with accounts of broken treaties. A few examples may be cited. In 1668 Charles II of England concluded a treaty of alliance with Sweden and the Netherlands, but four years later he joined with Louis XIV in war against Holland, having signed the Secret Treaty of Dover with France in 1771. In 1818 the Quadruple Alliance, of Russia,

Prussia, Austria, and Britain, solemnly declared an "unchangeable resolution never to depart, either among themselves or in their relations with other states, from the strictest observation of the Principles of the Law of Nations." But in 1831 the Czar suppressed the Kingdom of Poland which had been set up at the Congress of Vienna by a treaty of which Russia was a signatory. Later Britain destroyed a Turkish fleet without any declaration of war, and Prussia overran the Duchies of Schlezwig and Holstein without pretext or title. The subsequent history of the 19th century is a catalogue of similar breaches of International Law and treaty obligations which culminated early in 1914 with Kaiser Wilhelm's tearing up "the scrap of paper" which committed him to respect Belgian neutrality. Neither the Treaty of Versailles nor the League of Nations could prevent Adolph Hitler from reoccupying the Saar, or from annexing Austria; nor could the agreement he had signed in Munich with France and Britain restrain him from overrunning Czechoslovakia in 1938.

The reason for this catalogue of perfidy is plain. It is that nations are sovereign and always exercise their sovereign prerogative of acting in what they perceive to be their national interests. As sovereign they are subject to no higher authority, and there is no way of enforcing the observance of a treaty on a sovereign government except the threat of force majeure. Hegel, therefore, made no mistake when he maintained that the fundamental principle of International Law that treaties ought to be kept, "does not go beyond an ought-to-be *(bleibt daher beim Sollen).*

Some may contend that since the Second World War and the establishment of the United Nations all this has changed, but it has not. The Charter of the United Nations is itself no more than a treaty, and in Article 2 it commits the organization to the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members. Consequently, the resolutions of the Security Council have been ignored time and again, by South Africa, Israel, North Korea, and Iraq -- to mention only these -- while the Permanent Members have been able to veto resolutions which did not seem to them compatible with their national interests and policies. Decisions agreed to in the General Assembly are never binding; neither these nor any resolutions of the Security Council can be imposed on individual members, should they defy or ignore them, because they are sovereign states and cannot be forced to comply except by some form of military threat.

Any such coercion is ultimately military, because economic and other non-military sanctions cannot be made effective unless they are backed by military force. If they are to have teeth, they must be universally applied. Some form of pressure is needed to persuade UN members in general to impose them; yet sanction-busting commonly occurs if no military provision is made to prevent it. Frequently, as was recently the case with Haiti, a naval blockade has to be mounted, and forcible measures are needed to counter attempts by the country on which the sanctions are directed from using its own military might to break them. In short, the only effective sanction is ultimately war in one form or another. However, international order requires the maintenance of peace, and its condition is the rule of law of which military conflict is a practical breach. Incidentally, economic sanctions, as commonly applied, cause hardship and suffering among the innocent population, while the offending government tends to remain unscathed, as has happened in Iraq.

It follows that the United Nations is not equipped and is not competent to maintain world peace. It can enforce the resolutions of its Security Council on its members only in the last resort, if at all, by waging war, as it has done in the former Congo, Korea, and Kuwait and Iraq. Its attempts at pacification in cases of civil war: in Somalia, Bosnia, Kavorno-Karabach and Chechnya have been hopelessly frustrated by its obligation, imposed by its Charter, to respect the

sovereign rights of its members. In cases of dispute it cannot adjudicate (witness the futility of its efforts to mediate between the warring parties in the former Yugoslavia) if the disputing states refuse to abide by its decisions, for its judgements cannot be enforced without breaking the peace that they are intended to establish. Its agencies are obliged to observe strict neutrality and are dependent on the consent of the belligerents in order to function, so that their operation is constantly nullified. Add to this that the sovereign members, always giving precedence to their own national interests, are chronically reluctant to supply sufficient funds, so that the frequent failure of UN agencies, despite the skilled and devoted efforts of their employees, is hardly surprising.

The inadequacy of the United Nations, moreover, is only symptomatic of the endemic disease of international relations, infected by national sovereignty. Because every nation is fully aware that there is no superior power to protect its sovereign rights and that its independence can be ensured only by its own military strength, the primary "vital" interest of every national state is that of security, which of necessity comes to take precedence over all others when national interests are considered. Accordingly, the first and most insistent demand on its resources is defence. It seeks to maintain such military capacity as it can and to augment it by means of alliances with other nations whose national interests are compatible with its own. Those, whose main interests are opposed, see one another as potential enemies. The result is that rival blocs are formed, and there is a persistent effort to maintain a balance of power.

But this balance is very precarious; nothing more is needed to upset it than a technical breakthrough in weapon efficiency on either side; and, as each bloc, suspicious of possible build-up by its opponents, is constantly seeking to strengthen its own potential, an arms-race is inevitably generated. In consequence, tensions intensify and crises intermittently recur, threatening or actually breaking out into armed conflict. All this has repeatedly been reflected in the history of diplomacy and in the proceedings of the United Nations, the overall results being periods of so-called peace, interrupted by frequent crises and minor wars, even threatening to escalate into major warfare. The destructive capacity of modern weapons makes this pervasive threat an intolerable prospect. Yet, as we have seen, the United Nations is incapable of countering or mitigating it; and there is no other means to remedy the inevitable effects of rivalry between sovereign states whose competing interests in national security cannot be reconciled.

The history of the past three centuries nicely illustrates this pattern of recurring warfare. After a succession of European and colonial wars in the eighteenth century, the Napoleonic wars engulfed Europe and had worldwide repercussions. The nineteenth century, despite expressed intentions by the great powers to maintain peace, was marked by a succession of minor wars and major crises ultimately culminating in the First World War "the war to end all war." Alas, the Peace of Versailles might more appropriately have been described as "the peace to end all peace." The League of Nations made little if any difference to the succession of crises and minor wars during the next twenty years (the twenty years of crisis,[7] as E.H. Carr called it in his book of that name) which led to even greater and more devastating conflagration, World War II. Since 1945, the establishment of the United Nations notwithstanding, there have been more than 200 wars, some of them waged in the name of supposedly peace-keeping organization. The Cuban missile crisis brought the world perilously close to a third world war, and the succession of crises continues to the present day without prospect of final settlement, even though the Soviet Union has collapsed and the Cold War has allegedly ended.

The oft-repeated opinion that the policy of so-called nuclear deterrence has prevented a major war for the past fifty years is both misled and misleading. Nuclear deterrence is nothing

other than the contemporary pursuit to maintain a balance of power. It has now become a balance of terror, the strategy the appropriately acronym MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction), the instability of which until recently was rather augmented than decreased by the continual buildup of nuclear arsenals. American strategists at one stage were entertaining the idea of possibly winning a nuclear war, and may even have been projecting plans for a preemptive first strike. President Reagan's "Star Wars" plans were seen by the Russians as preparation to carry this strategy into operation and led to greater suspicion and tension between the superpowers, until Gorbachev's statesmanship persuaded the governments to greater prudence. With the end of the Cold War, the major blocs have agreed to destroy their more obsolete nuclear weapons, but this alone has created new problems: not only the difficulty of disposing of nuclear waste, but also the possibility that the states of the former Soviet Union, to acquire much needed hard currency, might sell materials and know how to smaller nations aspiring to nuclear capability; or that organized crime might succeed in supplying the means of manufacturing atomic bombs to terrorists. Israel, Pakistan, India and China all seek or have already attained nuclear capacity, not to mention Iraq, and the United Nations can do little or nothing to stop nuclear proliferation. The menace of nuclear war has by no means been averted.

Almost a hundred years elapsed after the Battle of Waterloo before Europe was plunged into the Great War, which the so-called balance of power did nothing to prevent. Since the end of the Second World War we have enjoyed little more than fifty years of unstable and somewhat spurious "peace," and the possibility of another major conflict is still with us, increased rather than diminished by alleged "nuclear deterrence."

This prevailing state of affairs and the universal awareness that independent states have no assurance of security apart from their own and their allies' military power ensures that disarmament and arms control are in principle impossible. They could be brought about only by international agreement -- by treaties. But treaties (we have shown) are not habitually observed and are commonly renounced or broken when vital interests are at stake (none being more vital than security); and the observance of treaties can be enforced, if at all, only by military threat. To agree to a disarmament treaty therefore would be to abjure the only means of ensuring that it would be kept. However, if it were not observed the security of all its signatories would be undermined. Disarmament and arms control, therefore, become contradictions in terms.

THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGE

Over and above the difficulty of maintaining peace and of averting nuclear destruction, mankind is faced, as the 20th century draws to a close, with enormous and even more daunting problems arising from the destruction of the environment and the planetary ecosystem. The inordinate growth of population and the consequent demand for food and industrial products the world over have generated widespread interdependent and mutually exacerbating problems. The earth's resources are being exhausted; consumption of fossil fuels in vast quantities is polluting the atmosphere and increasing the greenhouse effect which threatens climatic change of dramatic and catastrophic proportions. The resulting loss of food crops is likely to cause starvation in many areas on a disastrous scale. The uncontrolled destruction of rain forests, the main source of atmospheric oxygen, is removing a major means of reducing atmospheric carbon dioxide, which is the chief greenhouse gas contributing to global warming. Deforestation is also a contributory cause of desertification, the effects of which are cumulative, putting at risk the survival of wildlife, livestock, and people. Continuing destruction of the ozone layer is exposing both

humans and crops to ultraviolet radiation, which is directly detrimental to the health of the former and lethal to many of the latter, as well as to plankton in the oceans, the basis of the entire foodchain. Add to all this is the accumulation of toxic and hazardous waste from industrial processes and nuclear power production, the disposal of which (some of it remaining lethal for thousands of years) poses a problem for which no solution has been found, and it is evident that the future of mankind is fraught with the utmost danger.

Associated with many of these destructive processes is the current atrocious loss of living species, both vegetable and animal, depriving human beings of the medicinal benefits from numerous herbs and of foodstocks on which they have relied for centuries. Overfishing has depleted a number of species to an alarming extent in many fishing grounds. Along with the ravaging of the rain forests, the draining of wetlands for "development" and the concurrent loss of wilderness are depriving innumerable species of their natural habitat. As a result birdlife, reptiles and mammals, as well as plantlife and insects are threatened with extinction. Hunting and poaching are so widespread that the extermination of tigers, elephants, rhinoceroses and other such animals is imminent, while the damming of rivers (for hydro electric power and water supply) is isolating salmon and other species of fish from their natural spawning grounds. The pollution of the oceans (from oil spills and the like) is endangering the plankton, on which most species of fish ultimately depend for their survival. Thus the entire terrestrial ecology is being disrupted, and, as the biosphere is a single biocoenosis, every species of life, including our own, is under threat.

This erosion of the environment is not a natural process but is the direct result of human activities in the industrial age. It is proceeding at such a pace that, scientists tell us, if it is not checked soon (if not already) it will become irreversible. By the end of this century we may well have passed the point of no return. Yet international agreement, even such as could be reached in 1992 at the Rio Summit, has achieved nothing adequate. Non-binding decisions indicate only failure to resolve; to limit $C0^2$ emissions to present levels by the year 2005 is lamentably insufficient. The reason for reluctance to act resolutely and adequately, the so-called lack of political will, is clearly this sovereign nations give precedence to their national interests over global requirements; and agreements either cannot be reached at all or, when they are made, they are nonobligatory, (at best) half-hearted -- and, in any case, unenforceable.

The problems are global in scope and only global remedies will suffice to solve them. The necessary measures cannot be effectively taken by private individuals or non-governmental organizations, which have no legislative powers, because the necessary action must be compulsory for everybody. Action by separate nations will not serve because what one nation may do, however effective locally, will inevitably be frustrated by neglect or counter-action in neighboring (or even far distant) countries. What will suit the national interests of one people may not suit those of another, and global requirements may well conflict with national demands. International collaboration is therefore essential and must be made obligatory upon all; but that cannot be achieved by treaty agreement, for reasons already set out. Even if agreement could be reached, its observance could not be enforced, except by military means which would defeat the objective of the exercise. Nothing can be done by the United Nations to ameliorate the situation because it is committed by its Charter to respect and preserve the sovereign independence of its members and so to perpetuate the impasse.

The same obstruction impedes respect for human rights. The Charter of Human Rights has only the status of a treaty, which in numbers of countries throughout the world is not observed. Amnesty International and other non-governmental organizations do all they can to publicize and

protest against violations, but almost invariably the offending governments reject their accusations or ignore them. The United Nations can and does take little action, in part because the national interests of its members dictate otherwise, and in part because it would involve interference in the internal affairs of the offending country. There is no genuine legislation protecting human rights and no means of enforcing such existing international law upon sovereign states apart from military pressure, economic measures avail nothing without it, and the cost and risk of far outweigh the concern of governments for the victims of infringements.

BEYOND SOVEREIGNTY

National sovereign independence, thus, has proved and continues to prove, inimical to the solution of world problems. Yet it is upon the resolution of these problems that the welfare of all peoples -- the very survival of humankind -- depends. The national sovereign can no longer effectively ensure the security of the commonwealth or the welfare of its citizens, neither can it prevent the deterioration of the quality of life consequent upon the devastation of the global environment. The insistence by national governments on their sovereign rights cripples the ability of the United Nations to achieve either world peace or environmental conservation. In short, the national state now lacks the one and only justification for the exercise of sovereign power, the fostering of national prosperity and the maintenance of national security. The ethical character of sovereignty has been globally undermined, and its claim to juristic supremacy is accordingly no longer valid.

This fact is seldom recognized or acknowledged either by politicians or by the general public. Scientists and others, who see the predicaments and recommend measures to counteract them, fail to realize that such measures require political action which, if taken by national governments, will inevitably be insufficient in scope and which will not be taken if they are thought to conflict with "vital" economic and security interests. For the same reason, the necessary, concerted international co-operation will not be forthcoming and, even if it were, could not be relied on for lack of pacific means to enforce treaty obligations. The scientists and nongovernmental organizations like Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth may protest and demonstrate, but they cannot legislate; so they can draw attention to the evils but can do nothing to remedy them. The action of national governments is insufficient if only because their jurisdiction is limited to their own borders; and the United Nations is hamstrung by the sovereign independence of its members. Unless this problem of sovereignty is squarely faced and addressed, the prospect for civilization and human survival will be bleak in the extreme.

Professor George Keeton wrote as long ago as 1939, that "the fetish of national sovereignty assumes the shape of the evil genius in the . . . forest of international intercourse."[8] The national sovereign state has become obsolete in the circumstances of the present-day world. The ethical basis of its right to supreme power has been eroded, and its legitimacy has been undermined by its loss of competence to protect its citizens either from nuclear destruction or from environmental calamity.

If the decline and fall of civilization, not just in the western world but the whole world over, is to be averted, some new form of world government is essential. Of this form the United Nations falls short, because its professed objectives are constantly obstructed by the sovereign rights that its members claim, rights which its Charter endorses and protects. This fundamental contradiction has somehow to be removed; but current efforts at reform, whether recommending increase in the number of members (permanent or other) of the Security Council, or popular

election of a new Assembly to advise the General Assembly, are futile as long as the provision remains in the Charter that the sovereign independence of members is to be upheld. Any new Assembly or Council would have no legislative power as long as sovereignty is retained by national governments. Even the abolition of the right of veto in the Security Council would be unavailing as long as states are able to defy that Council's resolutions with impunity or can be forced to respect them only (in the last resort) by military means. If any path to salvation is to be found, something more radical and more far-reaching than such so-called reforms must be contemplated. The primary problem to be tackled must be that of national sovereignty, which most thinkers today seem loath to face or even to recognize. Nations must consent to share their sovereignty and to submit themselves to a World Legislature, representative of the whole world's population and empowered to act in the common interest of all peoples, while assuring autonomy in local matters to separate nationalities. This may not provide automatic solutions to world problems, but at least it would remove the current obstacles to them. Without this new government, there can scarcely be an affirmative answer to Bertrand Russell's question, "Has mankind a future?"

NOTES

1. Cf. E.E. Harris, *The Survival of Political Man* (Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1950), p. 35f;*Annihilation and Utopia* (London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1966), p. 37; *One World or None: A Prescription for Survival*(Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1993), p. 44.

2. Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, Ch. III.

3. Benedict de Spinoza, *Tractatus Politicus* Ch. III, 13.

4. G.W.F. Hegel, *Philosophie des Rechts,* 333-334. T.M. Knox's translation: *Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1942, 1949, 1953), pp. 213—214.

5. Georg Schwartzenberger, *Power Politics* (London: Stevens and Sons Limited, 1951).

6. H. Lauterpacht, *The Function of Law in the International Community* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933), p. 64.

7. *Philosophie des Rechts*, p. 333.

8. George Keeton, *National Sovereignty and International Order* (London: Peace Book Co., 1939), p. 35.

CHAPTER XXI

IDENTITY AND GLOBALIZATION: THE METAPHYSICAL QUESTION OF THE 21ST CENTURY

H. DANIEL DEI

Summary

This paper considers the main issues as we enter the 21st century to be not primarily "problems" but "questions" or mysteries, that is, issues of meaning. Without a spiritual disposition, beyond strategies of self-interest and control at the expense of others and things, it is impossible to visualize an inclusive human horizon. For this reason, our philosophical task is to resolve these problems by transcending the theoretical basis of Reason that has defined the world as an order of possessions.

Man has to remember the man,
who forgets where the path leads.
Heraclitus, extract 71.

POINT OF DEPARTURE: THE INEVITABILITY OF CAREFULLY THINKING THROUGH REALITY

The theme of this volume invites one to investigate life as a possibility, that is a place or piece of earth able to shape itself as a project of history.[1] In other words, "life as possibility" is a way of asking one to discover life or allow it to be revealed to us as an alternative and consequently to assume it as our destiny or life as lived by us.

In fact, man lives experiences without being able to unite them through reflection. This phenomenon, that has become prevalent and even characteristic in our age is expressed in the fragmentation of identities.[2] It appears in the loss of the old Reason that shaped utopian worlds and legitimated our actions. The same can be said about the seductiveness of empirical truth so that there is lack of confidence in the group of philosophers who seek meaning in such issues as God, the world and existence. The logic of validation is rather in terms of efficiency, which masks or disguises[3] the way identity is constituted.[4]The implication of this logic is loss of reliance in modernity's omnipotent and falsely liberating Reason[5] and, naturally, in the narcissist blindness of those who seek protection therein.

The 21st century has confronted us with the challenge of the metaphysical dimension, just when thinkers and philosophers are less prepared to see and think in those terms. The exaltation of scientific-technological devices, the search for a "God who has died" among the comings and goings of the hypertext, cybernetics and epistemology, leaves us blinded by the footlights.

To create room for encounters in thinking and feeling regarding the destiny of man I will search for the sense of events already lived. The hope is to recover in the process the object of the philosophical search, namely, "to accompany man in his passage towards consciousness of his dignity".[6]

The link of man to philosophy makes of this discipline, at the same time, knowledge, attitude and, above all, passionate testimony to life, and finally a path towards truth. This is one of the first moments of that reflective conscience which had been relegated to the dust bin for lack of scientistic precision. The so-called "exactness" of the reductionist knowledge temporally took us away from

any existential commitment. But this choice is also a symptom of the spiritual weariness of Reason that emptied knowledge of meaning. Here I rely to some extent on the characterization of philosophy bequeathed by Hegel in the Preface of his Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts, with his image of the owl personifying "the thought of the world, which appears only when reality has finished and completed its process of formation". It is curious that this aspect of Hegelian thinking has been accepted as true, even by those who strongly reject his work; I know of no generalized criticism of this characterization. Elsewhere, I have called this "model" of the mission of philosophy "speculative auditing".

> This sees philosophy as `critical history'. Although incapable of knowing the future . . . it can be a systematic and legitimating inventory based on control over others: some kind of `speculative auditing' that intellectually takes account of the meaning in which man has developed a moment of his vocation for infinity, but that does not exhaust his full ambition therefor.[7]

Hence, a conversion is needed if philosophy is to become a living and profound experience of radical thinking.

The principal world problems begged for an answer at the end of the 20th century. Amid the enthusiasm of some people and the uneasiness of others, few foresaw that gaining domination was a Pyrrhic victory. For example, the victory of capitalism opened uncertainty regarding its capacity to solve social, political and economic problems. These arose from the new state of affairs in the world which current theories are inadequate to solve. Obviously, to initiate a revolution and make peace requires new strategies, attitudes and, above all, a substantially different use of freedom and power. This is why it is so difficult to understand why good meditative thought is scarce.

The present proposal highlights the central problems we face in this millennium, many of which will reach a serious and decisive point in our children's life time. They are not primarily problems, but questions which demand from each person -- especially from leaders -- a reordering of the course of events in the direction of the possibilities of human life. Hence the role of metaphysics is radical reflection without any restriction in order to realize the full possibilities of humanity. This requires that we not be already committed (metaphysically speaking) to "living the illusion of the world".

THE MEANING OF EVENTS: THE EFFECTS OF THE EARLY 21ST CENTURY

Many of the main problems we face today and that many historians and social scientists have already described and accurately analyzed, concern human destiny. This is implied as well in the wrong or invalid projections of developmental trends over the long term and on a world-wide scale with regard to demographics, ecology, politics and the social-economy.

A critical approach looks for the possibilities of all and any human beings. This is not another megalomania which intellectuals are accustomed to produce theoretically, but an ethical condition.[8] At the heart of any possible solution lurks a question about the meaning of life.[9] Unlike a problem, a question imposes an unavoidable decision which cannot be avoided, but is subject to our freedom and to knowing where to stand in terms of existence. The challenge is to be able to accept life in its fundamental possibility for interchange and of communicating with others.

But the so-called phenomenon of "globalization", as established by the decision making centers, far from giving priority to a planetary conscience, has oiled the mechanisms of supremacy. By not including the other, in the end, globalization lacks its own identity. This has already happened

through lack of effective historical consciousness in the Western World.[10]Globalization consists of an updated and efficient expression of the old logic of supreme domination, capable of erasing differences and flattening landscapes as if they were deserts. This phenomenon may continue as a tragic imitation of instrumental reason of it remains anchored in the fragmentation and isolation of populations and human beings. As already pointed out,[11] the term sums up the pincer-like maneuver in the `80s by the concepts of postindustrialization and postmodernism. Together these constitute the present socio-economic paradigm[12] and the force of the postmodern mentality: the imperative of political and cultural freedom.

One of the questions to be considered is the very nature of the phenomenon of globalization. Is it just a relapsed sign of appropriation, acquisition and consumption, of supreme control by calculating Western Reason? Or, can we hope from this phenomenon, the rise of an authentic and true "communicative society" as Vattimo trusts. This must be in the sense not of pure technological readiness which is always restricted, but of the effective creation of a realm of encounter. This must allow our conscience to overcome barriers so that we can grow with the real -- not virtual -- presence of the Other. This alternative globalization is no longer defined in markedly economic terms, at least not unilaterally as regards interests. Instead it projects a global vision, in which singularities (not fragmentations) constitute the fulfillment of its universal condition. However, for the time being, this alternative is only slightly possible, not even probable, because its realization depends on an essential change in understanding in the Western world.

Certainly, an implicit questioning of reason is required. Whether criticized or not, reason has been fundamental to metaphysics from Greek times until now. Nevertheless, a transformation or, better still, a change of spirit may rise from the need to provide an answer to the crisis of systems of order and interchange of society at the planetary level as the basic historical operating trends of the beginning of this century engage in conflicts for survival.

The main problems of the world must be pondered in the light of a spiritual disposition that is alien to any strategy founded on self-interest or on power achieved at the expense of the others and of things. Otherwise, a generalized holocaust is likely to come sooner or later in the next generations. Earlier the thought of the death of the species was impressed on the conscience of the European population. It prevented a nuclear war by forcing the world's political leaders to reformulate their ambitions. Similarly, we can hope that in view of a new threat of annihilation or "infinite of nothing"[13] a conversion of humanity is feasible, although the present historical conditions are more complex and determining.

As Professor Eric Hobsbawm[14] and most serious historians point out,

> the [twentieth] century ended with a global disorder of an unclear nature, and without any mechanism to stop the disorder or keep it under control. . . . The reason for this impotence is not only the depth of the world crisis and its complexity, but also the apparent failure of all the programs, new or old, to deal with the issues of humankind to better them.

There are two decisive problems for the long term, one demographic, the other ecological. Both problems must be examined in a context of generalized *anomia*, questionable or illegitimate institutions and leaderships, exaltation of the banal and a total commercialization of people's expectations and grievances. These entail social, political, economic and cultural phenomena whose results are absolutely uncertain from the point of view of the normal predictions of the sciences and

of the present resources of the today's intelligentsia. Only a break in observable trends makes it possible to identify unexpected and alternative solutions to present conditions.

This underlines the need, responsibility and opportunity of philosophers to focus their efforts on carefully thinking over the available scientific information on these problems. By nature, they immediately turn them into questions, into a reflection in which the decision to give new sense to our life as "human beings" -- with all the philosophical connotations of this expression -- is foundational for any practical consideration.

This is not a mere academic discussion; the future of humanity is at stake. It is the choice between supporting the birth of a new threshold of the conscience of humanity, or, on the contrary, accelerating the final phase of its prostration -- the inertial process of the death of the species, as some post-modern authors have already diagnosed. By the term "man" I mean to designate all and every concrete human being living on the planet; not one class of people or some populations to the exclusion of others. This clarification ceases to be obvious as soon as we examine the partiality of the solutions to the world's present problems proposed by the specialized organisms and the governmental leaders of those countries relatively capable of taking steps.

Even taking into account the hypothesis of moderate growth in the world population with a tendency to stabilization and with a lower birth rate than estimated for the year 2025,[15] there are many and grave problems: regional imbalance, the deepening of the abyss between rich countries and poor, the installation of "essentially unequal societies" in a region or state, the increase of urbanization, intolerance, racial, religious and juridical discrimination towards immigrants in search of work and a better standard of living. All are real causal vectors of social conflicts, hardly predictable or manageable.

The contradictions of progress made legitimate by the work of Cartesian Reason, have, in fact, created the bad place, the "distopia," of the utopian dream of Modernity. In this process of decomposition of order there is prospect that some countries will be left out of history for ever. This discourages our daily claims to a spirit of justice and dignity. Where there are no "strategic" interests, that is, where there is no dominant self-interest the West has no "humanitarian" disposition. Other humans -- as important as the other biological species which are the object of international concern -- in Africa "the Third World's Third World",[16] Asia, Latin America and in the social margins of the rich countries die of starvation, AIDS or of silent forgetfulness in this era of communication.

Despite rational anxiety over the ecological crisis and the efforts to overcome it, global solutions seem to aim unilaterally at the benefit of those countries which have achieved an acceptable development for most of their citizens.

> Proposals such as the one of a world with zero growth . . . are completely impracticable. Zero growth in the existing situation would freeze the present inequalities among the countries in the world, something that turns out to be more bearable for the average inhabitant from Switzerland than for the one from India. It is not by chance that the main support to the ecological politics comes from the rich countries and from the middle and wealthy classes from all countries (except for those businessmen who expect to earn money from contaminating). The poor, who multiply and are underemployed, want more development, not less.[17]

Sustainable development in the mid-term is a self-limited possibility, as long as the principles and instruments of action continue to be incompatible with the true and unclear aim of the efforts. What is meant by "sustainable development"? "Undoubtedly," says Hobsbawm,

> scientific experts can establish what is necessary to avoid an irreversible [ecological] crisis, but we mustn't forget that establishing this balance [between Humanity, the renewable resources it consumes, and the consequences that its activities produce in the environment] isn't a scientific technological problem, but a political and social one. . . . There is no doubt that this balance would be incompatible with a world economy based on the unlimited search for economic benefits by some corporations, which are essentially devoted to this aim and compete with each other in a global market. From the environmental point of view, if Humanity is to have a future, the capitalism of the crisis decades shouldn't have one.[18]

THE HYPOSTASIS OF INEQUALITY IN THE LANGUAGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

In fact, what derives from the data provided by specialized international organizations in our interpretation is not only the "problem" that humanity has to face in this millennium, but the metaphysical question of choosing a new way, as I have previously pointed out. If we want to succeed in the solutions or, even better, in the "re-solutions" we make, "choosing a new way" must refer explicitly to the tremendous task of reformulating the symbolic universe that has sustained the history of humanity up to this day.

In order to allow for the improvement of our perspective on reality, it is important to pay attention to the use of language as a conditioning factor in the formulation and testing of the problems themselves. Here I refer to such expressions as "central societies" and "peripheral societies", "North-South", "development" and "underdevelopment", "Third World-First World," etc. It is not simply a way of speaking or a conjecture that subsequently may be refuted. It consists of a starting point in terms of which alone solutions can be thought. Its truth function is accepted more naturally than a statement about the existence of God. Social sciences and, of course, philosophy evidence here their incapacity for a prior criticism and submit to a structure of institutionalized power.

What is "North"? Is it perhaps a geographical place, the direction in which we have to go, the meaning of the power of dominion, a welfare model? Why is it necessary to identify "South" with what is peripheral and marginal, marginal with respect to what? Is it not a cultural scope, a life-style, or maybe a geographical place too? What are the developmental parameters? Are these concepts the result of an aseptic linguistic agreement, in which event is it possible to imagine an asepsis in social sciences? Or is there present in linguistic usage a "cosmovision," a necessary idea about life, about man and his ontological possibilities? Are linguistic games not essentially power games?

This appalling "metaphysics of legitimization", that the philosophy of dusk is unable to account for, sustains at present the whole discursive assembly of social sciences and the operative logic of international actors. It closes the way for all open interchange about the true metaphysical questions that today should define the future horizon of humanity. Ignorance, indolence or the interested justification of dominant power spaces are installed in the conception of the world as an entity. This ontology has imploded into a fragmentation of expectations in a recurrent and purposeless history. Certainly, the dominant-submission relationship and the manipulation of hope put into practice the principle of inequality between men and nations. This is the reason for contradictions between discourses and facts in the "humanitarian help" game: the need for subtle but revealing conditions of growth, speculation about sustainable development, care for environment, the effects of indebtness, or the political appraisal of human rights.

If every living thing has its cycle, then it is proper to hypothesize that central societies are entering -- if they have not already done so -- into a cycle of "inertial prostration" having completed the shapes in which historically they have modeled their destiny? Why count further on some finite ways of manifesting freedom as if they were the necessary unfolding of being. In this millennium, "societies with an integrated history," enter a process of exhaustion of their historical time. They face the choice of either being defeated by the spiritual weariness that vitiates their future realization, or joining together as societies with a possible history. This must begin from recognition that they are immersed in a logic of appropriation and consumption.

THE METAPHYSICAL QUESTION IN THE 21ST CENTURY: THE AUFHEBEN OF POSTMODERNISM

What is our responsibility in the problems of humanity in the 21st century? What can we do with philosophical reflection from the anchorage of a living metaphysics that engages the ontological-existential questions involved in the social, political, economic, and scientific-technological problems of this new century?

The first is to break with the assumption that the task of philosophy is to arrive late and to contemplate the world in the somnolence of dusk. If philosophy is a way of thinking, then action must be preceded by thinking. The search for truth that has accompanied it during the worst moments of its history must sustain it in permanent wakefulness. This critical task regarding our own foundations and position before the world can be translated into practice as an openness to truth, not the possession and legitimization of one truth above the other. In philosophical questions truth is not a term of knowledge, but a state of openness. Has this not been the Socratic inspiration in the Western philosophical tradition and mutatis mutandis the principle that has encouraged the real, silent and effective work of authentic scientists in all times?[19]

The second step in accompanying man in the configuration of a new ontological horizon is to determine what is essential, namely, to discover that we confront not problems, but questions of meaning. This calls for joining together with the others and with things in the symbolic configuration of the world. It is essential, then, to assume the questions of human destiny and to re-solve them.

The third step is to open truth by questions of the meaning of being with others. This is to recognize that in the event itself of questioning there is neither "a unique account" of our history nor "a unique idea of reason" that articulates the meaning of human life. The task at this stage for the Western philosophical tradition is to be capable of a new Aufheben. That is, of a leap in the consciousness of being from opposition or contrast to others, to a way of thinking, feeling and, above all, acting with all others without exclusions. In this way the distopic experience of modernity reflected in postmodern culture can be thought of as the human possibility of a free decision to exist in the world according to an identity which is not one of appropriation, grasping or consumption.

"It is a rule of being and of life," said Jean Guitton[20]

> that when time is compressed and failures obstruct progress, the species -- whether biological or rational -- confronted with the threat of death passes through a threshold, rises, and is sublimated. There is an unknown way of adaptation at the highest level. The first model for this is thinking, when animality appeared limited by its `giant's wings' and unable to go further then, the choice emerges between death or survival, destruction or a way out.

If it is true that common sense or reason is the best distributed thing in the world and that it is just a matter of applying it correctly in life, then instrumental reason as the prime product of modernity can find in globalization its universal meaning. This universality, however, does not imply a planetary historic consciousness of truth. Rather, it is a universality without identity, a space of things in a time of things. Like things, it is mired in what is useful, in presences without faces or names.

NOTES

1. La esperanza del sentido. El pensamiento metafísico del hombre, 2 vol. (Buenos Aires: Editorial Docencia).

2. Partly inspired by the reflection by Otto F. Bollnow [cf. Neue Geborgenheit, Stuttgart und Köln, Verlag W. Kohlhammer, Spanish version: Filosofía de la Esperanza, Buenos Aires, Fabril Editora, 1962], I first developed the difference between "expectation" (`espera', [lat.: spectatio]) and "hope" (`esperanza', [lat.: spes]) in the essay Discépolo. Todavía la Esperanza (Buenos Aires: Editorial Almagesto, [2ª] 1995).

3. The use I make of this term can be broadened according to the characterization of post-modern society in my paper: "La lógica del travestismo y el metarrelato de la postmodernidad", in Postmodernidad y Postcolonialidad, (Theorie und Kritik der Kultur und Literatur) (Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert Verlag, 1997); pp. 155-175.

4. Cf. the foundation of the expression "spaces of identity" in, among other writings, my essay Poder y libertad en la sociedad postmoderna (Buenos Aires: Editorial Almagesto, 1995, 2ª edic. 1998).

5. Op. cit., pp. 108 ss.

6. H. Daniel Dei, "El sentido de la indagación filosófica", in Revista de Filosofía de la Universidad de Costa Rica, XXVI (63-64), 1988; pp. 71-76. Also, as a chapter of my essay Antropodicea. La cuestión del hombre (Buenos Aires: Editorial Almagesto, 1997).

7. Poder y libertad en la sociedad postmoderna . . ., pp. 28-30.

8. Cf. the contribution of Karl Otto Apel and of Jürgen Habermas to the "communication ethics" and "discourse ethics".

9. From my philosophical point of view, the difference between "question" and "problem" is the key to understanding the aim and work of Philosophy. See especially Antropodicea . . ., already mentioned.

10. For further information and theory, doubtless, on this daring statement see: "La reparación de una distopía. La conciencia histórica de la Postmodernidad", in Damero, nº 1, 1997; pp. 40-55.

11. Cf. "La reparación de una distopía . . .", # 7.

12. For more information on the neologism `paradigm' see, among other works, my lecture material: "Paradigmas y paradogmas en las ciencias sociales," in La Cuerda Floja, nº 10, January 1998, electronic publications of the Universidad de Chile, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales.

13. This expression belongs to J. Guitton. Cf. H. Daniel Dei - Silvia D. Maeso, "Jean Guitton: La dimensión metafísica de la guerra actual", in Revista E. S. G, n° 479, August-October 1986; pp. 29-54. Translation, comments and criticism of the conference "Le Philosophe et la Cité Future", read by the author on June 26 at the École Militaire en France.

14. Historia del siglo XX, (Crítica) (Barcelona: Grijalbo Mondadori, 1995), pp. 555 ss.

15. Calculated as eight billion persons.

16. D. E. Duncan, "Africa: The Long Goodbye", en Atlantic Monthly, July 1990, p. 20. Doubtless it's a cruel expression to evince a reality and the ambiguity becomes an object of the Western ethical consciousness. From the beginning of the present decade, the technical reports about the situation and the future of the African continent were pessimistic. Paul Kennedy (Hacia el siglo XXI, Barcelona, Plaza & Janés, 1995, pp. 318 ss.), gives a summary of the state of the art with words that were taken from these reports, such as "a catastrophic human and environmental zone", "moribund", "marginalized", "peripheral zones of the remaining of the world", with so many problems that some foreign experts in development abandon it and they prefer to work in other subjects. "In the World Bank's opinion, he says, practically all of the regions of the world will experiment a lessening of poverty in the year 2000, except for Africa, where the situation will change only for the worst."

17. Hobsbawm, p 562.

18. Ibid.

19. I share the spirit of Prof. Franz Wimmer's ("Intercultural philosophy", in Rev. Filosofía Univ. Costa Rica, XXXIII (80), 7-9, 1995). As regards the item I considered, he says: "The first consequence when considering the situation of humanity as globalized in regional ways of thinking, that are essentially different, consists of a critical evaluation of philosophy as a discipline. We must admit that each attempt by philosophers to match the general concept of "philosophy" with the cultural concept of "Western philosophy" is misled. This matching was the standard in almost all the academic philosophers during a long period, at least in the West. On account of this, it will not be an easy task, because it is a necessary precondition -- not sufficient -- to criticize Eurocentrism and turn that criticism into a general criticism of the centrist ways of thinking. . . ."

20. Op. cit., p. 53.

CHAPTER XXII

TWO MODELS OF TRINITY: FRENCH POST-STRUCTURALIST VERSUS THE HISTORICAL-CRITICAL ARGUED IN THE FORM OF A DIALOGUE

ROBERT MAGLIOLA

Theologians have long taken heart from St. Paul's encouraging words, "Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is from God, that we might understand the gifts bestowed on us by God" (I Cor. 2:12), and "the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God" (2:13). Nowhere in theology has this search been more exciting but also -- necessarily -- more intimidating and awe-inspiring than in studies of the Blessed Trinity. As a professor teaching and researching in Asia since 1983, I have been touched in particular by the Buddhist emphasis on what -- in western terms -- can perhaps best be called *non-entitativeness*. Simultaneously, involved in Buddhist-Christian dialogue as I am, I have come to the conclusion that whatever `samenesses' exist between Buddhism and Christianity are founded on *differences* between the two religions, and not on `common ground.' Indeed, in our dialogues, we have found that whenever we Buddhists and Christians agree on a value -- on the importance of loving-kindness, for example -- our rationales justifying the value always reduce down sooner or later to purely differing `grounds'. Here, as on many occasions, a French post-structuralist claim, indeed, specifically a claim of Jacques Derrida, comes to my aid: `samenesses' are appointed, raised, `constituted' (in the philosophical sense) by `differences', not `common ground'.

But how then to work out a Trinitarian model, and an orthodox one at that, which purely differs from Buddhist non-entitativeness yet influenced by the notion of non-entitativeness? The solution eventually came to me and became one of the main theses of my recent book, *On Deconstructing Life-Worlds: Buddhism, Christianity, Culture* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997) (hereafter *ODLW*). Its characteristic is marked out in the following paragraph:

> Surely we should not expect that Christianity's deconstruction of holism *imitate* Buddhist deconstruction. Indeed, `pure negative reference', a key thought motif of this very section, means that the religions erect their `samenesses' by way of their very differences. What I have found, rather, is that pure negative reference has been `crypted' into Christian theology for a long time, perhaps from the beginning, crypted into Christian theology in ways purely differing from the Buddhist ones. For me the topic of Buddhist-Christian dialogue becomes, then, an intersection of Buddhist devoidness and Christian devoidness, two intersecting lines that necessarily have no `common ground'(183).

[The analogical reference is to mathematical lines, which do not have width and thus have no space in common even when they cross each other].

In short, influenced and inspired by the Buddhist appreciation of non-entitativeness, I have come to find a Catholic non-entitativeness which has been there in the Catholic tradition, perhaps there all along: it purely differs from Buddhist non-entitativeness, but has been covered-up. Covered-up not by design, of course, but by western entitative thinking. *OnDeconstructing Life-Worlds* introduces

the Derridean notion of `glitch' to the theology of Trinity, developing further the Catholic non-entitative theory of Trinity which I first proposed in an earlier book, *Derrida on the Mend* (Purdue U. P., 1984; 2nd ed. 86) (hereafter *DOM*). Derrida argues that the irreconcilable clashes between formulae which are valid in their own contexts often `mark' the most productive and fecund points of `truth'. In my recent book I apply this notion of glitch to the equivocal status of the `Active Spiration of the Holy Spirit' in Conciliar declarations about the Trinity, where definitions, on the one hand, of the `oneness of God' and definitions, on the other hand, of the *hypostases* or Trinitiarian persons, seem toleave `no place' for the Active Spiration. This is an old conundrum recognizable to Trinitiarian scholars, of course, as are the `synthetic' solutions proposed by the scholastic tradition; but my Derridean approach reworks this famous `crux' into a fertile site, not a vexatious dilemma. Much of the fertility arises in terms of non-entitative thinking, deploying `negative overlap' and other maneuvers, derived from Derrida but which I appropriate in what I insist are orthodox Catholic ways, that is, ways not incompatible with the *magisterium*.

On Deconstructing Life-Worlds includes many other topics besides theology, and the book has already elicited a number of reviews, most not in American journals. Yet, it is the private letter from a Catholic theologian friend which has most provoked me. He is a Biblical scholar, and enthusiast of the `historical-critical' method which now dominates Catholic Biblical scholarship and is becoming increasingly popular in dogmatic theology and the other theological disciplines too because it extends its claims as `founding' in relation to the other disciplines. As was to be expected, he excoriated me for my deference to the papal and Conciliar *magisterium*, which he considered slavish; and at the same time he excoriated me for my `distortion' of magisterial declarations on the Trinity according to the principle that if one is going to have recourse to the *magisterium*, the relevant magisterial texts must be read according to the `historical-critical' method. Our correspondence extended over several months, and was interesting enough, maybe even arresting enough, in my own opinion, to be published in its own right. In the course of the pages, scholastic intricacies were indeed engaged, very engaged, but what came to head were even more elemental questions roiling the Church today. What should theology do? How should the Scriptures be read? What are the roles of Church authority? What are the roots of religious experience? What seemed to be several meaningful ironies came to light, ironies to the extent that they would confound -- I believe -- the expectations of most mainstream Catholic academics. For example, it proves to be my position as post-structuralist which acknowledges and affirms Buddhist influence, whereas the `liberal' position represented by my friend excludes the possible pertinence of Buddhist thought to the Trinitarian project. Yet at the same time, it is my post-structuralism which positively matches the re-interpretation of Trinity to Church Council documents and even to Aquinas, whereas my historico-critical friend downplays the traditional *magisterium* of Pope and Councils and affirms the `*magisterium* of theologians' as an integral and real part of the Teaching Office (and not just as advisory *periti*).

In any case, the result was that my theologian-friend refused permission to publish his side of the epistolary exchange. Convinced that the debated ideas were worth publishing, how could I continue my plan *ethically*, then? What I decided was (1) to extract the principles of the historical-critical position, idealizing and universalizing them so they stand as almost a generic historico-critical response to my post-structuralist position, and then (2) to create a fictional `interlocutor' who can in no way be tallied to my friend's identity. Through this device I would express the abstract arguments concretely, putting them in said fictional *persona*'s mouth. My friend is not compromised and I am not compromised, yet the arguments are served. The resulting `dialogue' appears below, immediately after the *précis* of my Trinitarian thesis (condensed from the Trinitarian chapters of my

two relevant books). The *précis* which is necessary, of course, if the reader is to make sense of the dialogue which follows. The dialogue itself is cast in the form of epistolary debate between me as `author' and an `interlocutor'.

A *PRÉCIS* OF A TRINITARIAN THESIS

The Council of Florence (1438-39) affirmed that "everything is one" in God "except where an opposition of relationship [*relationis oppositio*] occurs," so that each of the three Persons *as* a Person is constituted (i.e., defined, established) *only* by oppositional relations among the Persons. Most theologians have always taken *relationis oppositio* in the Thomist sense (though this is by no means strictly necessary for the case I am making), namely -- the `opposition of relation' is*contrariety* rather than *contradiction*. The only `functions' that are applied *uniquely* to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*respectively* in Scripture are the following: `Paternity' to the Father, `Filiation' (Sonship) to the Son, and `Passive Spiration' or that which is `breathed-out,' to the Holy Spirit.

Because such is the case (among other reasons), Karl Rahner rejects the `psychological' theories of Trinity which define the Father as Knower, for example, and the Son as the Known (i.e., Truth): Scripture in one place or another identifies Knowing with each of the three Persons all told. Which is to say, according to the *relationis oppositio* clause, Knowing (in our example) does not define the Persons at all, but the Unity of God *instead*. (Scripture's attribution of Knowing to any one Person at any one time is said to be just `appropriated' to the Person: it does not *really* belong to that unique Person.)

This operation is mind-bending in a very `postmodern' way. *All* that the Persons would share is sacrificed, is preempted or is always already `gutted out' of them, so that it belongs to the Unity.[1] This `syncopation' in the midst of God involves*kenosis*, but -- since the Personal contrarieties `remain' -- it is `devoid' not `void' *kenosis* (I derive the void/devoid distinction from Derrida [2]). Furthermore, we should speak in the plural of *kenoses*, rather than *kenosis*, since the `opposition of relation' between Paternity and Filiation, say, is not the same as that between Active Spiration and Passive Spiration, and thus what is preempted out of them is not the same. (As for the special problematic of Spiration, I shall address it momentarily.) Finally,*apropos* of the Personal contraries, there is at least one other point to be made here, one which jibes with a Post-Structuralist notion in a startling way: While it is the case that the *kenoses* are devoid, Persons relate in terms of *pure negative reference*(i.e., the two comparata are absolutely *not* like each other, yet are somehow linked anyway: they `belong together'[3]). The Father, for example, is *purely*, absolutely *not* the Son, recalling that what they `would' share has gone over to the Unity.

To summarize, the *relationis oppositio* clause necessarily describes a Triune God wherein the three Persons raise the `sameness' of the Unity by way of their emptyings-out: This Unity is constituted *indirectly* by the `lateral' contraries of the Persons, and these contrary relations are themselves `pure negative references'. The *kenoses* raising the Divine Unity are devoid, and the Unity and the Three Persons are *not* interchangeable in the strict sense.

The problematic of the Holy Spirit and its `procession' (*Processio*) from the Father and through the Son also can benefit from the application of post-structuralist, specifically Derridean stratagems of thought. The Holy Spirit is said to proceed from the Father/Son *as from one principle*. Given that even in (what is called) the Eastern Church's formula, that is, "through the Son," it is not a question of the Father *transferring* Himself or a part of Himself to or through the Son this would vitiate the*relationis oppositio* clause. The question opens up: How does the `one principle' work? I argue that the Derridean deconstruction of Signifier-Signified dyads[4] can supply us with a clue. In Derrida,

the representation, or Signifier, boomerangs back as *different* from the Signified, as *its* cause (while the Signified *also* remains as cause); so the model of simple dyad breaks down. One plus one make at least three. The inescapable `addition' of the Third requires the interaction of the `initial' Signified and Signifier and requires that the interaction involve infringement. I use the word, `initial,' advisedly because what Derrida is doing is a *deconstruction*. In other words, Derrida is learning/showing `sequentially' where the traditional Occidental logic of Signification *really* must lead. I use the word `infringement' advisedly, because the Signifier usurps the causality of the Signified. What we learn from the deconstruction is that the Signified-Signifier dyad is `*always already*' three, and that the Third of these three proceeds perpetually from a transgressive yet singular interaction of the other two. Finally, we learn that this `alternative solution'[5] and the workings of the two that are three, must also necessarily come *sous rature* (`under erasure', a Derridean term meaning that an `alternative solution' *in turn* must undergo deconstruction because it violates the normative strictures of a yet larger frame).

I argue that this Signified-Signifier dyad Which-is-always-already-Three, operates *mutatis mutandis* as the best *clue*towards understanding the *Processio* that the 20th century has hatched. (I appropriated the term, *clue*, and ask for patience with a post-structuralist idiom which can `sound' harsh [e.g., `infringement', `transgression', `disruption', etc.[6]]). *Mutatis mutandis*, I go on to insist that the Derridean account can indicate how the Father and Son `infringe' each other and still `as one principle' spirate the Holy Spirit. As we have just seen , Derrida's Signified and Signifier split to make a Third, and a split is of course `disruption'. `Disruption' in the sense that the Signifier does not at all close around into the Signified (does not do so even though this `circle' is conventionally expected,[7] indeed, *most* expected). In short, the Signifier does not somehow *mediate* the Signified. In Conciliar theology, (which I mean, the theology insofar as it is set forth explicitly by the *magisterium*), it turns out that a like `disruption' is necessarily in effect.

How so? The theology strictly distinguishes between the `one principle' that spirates the Holy Spirit and the Father's*Generatio* that begets the Son. The *Generatio* is unilateral (the Son cannot beget the Father in turn); but the `aspiration from one principle' involves the Father and Son in a kind of mutual transgression,[8] in a kind of *disruption*. Which is to say, in short, there is no *mediation* between them. The Holy Spirit proceeds "from the Father and *at once* from the Son [*simul et Filio*], and*from both* (*ex utroque*) as from one principle."[9] While remaining `one principle', the Son is considered the `principle,' and the Father is considered the `principle'.

Next, there is a wonderfully Divine `*glitch'* in the Church's Conciliar theology of the Triune God. (*Not* that the `glitch' is in God; but that it marks a disconnection in the magisterial theology, sort of like a postmodern version of the Kantian antinomies: and an `otherness' of God is situated at that `blind spot' where the conceptual machine `jams'. In short, this `jamming', the *how* of a particular `glitch', is its own special kind of negative clue. It is a Clue in the peculiar Lack,[10] one might even say. It does *not* at all mean the magisterial theology in its own context and insofar as it goes, is *wrong*.) Given that the `one principle' of Father and/with Son is in `oppositional relation' to the Holy Spirit it establishes, the `one principle' would appear to be a *fourth* Person. But a fourth Person is deemed Biblically impossible. Thus theology has long insisted that this Actve Spiration (of Father and/with Son) which `breathes out' the Holy Spirit (Who is the Passive Spiration) is *virtual*, not real. (`Virtual' is taken to mean `of *only* functional validity'). But the Councils have long declared that the Passive Spiration is *real*. Otherwise, the Holy Spirit would not be real, and thus not a Person.

I argue that the `equivocating status' of the Active Spiration behaves much like a *Derridean* `double-bind'. To wit: (1) The Active Spiration *overlaps* with the definition of a Divine Person because it is in oppositional relation (*relationis oppositio*) to the Third Person, the Holy

Spirit, and thus would be a Person too, but (First Bind) this is *negative overlap* because the Active Spiration is virtual, not real, and thus *not* a Person. (2) The Active Spiration *overlaps* with the definition of the Divine Unity because `as one principle' the Father and/with the Son are transgressive of each other but are not oppositional to each other, and "everything is one in God except where *relationis oppositio* occurs." But (Second Bind) this is *negative overlap*because the `one principle' *cannot* belong to the Unity: it is locked instead into a singular *oppositional* relation with the Holy Spirit, who is a real Person. The Active Spiration, as *neither* Personhood *nor* Divine Unity, is thus a privileged clue to the Difference between them, that is, to what we can call from our human side the Difference `within' the Triune God. We can say from our human side that `in negative overlaps and non-holistically does the happening of God perpetually go-on'. (Of course, all this must come necessarily *sous rature*, in this case, God's own erasure. To put it another way, God `puts an X' over our clue; this is how the `clue *sous rature*' survives for us in this world -- as a clue with an X over it.)[11]

Lastly, the postmodern deployments described above can help the Church develop a theology of the *impersonal* in God (Rahner and Panikkar both agree that we already have a developed theology of Divine personalty, but not of Divine impersonality). In my case, Asian appreciations of impersonality have been a further influence (*not* that I *duplicate* these unique appreciations, however). Keeping in mind that Conciliar *hypostasis* as a term is meant to avoid identification with either the Unity, which would be `modalism,' or human personhood, which would be anthropomorphism, we can go on to propose -- according to the postmodern but orthodox protocols limned above -- the following scenario, and here I distinguish between `Person', as in the Trinitarian Persons, and `person', as in human personhood. (1) the Divine Unity is devoid and impersonal, (2) the Trinity -- because of its internal voiding oppositions -- is Personal, and (3) the Triune God is `impersonal' (except for the Son, insofar as the Son is incarnate in Jesus Christ, who in His human nature has `personal consciousness'). Moreover, figured into the Triune, God, is the dislocation (of the conventional human formulae of `unity') represented by the anomalous status of the Active Spiration, so the Triune God would seem to loop forever from the elegant double-bind at the Divine (Personal/imPersonal) core. It goes without saying that all this scenario, of course, in turn comes under erasure, God's X over our fragile, feeble human thinking. Recall St. Thomas Aquinas in mystic vision: ". . . all that I have written is as straw compared to what I have seen!"

AN EPISTOLARY DIALOGUE

Interlocutor

(1) There is first of all an `external' problem with your discourse, both in *Derrida on the Mend* and in *OnDeconstructing Life-Worlds*. There are at least two potential readerships who are not going to understand what you are arguing. Both the Buddhologists and the Derrideans are not trained in the disciplinary modes nor in the long and complex history of Catholic Trinitarian doctrine. As for the third readership, contemporary Catholic theologians, they will foreclose on reading your book because your kind of Trinitarian speculation has been superseded: the last of the important scholastic types was Lonergan.

Now I go on to the `internal problems'. Your treatment of magisterial and scriptural authorities is proof-textish: you don't make necessary distinctions, and you disregard historical context. Your study of the trinity focuses on medieval trinitarian logic and ignores the early but founding history, especially the slow and twisting path from Philo to Augustine. If I may hark back to your earlier

book involving Derrida, Buddhism and Catholicism, *Derrida on the Mend*, you say that there are scriptural texts which announce the co-equality, co-eternity, and co-substantiality (pp. 137-38). Actually, read in their *own* historical context and the Biblical contexts themselves, the scriptural texts you quote do not support the Nicenic interpretations. "I and the Father are one," for example, is a phenomenological statement: it expresses Jesus's experience of non-duality; and insofar as it deploys the Old Testament motif of the `unity of sender and sent', it is a very Jewish statement.

(2) Aquinas represents medieval theology at its best. Perhaps his greatest real contribution to the theology of his epoch was his foundational methodology: whatever the speculation, he consistently referred back to the data of scriptural revelation and used these data to mark the limits of how far theological speculating can actually go. He does not put the cart before the horse. Thus, Aquinas functioned in the argumentative economy of his day so that most of his work is clarification: he studies and applies the rules of medieval theological language and logic in order to ascertain whether a given theological `position' is accountable to the scriptural data. He refutes heretical formulae precisely by measuring them in terms of these data. You say in your work that Derrida's "differential mode" allows us "true progress" in apprehending the manner of the Trinity; but Aquinas did not *add* to revelation, and the whole thrust of his work is to signal the limited scope of speculative `progress'. You want to replace entitative by non-entitative speculation, but the latter is no less accountable to Biblical data. There is no room for Buddhist influence here.

(3) Aquinas is faithful, throughout, to the rule of faith. The one divine essence is identical with the Father, from whom the Son and the Holy Spirit receive it (the Son and Holy Spirit are thereby the same divine essence as the Father, God from God). The very process which constitutes Son and Spirit as `persons' or `*supposita* of the divine essence,' also constitutes them as God. There is no expropriation of the divine essence, as you seem to suggest. That the three persons, in your words, are "Perpetually and mutually and totally abrogating each other" (*DOM* 140), does not fit the Thomistic understanding of the trinitarian oppositions. The only differentiations allowed are those occurring "*ubi obviat relationis oppositio*" (where an opposition of relation occurs). The divine essence which the Father is, the Son is, and the Spirit is, is one and the same.

"Thus it is manifest that relation really existing in God is really the same as His essence and only differs in its mode of intelligibility; . . . in God relation and essence do not differ from each other, but are one and the same" (*STh* I.28.2).[12] The `real distinction' in God is "*secundum rem relativam*" (28.3). In other words, the relations are the essence, and differ from it only in reason. A trinitarian person is a `relation as subsisting,' and this *hypostasis* subsisting in the divine nature is nothing other than the divine nature. Indeed, Aquinas says although "the name `person' signifies relation directly, and the essence indirectly," the word `person' can likewise signify "directly the essence, and indirectly the relation, inasmuch as the essence is the same as the*hypostasis*" (29.4).

You say "the three persons are not the self-same -- they do not share or hold in common the divine unity, simply because, *qua* persons, anything they would share in common belongs to the divine unity instead' (*DOM* 144, 146; *ODLW*, 184-85). No orthodox theologian, as you claim to be, can deny that the three persons have in common the divine essence. "The Father is good, the Son is good, the Spirit is good, yet not three goods but one good," and so on. The persons differ only as relationally opposed subsistences of that essence, (and `opposed' here is to be taken to mean `across from').

(4) Your discussion of the problematic of the active spiration obfuscates what should be clear. In reference to `subsistent spiration', Aquinas says: "Although there are four relations in God, one of them, spiration, is not separated from the person of the Father and of the Son, but belongs to both; thus, although it is a relation, it is not called a property, because it does not belong to only one person;

nor is it a personal relation -- i.e., constituting a person" (30.2 ad 1). Paternity, filiation, and passive spiration are person-constituting relations; but active spiration is not because the Father and Son are constituted before (*sit venia verbo*) they spirate, so spiration cannot constitute them.

(5) Because it is a mystery, the logic of the trinity is flawed from the start. History shows that the scholastic kind of discourse is limited and impractical. I agree with Cardinal Newman's recapitulation, setting forth nine simple propositions in regard to trinitiarian dogma. These nine safeguard the dogma, and even these nine lead only to headaches if one attempts to build a metaphysical basis for them.

Author

In God everything is one except where an opposition of relation occurs. The applications I had in mind were primarily to the `essential attributes' and `personal properties'. The essential attributes are represented in your letter to me by the reference, for example, to the famous `The Father is good, is wise; the Son is good, is wise; the Holy Spirit is good, is wise; yet not three goods and wises, but one good and wise', etc. Since your letter draws so much from Aquinas, I shall try to explain myself here in terms of his *Summa Theologiae*, though in point of fact the *Summa Contra Gentiles* (SCG) works quite well for my purposes too. In Aquinas the essential attributes are only `appropriated to' the Persons (39.7). For example, because "truth" belongs to the intellect, "It is appropriated to the Son, without, however, being a property of His. For truth can be considered as existing in the thought or in the thing itself. Hence, as intellect and thing in their essential meaning, are referred to the essence, and not to the Persons, so the same is to be said of truth" (39.8 ad 5). In other words, essence is identified with God's `unity' or `common nature', not with Persons *qua* Persons. These three `personal properties', paternity, filiation, and procession (30.2 ad 1) are "really distinguished from each other" (30.1. ad 2), whereas the "absolute properties in God, such as goodness and wisdom, are not mutually opposed; and hence, neither are they really distinguished from each other" (ibid.). "The very nature of relative opposition includes distinction. Hence, there must be real distinction in God, not, indeed, according to that which is absolute -- namely, essence, wherein there is supreme unity and simplicity -- but according to that which is relative" (28.3).

Given that there are three Persons in/of one divine nature, the adjudication of terms such as essence, *supposita*, and subsistence (*hypostasis*) becomes, needless to say, extremely delicate, so Aquinas warns "if we wish to express ourselves correctly, we must take into account not only the thing which is signified, but also the mode of its signification . . ." (39.5). "To express unity of essence and of person, the holy Doctors have sometimes expressed themselves with greater emphasis than the strict propriety of terms allows" (*ibid.*, ad 1). "Although God and the divine essence are really the same, nevertheless, on account of their different mode of signification, we must speak in a different way about each of them" (ibid., ad 3). "The word `essence', however, in its mode of signification, cannot stand for Person, because it signifies the essence as an abstract form. Consequently, what properly belongs to the Persons whereby they are distinguished from each other, cannot be attributed to the essence. For that would imply distinction in the divine essence, in the same way as there exists distinction in the `*supposita*'" (39.5). [In the *SCG* we have the same teaching, e.g., "The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son (John xv, 26; xvi, 14): which cannot be understood of the divine essence" (4.18).]

God and the divine essence are really the same; "since this word `God' signifies the divine essence in Him that possesses it, from its mode of signification it can of its own nature stand for Person" (39.5). The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are each of them the one God, so how to retain their

co-essentiality (*STh*'s term, e.g., 30.2 ad 2) while still retaining the aforesaid strictures pertaining to the `*supposita*'? Aquinas answers, "The divine essence is predicated of the Father by mode of*identity* by reason of the divine simplicity [likewise it can be predicated of the Son and Holy Spirit]; yet it does not follow that it can stand for the Father [or Son, or Holy Spirit], its mode of signification being different" (39.5 ad 4). I take this to mean that the essence is predicated of each Person by virtue of the *unity* or *oneness*, not the `*supposita*'. To regard the three `*supposita*' as the divine essence in its three hypostatic related modes-of-being can suggest some sort of modalism, as if the essence were the foundation and the hypostatic oppositions some kind of overlay. Indeed, this *would be* an entitativeness in the derogatory Derridean sense! When the Church speaks of `one God in three Persons', each Person is understood as `God whole and entire' because of the oneness, not because of the `hypostasis' or subsisting personhood. This is what I mean when I say in *ODLW* that "All that the Persons would share is sacrificed, is preempted, is already `gutted out' of them, so that it belongs to the Unity" (*ODLW* 184).

Interlocutor

I grant that the language of Basil and Augustine which was the underpinning for my reading of Aquinas can evoke a kind of modalism. In order to avoid offending Jews and Moslems, I have tended to emphasize the oneness of God, not the trinity of God. Granting this, I still think that you are turning distinctions into oppositions. You say the essence is predicated of each person by virtue of the unity or oneness, and "not by virtue of the *supposita* themselves." But that the *supposita* are at all is by virtue of the essence! Each person is a *suppositum* of the essence. The essence belongs to *hypostases* because the essence is communicated to the *hypostases* in their very constitution as *hypostases.* "It can be said that [the Father] is the principle of the whole Godhead, not because he generates and aspirates it but because by generating and aspirating he communicates it." (36.5 ad 6). The Father does not generate the essence, but by generating He communicates the essence. We cannot say the essence generates or is generated, but the essence is that whereby the Father generates and the Son is generated, -- we can perhaps call it, in less technical terms, the `substantive content of the relations.' The essence is the substance of Godhood but can only be found as subsisting in the three *supposita*.

Author

When I was researching *Derrida on the Mend*, I developed a very extensive library on the problematic of the `common spiration' -- it has not been dismissed as a non-question. Aquinas when treating the `common spiration' (in 40.1 ad 1) supplies two reasons whereby the properties can be identical to the Persons, the first reason applying to `personal properties' and the second to `non-personal properties'. Both reasons can be argued from the divine simplicity. The first reason is: "Since the divine simplicity excludes the composition of matter and form, it follows that in God the abstract is the same as the concrete, as `Godhead' and `God'." In God the abstract is the same as the concrete, so the paternity is the same as the Father, the filiation the same as the Son, the procession the same as the Holy Spirit. The second reason is: "And as the divine simplicity excludes the composition of subject and accident, it follows that whatever is attributed to God, is His essence Itself; and so, wisdom and power are the same in God, because they are both in the divine essence." As the attribute is the essence Itself, so the "common spiration is the same as the Person of the Father, and the Person of the Son; not that it is one subsisting Person, but that as there is one essence in the

two Persons, so also there is one property in the two Persons, as above explained" (explained in 30.2 which you, my interlocutor, quote). Since Aquinas assigns the `common spiration' to the kind of identity belonging to essential attributes, a problem opens up -- essential attributes belong necessarily to all three Persons because "the divine essence is not only really the same as one Person, but it is really the same as the three Persons" (39.6). Aquinas is placing the `common spiration' on the side of attribute because he must eschew the first reason for identity, which necessitates subsisting personhood; but the second reason for identity, according to Aquinas's own definitions, comports its own impossibility, viz., that the `common spiration' is the Holy Spirit, too.

This kind of bind happens in other places also because Aquinas feels obliged to show that the common spiration, while not being a *suppositum*, must nonetheless remain correlative as `active spiration' to the procession (passive spiration). Later in history the need (on the part of theologians) to justify a very special status is further sharpened when the Council of Florence underscores both `oppositional relation' and procession from Father and Son as from `*one* principle'.

The bind recurs in 28.4. We are told the procession of the Word has a proper name, viz., generation, and that therefore its opposing relations have proper names -- the relation of the principle is `paternity' and the relation of the Person proceeding from this principle is `filiation'. But the procession of Love, we are told, does not have a proper name, and so neither do the ensuing relations have a proper name of their own. In the case of the procession of Love, the relation of the principle is called `spiration' and the relation of the Person proceeding is called `procession'. Whereas the names `paternity' and `filiation' are self-reflexive, that is, name the relations, the names `spiration' and `procession' do not name themselves, but refer back to the `processions or origins themselves'. Aquinas here sends us to 27.4 where he says that the procession of the Word is consistent with the order of intellect, i.e., "The intellect is made actual by the object understood residing according to its own likeness in the intellect." The procession of Love is consistent with the order of will, i.e., "The will is made actual not by any similitude of the object willed within it, but by its having a certain inclination to the thing willed." Thus, Aquinas argues, there cannot be a proper name for the procession of Love. This is a most unconvincing rationale. The real reason that Aquinas says the procession of Love has no proper name is because (1) the procession is equally from Father *and* Son, and -- more importantly in the immediate context -- because therefrom he can argue that the spiration, the `relation of the principle', cannot have a self-reflexive proper name. If it did, it would `constitute a Person'.

Controversies over such material are important for me, and not trivial, because my understanding of their function differs from yours. To me, a `glitch' refers to a point of disconnection between magisterial statements which must be taken as true. I give solemn statements of Church Councils the full weight of *magisterium*, and accept them as definitely true (at least insofar as they go, expressed in human language as they are). Also, I do not tie these statements as absolutely to immediate historical context as you do. In the case of magisterial statements about the Trinity, for example, of course I recognize that they are mediated, at least from the Middle Ages onward, through the language of scholasticism (and indeed must be understood as they operate in such a context). But for me this does not mean that their truth cannot transcend local context. (Any calls for me to forsake `Nicenic shortcuts', for example, really ask me to give up how I understand developmental theology works. For me the Nicenic interpretations of the Johannine texts, for example, supply a *fuller* divine meaning than the Johannine writer(s) may not have *humanly* intended. In terms borrowed/adapted from the (early) Heidegger, one could say, I privilege the *als-Frage* of the Council fathers and the resultant *als-Struktur* which is the Nicenic interpretation.

Theologians are those whose *métier* is prudent speculation, and for me they properly operate according to the magisterial parameters. I think that those points, where officially-defined statements leave gaps that speculation cannot close, are Divine `markers.' The workings of the `failure' to close or `link-up' consistently are a *clue* to that which is most mysterious. I am *not* at all here suggesting the `glitches' are in God. Rather, the glitches, mark those points which -- because of our human inadequacy -- we *especially* cannot understand. They can be *clues*, however, in a sense analogous to how Ch'anist *kung-an*[Zen koans] are clues. A genius like Aquinas (of whom I have always been in awe) functions to `mark' these glitches, even while trying rationally/systematically to patch them (which it is his duty as a theologian to try to do).

As for the cart and horse, I agree with those many historians who say that -- from a strictly scientific point of view -- the most that can be inferred from the `data' is that a faith-community arose in the first century, which believed in a savior-figure it came to name the Christ. (The failings of the `Jesus Seminar' point up once more the futility of questing for the `historical Jesus', and I *do* read Crossan and the others.) Gradually over the next century these Christians assembled, what came to be called, the `official' written New Testament. Which texts belong to it, and how they can be understood, was thrashed out in a long historical process, as was the structure of the church. The structure of the church evolved through the first millennium -- in terms of historical `*power*-structure' -- into the `Catholic church', eastern and western. This power structure was often overweening and overbearing; and it often ground minorities of one kind or another into oblivion. It was and is hated by many people. I still accept it because I believe it houses the Christ and that down through the centuries it is being purified into His Mystical Body. (From this point of view, even the Protestant Reformation was a terrible, but necessary purification that the sins of the Church brought down upon itself.)

The biblical texts are by nature so ambiguous that so-called *scientific* efforts to `nest' their meanings *comprehensively*in terms of the first and second century faith-community are doomed to failure, as are scientific efforts *adequately* to describe that community itself.[13] The claim of the Catholic Church became that it had from the beginning at least in embryo -- the charism to *interpret* Christian belief, including the Scriptures, in order to deliver the faithful from what would *otherwise* be a very precious but inchoate collection of potential confusions. I accept on *faith* this claim of the Church; and the Christ I *believe*in is the Christ nesting in the Church today, whose image is the ongoing result of a messy and torturous history. I proclaim the special presence of Christ in His Mystical Body which nourishes me *today*. When I read Scripture, it is in the light of this Body that I read it and not by the sterile light of `objective' scientism. I do not put the cart before the horse or the horse before the cart. The horse, or -- if you permit me to alter the metaphor -- the Lion (the Lion of Judah, of course) is *in* the cart and master of the cart.

Interlocutor

The problematic of the active spiration may have excited much attention once, as you say, but nowadays it sounds like no more than a case of out-dated *Problemstellung.* In my view, any debate over it was really a problem of rules of language, not trinitarian ontology. The scholastic style of debate chased after every issue to the extreme and demanded an exactitude which we really cannot have about God.

I do not want to tie magisterial statements *absolutely* to context; but I do want to stress that these statements are very `situated' in history: their truths can be passed on to later ages (and epistemes) only insofar as these truths can be *translatedinto* the theological languages of the later epistemes. As

Karl Rahner said "the age of `dogmatic formulations' is over." In my view, the very fact that Vatican Council II did not issue doctrinal definitions signals the new emphasis on `Biblical proclamation.' This is the primary duty of the Church, but one long ignored by Catholicism.

You speak of the points of disconnection between various authoritative statements of the *magisterium*, and you tend to mystify these `glitches'. The `points of disconnection' stem -- in my opinion -- from a hermeneutically unsophisticated reading of conciliar utterances, and can be dissolved by way of proper historical contextualization. Also, you should keep in mind that conciliar statements binding *de fide definita* do not include the argumentation used to arrive at these statements. When one faces the apparent blank contradiction -- on the status of non-Catholics -- between the Council of Florence and Vatican Council II, it becomes clear that the reconciliation of conciliar dogmas must be necessarily a flexible and complex art indeed.

As for the `glitches' that beset Judaic and Christian theism, and have from the beginning, such as the disconnection between a benevolent omnipotent God and the rampant triumphs of evil, or between God's omniscience and human freedom, I maintain that a return to the Biblical sources allays these issues.

My remarks on the `Nicenic shortcut' -- an unfortunate shortcut which elides both Biblical context and the first three centuries of dogmatic development -- were intended to mean that the Johannine utterances should instead be taken as contemplative ones perfectly sufficient in their own Judaic setting. When John leads the reader up Christ's ladder to "The Father and I are one," it is a `saturated phenomenon' in Jean-Luc Marion's sense. The topic is not the `consubstantiality' of the Logos and the Father. Nor, for that matter, is revelation of the dogma of the trinity the prime purpose of the Incarnation, as some theologians seem to suggest. An Easter encounter with Christ and his Spirit is the prime purpose.

You say that theologians should "operate according to the magisterial parameters," but this is misleading. While respecting the *magisterium*, theologians should operate according to scripture (the `soul of theology', as Vatican Council II says). In fact, there were times in the history of the Church, at the Council of Trent, for example, when theologians were regarded explicitly as part of the *magisterium*. You say the *métier* of theologians is "prudent speculation." But I say their calling is to `interpretation', and the more Biblical their theology, the less speculation. It is dogmatic theology that tends to be `speculative'.

You say "the most that can be inferred [in terms of scientific history] is that a faith-community arose which believed in a savior figure . . . ." If you are so sceptical about historical research, how can you then rest your case so squarely on Church councils that are in the `historical past'? Besides, historical-critical study of the conciliar texts reveals as much fuzziness and ambiguity as do the Biblical texts.

I can appreciate your confusion over the scattered and reckless conclusions of the Jesus-seminar: its `seminarists' are misled by a-historicism and gullibility. There is now a third wave of questers after the historical Jesus (Meier, Freyne, etc.) who are doing a more responsible job.

You say that from a socio-anthropological point of view, "Religions are ongoing constructs of the collective imagination of their believers, cultivated by the power-structures which the believers agree to affirm." I think this contradicts what you hold about the solemn definitions of the *magisterium*. I would say that religions are authentic insofar as they express objective truths which can be stated propositionally. Christianity cannot allow Christ to dissolve into legends, no matter how legendary a figure Padmsambhava is. Besides, in Buddhism Padmasambhava serves just as `expedient means' to enlightenment.

Permit me two addenda, as I close. First, the Fourth Lateran Council declares against Joachim "that reality does not beget nor is it begotten, but it is the Father who begets and the Son who is begotten; he [the Father] gave him [the Son] his own substance, nor can it be said that he [the Father] did not retain the substance himself" [Denz. 432]. Surely your thesis of hypostatic `gutting-out' or expropriation is excluded here. Second, the Pontifical Biblical Commission emphasizes the priority of biblical over patristic and medieval language: "Les langages `auxiliaires' utilisés au cours de l'histoire de l'Eglise n'ont pas pour la foi une valeur identique à celle du langage référentiel utilisé par les auteurs inspirés: celui du Nouveau Testament qui plonge ses racines dans le Premier" (1.2.2.1).

Author

The bulk of the readership of *ODLW* is either Buddhist or secular and postmodernist. My realization of this conditioned my rhetorical and argumentative strategies. You are right to say that neither secularists nor contemporary theologians will be attracted by what sounds like `out-dated' *Problemstellungen* and proof-texting; but here I draw the line -- there are *some* things I sense I *must* say, regardless of indifferent (or hostile) reception. Actually, I treat the pertaining Scholastic Trinitarianism in terms of Derridean/Lacanian/Deleuzian maneuvers which belong to a *very* contemporary episteme. Derrida, for one, says he inserts himself into traditional systems and finds internal fault-lines in the systems, fault-lines which -- ironically for some -- mark the special `truths' of these systems. Much as in George Herbert's poem "The Altar," the hidden cracks and interstices in the body of the text -- quite apart from the semantic -- are crucial clues to what the poem is *most* about. In terms of an ecclesiastical readership, if just about all of these readers would foreclose on me in advance, then so be it. I have nothing to lose. What I say about the Trinity for me is not a speculative game, but is intimately involved with my prayer life, and flows out of it (though necessarily in `translated' form). Nor is this `gnosticism' on my part, as you have sometimes privately implied to me, since my intention is always to subject whatever I write -- in the most loyal fashion -- to the scrutiny and jurisdiction of the Church.

You say, in the matter of our debate, that Aquinas is really just treating (in the passages we discussed) a problem of `rules of language'. I answer that St. Thomas certainly did not think so, because he ascribed to a theory of language much akin to what we call nowadays a `correspondence-theory' of language. The references/notes to the 1947-48 Benziger Bros. Latin edition of the *Summa* are very good on language-theory in Aquinas, and make my point throughout. See also this same edition's citation to H.-F. Dondaine in his *La Trinité*, "[For Aquinas] metaphysic, logic and language are inseparable,"[14] etc. The preponderance of late-20th century post-phenomenological French language-theory must necessarily agree with me, though surely not because of St. Thomas's reasons. Rather, it would agree because it affirms that language and referent are inextricably entangled in each other: that is, it would agree as a result of the deconstruction of language-referent correspondence.

As for other possible `points of intersection', the sectors where my deconstruction could prove fruitful are (1) controversies over grace and free will and the magisterial guidelines generated as a reaction to these, to use the term, glitches, here could mark the problematic of so-called `inside' and `outside' and possibilities to which the western tradition has been blind, and (2) controversies and the resulting magisterial guidelines concerning God's `fore-knowledge'; glitches here could point to supernatural tracks through the problematic of what humans call `time'.

I don't want to wax polemical; but it is Marcus Borg *et al*. who fall for a hermeneutic of transparent circularity between ancient and modern interpreters, not I. Apropos of the limited nature of magisterial statements, so that they do not extend to the "arguments used to arrive at them," of course I concur; but *you* are the one who initially shifted the ground and made Aquinas bear the brunt of our discussion.

You are probably familiar with Philip S. Kaufman's *Why You Can Disagree and Remain a Faithful Catholic*(Crossroad, 1994) which is a history of `apparent blank contradictions' between magisterial statements, and which I read upon its publication with great interest. *In re*, you point out the discrepancy regarding the status of non-Catholics. My intuition is to examine this `glitch' as meaningful in its own right, rather than to dissolve it away via `historical contextualization' (though I first am willing to give studies of historical contextualization which seek to accomplish this feat `their day in court'). Just as you approach research with fore-questions, so do I. My sense is that the aforesaid feats of contextualization can easily be `sophisticated' (as in sophistic) sleights-of-hand. I prefer the `fudges' of the Councils themselves (because I can be sure God's hand is in them). For instance, Vatican Council II, in the wake of "*Mystici Corporis*" and the "Letter to Cardinal Cushing," extends the applicability of `implicit desire' to people outside the Catholic historical orbit. According to my way of thinking these fudges -- given their provenance -- can be holy fudges of sorts: that is, they can be epiphanic, the opening up of a Divine Site. (`The epiphany that the *magisterium* is fallible!' a *soi-disant* wit might want to interject here. But I believe reason *sousrature* in my Derridean sense is in play at this point and Derridean double-bind, and it should not be belittled by a wit's stimulus-response rationalism nor by banal polemics.)

The point I was making about Scripture and the Jesus Seminar is made by Luke Timothy Johnson in his own way (where is not mine) in *The Real Jesus* (Harper Collins, 1996), where he argues that "the writings of the New Testament are too few, too fragmentary, and too lacking in chronological and geographical controls to enable a truly comprehensive reconstruction of Christian origins" (p. 172). Instead, he proposes: "Within an ecclesial hermeneutics that begins with the premise that God's spirit is working in the world to transform people into the image of the `real Jesus', the discernment of the complex texts of human experience are brought into conversation with the complex and often *conflicting* voices of the normative texts of the tradition" (p. 176). Moreover, "*Contradictions* in the scriptural texts can be exploited to provide new insights into the `mind of Christ' by which the Church seeks to live" (*ibid.*) [italicizations mine].

Regarding the relative ambiguity of Biblical texts and the clarity of Conciliar texts, you know as historian as well as theologian that Biblical texts are considerably older than Conciliar texts; and in almost all cases their archival data much more tenuous. Additionally, you know that Biblical genres in almost all cases do not employ the "propositional statements" (expressive of "objective truths") which you so admire; but on the contrary employ concrete polysemous language. There is the further consideration (which given your definition of the role of theologians, you would not agree to) that *if* the contemporary Church has substantive doubts about what the declarations of a long-past Council mean, it is assured in the last analysis that it has the charism to make these judgements. (In my view, the *magisterium* can give a full hearing to the presentation of historical evidence, but does not `rest its case' on this presentation.)

Regarding your quotation from the Fourth Lateran Council, you splice together several Conciliar assertions and truncate the initial one. The first assertion in your quotation goes on to say what you omit -- " . . . , the Holy Spirit who proceeds; thus there are distinctions among persons and unity in nature." What I say in *ODLW* is that what the Persons would share belongs to the unity instead. I purposely do not ever mention `substance' or `nature' (because of the prejudicial slants of

my majority readership). In our dialogue we have been discussing `substance;' and I can say here that `substance' or `nature' (the Council in this context equates them[15]) belongs to the unity and not to the Persons *qua Persons*. Each of the Persons is each of them the whole substance, but each of them is the whole substance by virtue of the unity, not personal subsistence.

Apropos of your quotation from the Pontifical Biblical Commission, do you really mean that I should endow with authority a statement from one Pontifical Commission, but not declarations from the Nicenic Fathers in solemn Council? What authority should I give the other Pontifical Commissions and the Congregations of the *curia* which also must have their say, in matters pertaining to "*thèses christologiques*"? Now you are being far more authoritarian than I. (Aside: your invocation of Marion's `saturated phenomenon' does not relate to the argument. His saturation-phenomenon means that the phenomenon exceeds the capacity of either Kantian or Husserlian intuition -- and presumably by extension, of `human cognition in general' -- to `take it all in'; `saturation-phenomenon' does not exclude the possibility that the phenomenon's logical dimension can be partially expressed through logical `propositions' [sic].)

Your thematic of scientific `objectivity' and `ongoing progress' casts doubt on your claims to `contemporaneity'. In my view, your hermeneutical assumptions and those of your like-minded colleagues seem positivist or at best modernist (i.e., `modernist' in the wider cultural and methodological sense: I do *not* mean here the ecclesial heresy of Modernism); and the rhetoric of 19th century meliorism further serves to `date' them. It is as if you were a Catholic Habermas, trying to sustain for Catholicism the `*projet*' of the 18th century Enlightenment which he tried to retrieve for Marxism (in the face of post-structuralist Marxism's Louis Althusser, etc.).

There are no doubt many *sub*-texts to this concluding dialogue. I suggest some are described by Carl Jung, the `modern' psychiatrist and `postmodern' psychiatrist ahead-of-time, and who is out of fashion nowadays. I have written elsewhere of the `postmodern' Jung, the `Other Jung' (as deconstructionists like to say) who writes between his own lines:

> According to the syntax of symbols which Jung found to be so necessary for psychic transformation, the [spiritually] richest span in the Catholic Church's history is that in which it achieves a balance between right-brain *cultus* (the form matching that of synchronic Nature Religion) and left-brain *cultus* (the form matching that of diachronic, teleological religion). I would be willing to argue that the role of the right-brain [intuitive]*cultus* in this historical mandala [+ intersection of left-brain and right-brain activity] is perfectly defensible in Catholic terms. (244-45)[16]
>
> According to Jungian psychodynamics, we can say that if, when the Church puts a check on left-brain colonization of the right-brain, and reinforces a viable syntax of symbols, a contribution shall have been made to *East-West* relations too [e.g., by reducing the aggressive need -- in this age of globalization -- for finding so-called `common-ground' with the East]. (245)

NOTES

1. In the *On Deconstructing Life-Worlds* (*ODLW*) text, I here and later introduce comparisons with Masao Abe's proposed model for the Trinity, which he adapts in part from the void-plenum dialectic characteristic of Japanese Buddhism's Kyoto School. I argue that Abe's model disregards

the Trinitarian *kenoses* unique to the Christian Trinity, and replaces them with Buddhist *kenosis*. See ODLW, pp. 184-86, and also pp. 157-65.

2. See *ODLW*, pp. 118, 140, 142, 184-85, 189.

3. See references to `negative reference, pure' in Index, *ODLW*.

4. See *Derrida on the mind* (*DOM*), pp. 9-17, 134-36, 140-44; *ODLW*, pp. 175-77, 186-88.

5. See *DOM*, pp. 15-20, 35, 38-9, 42-3, 105, 147-8; *ODLW*, pp. 71-2, 139-41.

6. Familiarity with these usages reveals that post-structuralists are in fact manipulating the Latin etymologies of these words as heuristic tools, and not literally describing hostile action at all.

7. "Logocentrically expected," in the Derridean idiom.

8. In the etymological sense, i.e., the Father and Son `cross' each other's (logocentrically expected) `defining borders'.

9. Mediation as such is also excluded by the Eastern formula: see *ODLW*, p. 188.

10. Lack is not a derogatory term here, nor is it in most post-structuralist thought. Note the affinity that post-structuralist `fecund lack' can have for Asian appreciation of absence.

11. Note that the `negative overlap' and `non-holism' described in this paragraph can represent a Christian devoidness that intersects (but does not share common ground with) Buddhist devoidness.

12. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, trans. English Dominicans (N.Y.: Benziger Bros., 1947).

13. An anthropologist would say that religion doesn't work this way in any case. Religions are ongoing constructs of the collective imagination of their believers, cultivated by the power-structure(s) which the believers agree to affirm. The constructs are constituted by the inside-and-outside (interlaced `subjective' and `objective' worlds) of the believing community. (Indeed, this is how I think God works through them, and there is a whole line of Jungian Catholics who would agree with me.) Whether Padma Sambhava was the factual figure that the legends around him describe is not really all that important to a Tibetan Nyingma Buddhist, for example. And if a deconstruction of historical research shows anything, it shows the breakdown of efforts to `objectively retrieve-and-reconstruct'. Not that historians should therefore stop their research. Rather, what happens is that their mind-set changes: many contemporary historians continue their project all the while incorporating an awareness of the inevitable objective breakdown into *how* they write/do history. This does *not* mean that they abandon themselves to `subjectivity' -- indeed, they continue to try to be as `objective' as possible; but at the same time they acknowledge their own *inescapable* historical sedimentation and cultural embedding: they are self-aware enough to acknowledge their own *vor-Struktur*, their own fore-structure. And the post-structuralist Jacques Lacan goes so far as to remind us that when a human knows a thing, this very knowing necessarily blinds one to knowing some other thing.

14. *La Trinité*, I, p. 64, cited in *STh*, Benziger ed., 1a.29.2. ftn. p. 47.

15. Denz. 432: ". . . each of the Persons is that reality, namely, the divine substance."

16. Magliola, "Transformation Theory and Postcolonial Discourse: Jung by Lacan by Derrida (bar Sinister Descent)," in R. Lumsden and R. Patke, eds., *Institutions in Cultures*: *Theory and Practice*, vol. 5, Critical Studies series (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Rodopi B.V., 1996), pp. 239-60.

CHAPTER XXIII

GLOBALIZATION, PHILOSOPHY AND THE MODEL OF ECUMENISM

WILLIAM SWEET

It is difficult to read a newspaper or a magazine, or listen to the radio or television, without coming across some mention of the phenomenon of globalization. What is meant by globalization, however, is not always clear; what is clear is that it is something which presents a number of challenges to existing institutions (and to those affected by these institutions), and to which one must respond. In this paper, then, I want briefly to explore what globalization is, to identify what some of these challenges are, and to suggest how philosophical reflection provides some insights and a means by which one might appropriately respond to such challenges.

GLOBALIZATION

What is globalization? While the term `globalization' is relatively new -- the word `globalize' was coined only in 1944 -- the phenomenon of globalization itself is not. To `globalize' -- meaning "to make global; especially to make worldwide in scope or application"[1] -- entails action and interaction, across borders and across continents, and the spread of cultural, economic, and political ideas (particularly by way of trade, industry, technology, the arts, letters, music and religion) throughout the world. Thus, perhaps the earliest, genuinely worldwide, wave of globalization was not, as some claim, that marked by the series of economic, social, and political changes which followed the Second World War or the recent collapse of the Soviet Union, but that of the empires of western Europe -- Spain, England, France, and Portugal -- in the 16th and 17th centuries and the concurrent missionary activities of Christianity. There have been other waves of globalization since then, such as secularization, which originated in Europe around the time of the French Revolution, and which has had or is having an impact in almost every country on the planet.

Today, `globalization' is thought of as predominantly economic, i.e., as being principally focused on trade and investment, and, particularly, global competition and deregulation.[2] Yet, as the preceding definition indicates, this economic trend or process is intermingled with a number of underlying political and cultural conditions and values, and it is primarily because of these conditions and values that globalization has had the effects it has. This interplay of the economic, the political, and the cultural has, of course, always been the case. For example, early waves of globalization, fueled by missionary zeal and supported by the territorial ambitions of European rulers, changed or replaced or built not only political, but religious and economic institutions in lands far distant from their source. Globalization, then, generally produces changes in the economic, the political, the social, and the religious environments -- though not all of these are affected at the same time and to the same degree.

Today's globalization has elicited a mixed response, but again this is not surprising for this, too, has always been the case with movements that have a globalizing character. Eighteenth century secularism (that, in many respects, continues to be present) brought with it ideas of individual liberty, autonomy, democracy and, later, socialism. In so doing it both challenged existing traditions and changed the ways of understanding one's place in the world. While some welcomed these changes to social, political and religious institutions, and to how individuals

understand themselves within these communities, others were left confused, disoriented or feeling marginalized. The response to contemporary globalization has been similarly mixed -- though it is worth noting that this response is *not* one that is divided just along `east/west' or `north/south' lines, but reflects a division of opinion that exists within many of the nations of the world.

Perhaps the principal reason why contemporary globalization has given rise to such a divided response is that, as an economic process, it is often identified with international capitalism and, as a political and cultural process, it has generally been associated with interests that have their origins in `the West.' According to many, the underlying rationality of globalization is `instrumental rationality,' its underlying principles are `universal' principles, and the mass culture it is said to bring with it, seems not to respond to, but merely to replace the cultures it encounters. Those who are opposed to globalization hold that, as these interests and principles spread, they marginalize local traditions and practices, and impose not only the answers and values of `others,' but come to dominate even the way in which communities and nations pose questions that relate to their self-understanding. Because globalization is not controlled by any one country or government (and, certainly, not by many of the countries affected by it), critics further insist that it undermines local political institutions and is fundamentally non- or anti-democratic.

Yet some have insisted that these putatively negative features of globalization are not as extensive and pervasive as has been claimed, and they have argued that there are aspects of globalization that are quite positive. While they may lead to the disruption and the transformation of some values, the vehicles of globalization also bring some positive values and provide means of preserving `local' culture and traditions. For example, consider the existence of the electronic media and, more recently, the Internet which allow members of national and cultural groups new and more effective ways of communicating with one another and of promoting their culture and traditions. These means have not only helped maintain language and culture, but have permitted community, even with those who, through emigration, are in `the diaspora.'[3] More importantly, perhaps, globalization has brought about an increased consciousness of principles of justice, equality, and rights (e.g., through human rights declarations, conventions, and education), has encouraged people to demand that these rights be respected, and has even led to the creation of institutions that are broader than the nation state, whereby life, liberty, and security of the person can be defended, and whose authority leaders of nation states cannot simply ignore. It has also brought about the means of effecting reform. More and more, capacities exist that allow people to remove themselves from the arbitrary restrictions of local authorities, to pursue and to exchange knowledge, information, and ideas internationally, and to bring their concerns to the notice of a wider community. Through the communications technology that comes with globalization (and a socially responsible use of this technology), for example, it becomes increasingly easier for a people to express its will. Furthermore, environmental action, and international safety and security (e.g., versus terrorism) are more effectively pursued when individuals and groups can draw on the information technology that globalization depends on and promotes. In bringing together not only a wide range of ideas and practices but of people from radically different backgrounds, globalization has contributed to the creation, in many countries of a much more pluralistic ethos. These positive results, then, are also consequences of globalization, its underlying forces and ideas, and the technologies it has encouraged and employed.

In any event, however positive or negative its effects, globalization is a fact. There has admittedly been a strong reaction to it. Think, for example, of the work of scholars, such as Saskia Sassen and Mahdi Elmandjra,[4] who have advanced a sustained theoretical critique of globalization. Think, as well, of the demonstrations in developing countries, such as India, over policy decisions made by the World Bank;[5] there have been many like responses. Still, given the ever-increasing levels of integration of national economies, the existence and the insertion into daily life of new technologies -- particularly, information technology -- and the opportunities for travel and trade throughout the world, globalization and its accompanying forces and features are not going to disappear. To oppose it unequivocally would be no more successful than the Luddite opposition was to industrialization. There seems to be, then, no question of whether we should reject globalization; it is, rather, whether we can effectively manage or control it.

Globalization, therefore, presents us with a number of challenges -- and these challenges include: how to react to the ideas and values that seem to be part of globalization; whether one can find a way of directing, transforming or redeeming the process of globalization in order to address such problems as poverty, disease, oppression, and lack of education, that affect people the world over; and whether it is possible to limit the influence of globalization in certain spheres and, thereby, allow for the continuity of local cultures and traditions. Responding to these challenges is not an easy task, since we must also acknowledge that there are positive effects of globalization and, therefore, take account of the concerns of both those favoring and those opposing it.

Indeed, some might say that the parties and the interests here are so far apart that either there can be no solution, or the solution can only be `political' or a matter of mere expediency and compromise, and not rational or principled. This is, perhaps, one of the greatest challenges occasioned by globalization -- that is, to determine whether we can articulate general, fundamental principles which will enable us to manage or control it.

In the next few pages, I want to suggest that one *can* meet the preceding challenges of globalization -- i.e., find ways to `redeem' it, to ensure that it is responsive to basic human needs, and to direct it so that it can address at least some of the concerns of those who find that they have benefitted little from it -- without rejecting it. Specifically, I will argue that philosophical reflection shows that there is, or can be, common ground shared by critics and proponents of globalization alike, and that this can provide a basis for a constructive response to the challenges globalization presents.

IN SEARCH OF A PHILOSOPHY FOR GLOBAL TIMES

The key to a constructive response to globalization, then, is to find a point from which a broad range of groups and individuals -- including those who, to varying degrees, already have a role in promoting economic, political, and social globalization -- can identify common interests and use them to decide how to direct it. How might philosophy be helpful here?

Some philosophers, such as John Rawls,[6] Norman Daniels,[7] and Kai Nielsen,[8] have claimed that decision making within a pluralistic ethos requires us to abandon `foundationalist' strategies -- i.e., strategies which restrict reasoned discussion to inference from axiomatic and universal `first principles.' They hold that interlocutors -- individuals and collectivities alike -- can arrive at certain common principles via a kind of *wide reflective equilibrium* (WRE). Thus, if individuals from different cultures and different perspectives can find some `neutral ground' from which to start discussion, the process of WRE will allow them to come to a consensus about the ideas and

values that are appropriate to the discussion and -- in the present case, for example, -- to address such questions as the character and direction of globalization.

Now, some consider this approach to be just the importation of another `western' `rationalist' perspective into public debate, under the guise of `neutrality.'[9] Consequently (though without making a judgment on the appropriateness of the strategy of WRE), I want to suggest another option -- that we take the example of ecumenism and inter-religious dialogue, and that, through a philosophical analysis of what is involved in this, we see whether we can discern or articulate a way of decision making that would allow ongoing discussion of the relative merits of globalization and of directing (redeeming, if you will) its activities. Such an approach could, I would also suggest, allow a wide range of potential participants to `have a place at the table,' and ensure that the ideologies of a few do not arbitrarily make a rule for all.

THE ECUMENICAL MODEL

What is "ecumenism"? Webster's Dictionary defines it as a movement "promoting cooperation and better understanding among different religious denominations;" the new Oxford Dictionary states that it is "the doctrine, or quality, of universality (especially of the Christian church)." The etymology of the word is Greek. It is ultimately derived from the word *oikos* (household), which might thereby suggest something narrow and insular, though its actual root is *oikoumene* -- "the whole inhabited world." Though there is a tension of `household' and `world' in the etymology of `ecumenism,' this etymology also suggests a kind of unity where, despite the differences among communities, all can live and work together.

The origins of ecumenism are in the early 20th century within the Christian religious tradition and, as it is generally understood, it aims at Christian unity (though, in fact, it has come to extend beyond that). As a religious movement, ecumenism professes to try `to know, understand, and love others as they wish to be known and understood.'[10] It seeks to avoid confrontation, to `find what is shared,' but also to locate where, exactly, individuals or groups disagree, to find ways of bringing the parties together to live and work in harmony or cooperatively, and perhaps to discern `new' (or previously unrecognized) truths.

The ideal of ecumenism rests on certain presuppositions about the nature and character of the traditions and perspectives it addresses, though it would take these to be fairly non-controversial. It presupposes, for example, 1) that different religious (and, similarly, non-religious) perspectives or faiths are ultimately committed to the recognition of truth, and of acting on this; 2) that these different perspectives -- and particularly those which have lasted over time -- actually do contain `truth' (either in terms of propositions affirmed or, in a more extended sense, of commitments); 3) that there is, therefore, a truth or set of truths which all do or can come to share, and that therefore all faiths or discourses share in some truth; 4) that no one group has articulated or can articulate all the truth -- that there can be a growth in one's understanding of one's own truth; 5) that these truths are to be found in the values and the facts present in the experience, discourse, and other practices of believers; 6) that one's `local' or `personal' views -- that is, one's religious or other basic commitments -- are inseparable from what one is, and cannot coherently be `hived off' or separated into a private sphere, independent of the public realm; and 7) that it is with these basic commitments that all discussion must begin. Thus, ecumenism would challenge the claims that a `secularist' separation of the public and private is possible, that a separation of private conviction from public discourse is necessary for social

harmony, and that a secularist position is neutral -- viewing this instead as another `commitment' to be brought into dialogue.

Though ecumenism is, admittedly, a `western' institution or practice, as we see in the preceding paragraph, what distinguishes it from a number of other approaches is that it acknowledges the fact and the legitimacy of diversity, and it acknowledges that one need not search for a `neutral' territory, independent of one's basic beliefs and commitments, for discussion with others to begin. It also reminds us that no one has a complete understanding or an exhaustive knowledge of the ideas and values of one's own tradition, and it notes that it is sometimes through contact with others that we may come to be able to arrive at a more complete understanding and articulation of them. As suggested above, ecumenism requires that the participants deal with one another in a spirit of humility.

But while respecting differences, the aim of ecumenism is not just cooperation, but finding what unites. Moreover (and unlike those who advocate wide reflective equilibrium), it presumes that the participants actually do or can share something fundamental, and it sees its range as `global' -- as `worldwide in scope or application.' It is also neither relativistic nor an approach that is ultimately contractarian or conventional. Further, while it recognizes that there are differences -- legitimate differences -- among traditions, it also holds that this diversity does not extend so far that the different groups, i.e., national, cultural and religious are incommensurable with, or irredeemably separated from, one another. In short, while ecumenism acknowledges the legitimacy and value of difference, it aims at the mutual recognition of unity, but this unity is not identity or uniformity.

The `participants' in the ecumenical enterprise can and do, then, have radically different religious commitments. Indeed, ecumenism is not just an inter-Christian activity, but inter-religious; one sees Christian-Buddhist, Hindu-Christian, to a lesser degree Muslim-Christian, and even Christian-atheist, e.g., Christian-Marxist exchanges. Yet, it has had at least some measure of success -- and so it is worthwhile for philosophers to ask what it is about ecumenism that has enabled it to have this success without resulting in relativism or subjectivism, or taking one's own or one's neighbor's religious, or non-religious, commitments any less seriously.

ECUMENISM AS OPENNESS

What underlies the possibility, and the success, of ecumenism? It is not that the participants believe that their respective religious perspectives are somehow `reducible' to one or another or are subsumable under one umbrella-like religious denomination. Undoubtedly, success depends on the respect of others in their "differences," noted above. But more than this is necessary for people of sometimes quite diverse backgrounds and traditions to be able to meet and find common ground on which they can build. A central factor in the success of ecumenical dialogue, I would suggest, is that those involved accept that there are interests, values, and concerns among people of different religious, political, and cultural traditions that all share, and -- on a more theoretical plane -- that these values, interests, and concerns are shared because there is a fundamental non-arbitrary relationship between them and how the world -- reality -- is. Specifically, they are shared because they reflect something basic about what it is to be a human person, e.g., the kind of being -- physical, mental, moral and spiritual -- that humans are, and the kinds of needs such beings have. That these interests and values and so on are shared is, in short, not coincidental.

What are these basic interests and values?

At the most elementary level, there is the recognition of the nature and value of life itself. To have human life there must be certain objective and material conditions, e.g., the presence of food, water, related resources, shelter and security, as well as the possibility of satisfying not only fundamental physical, but also intellectual, moral and spiritual needs. At an equally elementary level, for a people or any group of persons to live and thrive, they have to recognize that these interests, needs and goals, are common interests, needs and goals, and have to share or be capable of sharing a discourse and sets of practices with others that enable these interests to be pursued. They must also recognize individually the importance of these needs and, perhaps, interests and goals, and the superiority of some values to others, though they can, at least, begin to disagree about which values are superior to others.

However, but there is another set of material or quasi-material conditions that must exist, and that is necessary for the immediately preceding elementary conditions to exist. First, there must be a recognition of one another as human beings with whom we can live and act and, second (which is not actually independent of the first), that we do or can share a number of beliefs, attitudes and opinions about how nature works, what basic human needs are, how we might or must satisfy these needs, and so on. We might call these `dominant ideas.'

It is important to recognize that these `dominant ideas,' or the kinds of beliefs that human persons must share in order to interact with other persons, are not arbitrary or casual. Since many of these ideas are about the nature of reality and, specifically, about human needs and basic desires, they are not things that people can simply choose to have or not have. Indeed, they are also often the kinds of beliefs from which one derives one's sense of self and which determine or allow conscious and purposeful action in the future. The details or specific character of these beliefs can, of course, vary -- they can be ideas reflecting gender, ethnicity, religion, and so on -- and some become more or less dominant, depending on the surrounding circumstances. In broad terms these ideas -- for example, our understanding of `person,' `need,' `life,' and `future,' and, arguably, `like us' and `not like us,' which reflect gender and ethnicity -- are the kinds of ideas that, if we gave them up, we would (as one might in conversation say) no longer be who we were before. These dominant ideas have, in fact, a claim on us and provide a way through which we understand the world around us.

Finally, the success of ecumenism depends on the shared recognition that our basic interests and values are rooted in, or include, something fundamental that accounts for what we are and what we need, explains the relevance of these values, and so on -- something that is not explained solely by, nor is reducible to, the set of presently existing human individuals. This recognition seems to be essential to those who participate in any ecumenical discussion though there is more to the faith and religious belief of the participants than this.

Ecumenism recognizes, then, that religious belief is not just about a transcendent reality, but is also about this world. It holds -- as many, if not most, religious believers hold -- that the truths of religion are truths which concern and affect human life and flourishing *in concreto*. These basic interests and values related to our understanding of ourselves and our world underlie our distinctively religious beliefs as a whole, and it is because these interests and these values are or can come to be seen as also basic to the religious beliefs of others, that discussion and dialogue among those of different religious denominations can begin. Ecumenical dialogue generally does not start off by asking, `What is the divine?'; a more productive starting point may be the question, `What is it to show love to our fellow human beings?'

The success of ecumenism -- that it is able to go beyond a superficial level of coexistence and cooperation -- requires not only that there must at least be a mutual readiness to `be open' to

others, but also a mutual recognition of others as human beings with whom we share, or are capable of sharing, certain dominant ideas -- ideas which reflect or come to reflect a common understanding of what human beings objectively are, and of at least some of the things that are necessary for such beings to live and flourish. This openness and this recognition can, however, take place from within the perspective of one's own religious tradition. Moreover, as noted above, while ecumenism acknowledges that there are basic ideas and values that are objective and authentic, it also allows that these values are i) not always fully articulated, and ii) in some sense incomplete and that they grow and evolve (and must grow and evolve) because the world in which we live is incomplete and grows and evolves. This is consistent with, if not demanded by, the view that if there is a god or absolute principle that is not reducible to the finite, then no one interpretation or set of interpretations of that `being' is sufficient to express it. Thus ecumenism admits that there can be some `truth' in the views of others.[11] Thus, there can be inter-creedal or inter-cultural discourse and debate about these ideas and values, without calling into question the objectivity of values; one can come to a deeper and more enriched understanding of one's own values and can acquire a greater knowledge and appreciation of what is of value through this interaction with others.

Of course, it may well be that, at times, one group will not be able to go far in communicating with another on certain issues because sometimes the circumstances under which the discussants meet have become rather complex, and the interest in discerning or finding what does or can unite must be rekindled. (Here we might think of the difficulties involved in bringing together warring ethnic groups who live in the same country.) But there is no reason to think that such difficulties are insurmountable and such breakdown in communication irremediable.

In short, then, the project of ecumenism rests on the presupposition that it is possible for individuals from disparate groups to come to recognize together the existence of certain shared interests and dominant ideas. As I have suggested above, there is good evidence to believe that such dominant ideas do exist and are, or can be, shared with others. At the same time, the success of ecumenism reminds us as well that the presence of such ideas is not inconsistent with a diversity in national, cultural, and religious origin.[12]

PHILOSOPHY IN AN ECUMENICAL MODEL

Now how can this `ecumenical' model help philosophy or philosophers in addressing the challenges of globalization? Can globalization be pursued in a way that respects both basic common values, e.g., about the interests and needs of human beings, and cultural diversity?

Let us recall certain characteristics of globalization, and what, exactly, these characteristics imply or might entail.

As noted above, the process of globalization leads to an interdependency among institutions in different countries, and may even lead to the establishment of new social, political and cultural institutions on a world-wide basis. In doing so, many practices and institutions previously existing will inevitably disappear. In general, globalization is a complex process that reflects a number of features, including features which we can describe as `values,' and it both presupposes and tends towards establishing certain values as universal.

Now, such a move towards interdependency and unity is obviously not based on mere force and obviously not opposed to many of the values people have. Globalization assumes that there are human interests, needs, and wants that are common or general and which already exist, or must come to exist, on a global level. This is plausible, as the example of ecumenism suggests.

Indeed, some values involved in globalization are consistent with, or are the same, `local' values. It is, arguably, because of these features that what globalization brings or does has been able so quickly to `take root' in different economic or political environments. Still, this is not to say that all the ideas and values accompanying globalization are ideas and values that should be dominant.

Moreover, while globalization presupposes that there are values that are or can be global, this does not entail that it is monolithic in character. Because it is not the product of a single, comprehensive set of static cultural and political ideas and values, globalization can take root and develop in a country in a variety of ways. But it is not just because the precise circumstances of its origin vary (e.g., what specific `globalizing' phenomenon is being referred to, and what particular interests and needs give rise to it) that the process of globalization will differ somewhat from one culture to another. It is also because, when it `arrives' in a new environment, it does not enter into a vacuum. Globalization must take account of both the material reality and the dominant ideas in a society; it has to respond to `the environment' into which it enters, and so its effects will inevitably be different. One sees this as well when one considers previous waves of globalization where, based on the specific character of the societies it came into contact with, one later found distinct manifestations or variations of Christianity, e.g., Latin American Christianity, or democracy, e.g., Indian democracy, or economic system, e.g., African socialism.

Again, it is important to recall that not all of the values that have accompanied globalization are values that are unique to, or inherent in, globalization. Because some may actually be incidental to globalization in general, they can be rejected without thereby rejecting globalization itself. Even where core values of globalization differ from or conflict with local values, in order to succeed, as we have seen, globalization has to be brought into contact with and, to an extent, accommodate itself to the basic values and interests characteristic of the cultures into which it enters. At least some of the values that accompany globalization have to be open to change, for the process of globalization to continue.

Finally, it is important to recognize that globalization itself does not carry with it a complete set of values and ideas. Because globalization is a process and a product of a range of interests and `forces,' it is to some degree incomplete and possibly (inevitably?) inconsistent with certain needs and basic values. So, it is by no means unreasonable to consider bringing such a process into line with these needs and values.

The preceding points then further suggest or entail three things. First, they suggest that some -- perhaps many -- of the values that have accompanied globalization are open to modification and change and, therefore, that they can be changed. For example, the way that competition and commerce are engaged in can be consistent with a respect for the well-being of communities. The preceding account also reminds us that globalization is not an impersonal or natural force, but it involves the conscious actions of human agents and, so, can be controlled by them. Finally, these features of globalization suggest that even if there is a tendency towards interdependency, this does not eliminate or preclude all diversity. There is no obvious reason why global economic strategies cannot accommodate national and local `differences;' national cultures and institutions can retain a distinctive character even with the existence of international markets.

Given these features of globalization, one can say that globalization is (at least in principle, and very likely in fact) consistent with pluralism. Indeed, one might argue that the preceding account of globalization entails that, to be truly global, it must be pluralistic. For, if one holds that no single set of ideas, beliefs, commitments, and practices can exhaust all human possibilities, and if one acknowledges that individuals do live and develop in different

geographical, economic, social and political circumstances, it would be inconceivable that, even where there are common features, all would or could end up with a monolithic or static cultural, social, economic or political structure. Further, given the preceding features, globalization need not -- and, in fact, should not -- be anti-democratic and inattentive to local conditions. The existence of the information technology that has accompanied globalization can in principle, as noted at the beginning of this paper, ensure the continued presence and development of local and regional cultures -- though this development may lead at times in unanticipated directions.

Still, it is clear that globalization also leads to changes in values and in dominant ideas. It challenges established institutions -- but, of course, all that is new and different does so. Nor is challenge to local values and ideas an obviously bad thing, because it is far from clear that local culture is something that ought to be protected from outside influences or ought to be entirely controlled by local authorities.

These features and consequences of globalization show then that the interdependency or the unity that globalization may bring is consistent with the recognition of basic human needs and values or of the value of cultural diversity. Globalization is not monolithic, and it is not likely to be inflexible and static. Besides, globalization is not a blind force, but the consequence of acts of individual agents, and it is a process that, as we have seen above, can be responsive to other values and interests. If this is correct, then it is possible to consider orienting, or re-orienting, the forces or values accompanying globalization and, arguably, to `redeeming' or reforming the process of globalization itself. Still, the fundamental question is: How is this to be done? This again is where philosophy comes in.

A PHILOSOPHICAL RESPONSE TO GLOBALIZATION

So what is the role of philosophy in addressing the challenges of globalization? The central claim of this paper is that philosophy can help to discern and, thereby, provide a `discourse' -- modeled after that implicit in ecumenism -- that can serve as a context in which a reasonable response to these challenges can be achieved.

Specifically it is by identifying and pointing to the basic interests, dominant ideas, and values that we can or do already have in common with others, that philosophy can help to locate shared, though not neutral, ground, and articulate or make clear a space or discourse in which discussion can take place with those of other cultures and, by extension, with those having different stands on globalization. Indeed, for even the most elementary communication with, let alone criticism of, those having other perspectives to be possible, there has to be such a shared discussion. Philosophy also reminds us that, given the `open-endedness' of human life, we will inevitably be `called out' from where we are -- that we have much to learn, that what we have to learn is not simply arbitrary or purely subjective (because it can involve human needs and interests), and that this learning involves entering into relations with those `not like us.' Ecumenical dialogue -- a dialogue which has these features as well -- can, therefore, plausibly be a model for an exchange that can lead not just to consensus, but to the mutual recognition of a course of action as objectively best.

Philosophical analysis of the phenomenon of globalization itself indicates, furthermore, that the values that one finds in globalization are not, and cannot be, complete and exhaustive and that -- because they need to be consistent with certain basic facts about the world and about the nature of human persons -- an attempt to bring them into coherence with these facts is appropriate. It shows as well that it is possible that one could `redirect' or reform some of the

values and trends that have accompanied globalization, specifically those that have come into conflict with other important values and traditions. Given the model of ecumenical dialogue, philosophy can discern or arrive at general fundamental principles to govern discussion between both those who can be described as agents of globalization and those who would oppose them.

Nevertheless, in showing how one might go about responding to the challenges of globalization, philosophy also reminds us that more is involved here than having globalization conform to an *a priori* set of universal values, principles or dominant ideas. For example, it indicates that the influences of globalization -- the influence of the knowledge of other cultures, of scientific discovery and of spiritual or religious experience -- may entail that we must enunciate or `invent' new `structures of meaning'[13] that will allow us better to take account of, and more fully grasp, the changing and evolving environment in which we live. Of course, this is not done in a vacuum; such activity will reflect existing dominant ideas, principles, and values. As the model of ecumenism suggests, no one has a complete or fully articulated set of values and ideas, and the presence of globalization in a society may in fact be an occasion for one's dominant ideas and values to develop or change.

This last point does not mean that individuals or societies must concede or capitulate to all of the influences of globalization. Still, we have to understand not only the negative but the positive aspects of globalization if we wish to have some control over it. No culture should long refuse to engage these influences -- nor, in fact, can it since the present wave of globalization is so significant that one's views and even commitments may develop without one being aware of it. Consider how the presence of computers affects how many understand or talk about the mind or consciousness. Just as societies have to respond to the material conditions of reality, i.e., the material and quasi-material conditions for life, so, in order to grow and flourish, they have to address the challenges presented by changes in the social, political, religious or economic environment. No society and no individual has any ground for holding that all of what one believes and is committed to is exactly the way it should be and is infallible. And we should note as well that even those who seek to avoid certain aspects of the world around them, e.g., Hutterites and the Amish in North and Central America, still have to take up an explicit attitude towards what is happening in the world. It is in elaborating a model and criteria for discussion, then, that philosophy can help to identify and determine what responses to these changes and challenges are appropriate.

Of course, the experience of globalization may be unsettling because, as noted above, our present commitments and beliefs cannot remain just as they are. And even though some of the values and ideas of globalization are open to change, it does not follow that we will be able to pick and choose from them as it suits us. And so we might even challenge Mill's *justification* for pluralism in *On Liberty*. Since globalization brings with it new values and ideas, we may be forced to ask questions we do not know how exactly to answer and we may be challenged to answer why our old questions are in fact appropriate or useful questions. Indeed, one may find oneself having to express one's thought in a larger `reality,' i.e., a context that includes elements `foreign' to those to which one is accustomed. All the same, one should not take the preceding remarks as implying that one must simply accept the fact that one can be forced to express one's thought in `another reality.'

This call to invent new structures of meaning, or to recognize that one may have to express one's thought in a `larger reality,' is, however, really nothing more than a demand of the character of conscious life -- which reflects, after all, the influence of the culture, ideas, and material environment around it -- and it is a demand that one cannot escape. Taking globalization

seriously and responding to its challenges, are simply features of acknowledging the existence of the ideas and values of others, and of taking other persons seriously. As one comes to put one's thought into coherence with this `larger' experience, one's ideas will inevitably change and develop. But, even if this is unsettling, the preceding analysis assures us that globalization is not something that we must fear.

If, however, after all of this, one still claims that his or her culture must exclude or reject external or `foreign' influences, and that an `ecumenical model' of discourse -- along with the recognition of shared concepts of life and human flourishing -- must be rejected, it is unclear not only how one can constructively, or even effectively, deal with the phenomenon of globalization, but also how one's own culture and values can develop and flourish, i.e., survive.

CONCLUSION

Globalization and the ideas, forces and technologies that it brings with it are here to stay. What I have tried to defend in these pages is the claim that there is a positive way in which one can respond to globalization -- one that calls for a `participative construction'[14] and transformation, rather than a mere rejection or fatalistic acceptance, of it.

Specifically, I have argued that there is no epistemic impediment to globalization, and that the success of ecumenism gives us a reason to believe that those involved in and affected by globalization can enter into fruitful dialogue with one another in order to `orient' the process of globalization so that it is consistent with respect for persons and with a significant measure of individual and cultural diversity. Philosophy, drawing on the model of ecumenical dialogue, can help to define or describe this discourse, by identifying values and dominant ideas which all do or can share, and by ensuring that these values and ideas are coherent with the material and quasi-material conditions for human flourishing. Moreover, using a discourse modeled on ecumenism to engage the challenges of globalization not only would be compatible with, but also would promote cross-cultural community and mutual understanding; it would not entail ignoring diversity or starting from some `neutral' ground where individuals have to abandon their own basic values, dominant ideas and commitments, and it would not produce a bland homogeneity. Thus, the interdependency and unity that globalization brings may be consistent with -- and may even demand -- diversity. But the ecumenical model of discourse, described above, is also one that, though respectful of people's `starting points,' acknowledges that they must -- whether they like it or not -- sometimes reevaluate what their basic beliefs and dominant ideas mean and, when necessary, go beyond them and, thereby, better reflect values and interests which make a genuinely human life possible.[15] We can have confidence, then, that there can be a constructive response to the challenges that globalization presents, and that philosophy has an important role in this.

NOTES

1. *Merriam Webster Dictionary*.

2. In this sense, globalization is `a process of increasing economic activity towards the integration of national economics into a single world economy, for example, with increased trading opportunities.'

3. See Anthony M. Stevens-Arroyo, "Syncretic sociology: towards a cross-disciplinary study of religion," *Sociology of Religion* 59 (1998): 217-20.

4. Mahdi Elmandjra, *Premiere guerre civilisationnelle* (Casablanca, Maroc: Toubkal, 1992). For some other recent critical studies, see Saskia Sassen, *Globalization and Its Discontents* (New York: New Press, 1998), and Eleonore Kofman and Gillian Youngs, *Globalization: Theory and Practice* (New York: Pinter, 1996).

5. One evidence of economic globalization is the presence of multinational or transnational corporations and the influence of international economic agreements in countries such as India. A number of nationwide movements have arisen, however, with the aim of opposing this presence. Recently, in 1995, Enron -- the world's largest natural gas company -- began work on a $US 2.8 billion, gas-fired power plant, just south of Bombay. Villagers in the area were concerned that the effluent from the plant would destroy local fisheries and damage some crops, and hundreds of them stormed the construction site, injuring construction workers and some foreign advisers. Again, during the Uruguay Round of talks on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), one of the issues under discussion was a section on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). People in India became concerned that this section, if approved, could affect plant genetic resource conservation and farmers' rights and, during a massive rally at Delhi on March 3, 1993, demonstrators presented a charter of demands, saying that "we should not give up our sovereign right to frame our own system of invention for the development of new varieties of plants. Intellectual property rights should not be made part of GATT negotiation."

6. See John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1971). The initial articulation of reflective equilibrium is found in his "Outline of a Decision Procedure for Ethics," *Philosophical Review* 60 (1951): 177-197.

7. See Norman Daniels, "Wide Reflective Equilibrium and Theory Acceptance in Ethics" in *Journal of Philosophy*76 (1979): 256-282; "Reflective Equilibrium and Archimedean Points," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 10 (1980): 83-103;*Justice and Justification: Reflective Equilibrium in Theory and Practice* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996). See also J. Raz, "The Claims of Reflective Equilibrium," *Inquiry* 25 (1982): 307-330.

8. See "In Defence of Wide Reflective Equilibrium" in *Ethics and Justification* (ed. Douglas Odegard), (Edmonton, AB: Academic Publishers, 1988), pp. 19-37, and "Relativism and Wide Reflective Equilibrium," *Monist* 76 (1993): 316-332.

9. See, for example, Hendrik Hart and Kai Nielsen, *Searching for Community in a Withering Tradition: Conversations between a Marxian Atheist and a Calvinian Christian* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1990).

10. See Decree 12 of the Mission of the Society of Jesus, General Council 34 (1995).

11. As Aristotle writes, `No one is able to attain the truth adequately, while, on the other hand, no one fails entirely, but every one says something true about the nature of things' (*Metaphysics* II, 993a27-993b2).

12. I have argued elsewhere as well that this is compatible with pluralism. See my "Communities of Values and Ecumenism," in *The Future of Value Inquiry*, (ed. Matti Häyry and Tuija Takala), Nordic Value Studies, (Amsterdam: Rodopi Publishers, forthcoming 2000). I would, therefore, argue against the claim of Zygmunt Bauman that we are effectively unable to direct events, and that globalization inevitably produces a culturally and economically homogeneous world (See his *Globalization: The Human Consequences* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1998]). I tend, rather, to favor some aspects of the view of Robert J. Holton (see his *Globalization and the Nation-State* [New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998]).

13. I owe this notion to Professor H. Daniel Dei of the Universidad de Morón, Argentina.

14. See Vincent Shen, "Construction of Meaningful World in I Ching -- on the Origin of Chinese Philosophizing," in*Philosophical Challenges and Opportunities of Globalization* (ed. George F. McLean), (Washington, DC: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1999).

15. By way of illustration, some societies make efforts to ensure that basic human needs are met, but fail to recognize basic individual human rights; other societies may explicitly recognize human rights, but in a way that is simply formal and not substantive. For human life to flourish, however, it is clear that there must be both the satisfaction of needs and the recognition of rights, and so these societies must move beyond where they are.

CHAPTER XXIV

GLOBALIZATION AS DIVERSITY IN UNITY

GEORGE F. McLEAN

THE EMERGENCE OF GLOBAL CONCERNS

During the 1950s and 1960s the development of technological capabilities made it possible to design vehicles with sufficient thrust and precision to be able to break the bonds of earth and soar towards the planets. By the end of the '60s, as projected by President Kennedy, Neil Armstrong landed on the moon. What he saw *there* was of little interest -- a barren rocky terrain, alternating between great heat and frigid cold. But what he saw *from there* was of the greatest consequence. With a few of his predecessors in space exploration, he was able for the first time in human history to look at the Earth and see it whole. Throughout the millennia humankind had always seen fragments, piece by piece; now for the first time the earth was seen globally.

At the time, astronomers sought avidly to learn about the moon. But for philosophers the questions were rather what would be found about humankind, about relations between peoples and about their presence in nature. More importantly, they wondered if this would change the way in which people understood themselves in all these regards: Would this intensify the trend to see all and everyone as an object? Or could it contribute to overcoming alienation and anomie, to transforming antipathies into bonds of friendship? But, if this were to take place, would life be reduced to a deadly stasis? Though the stakes were high, the philosophical questioning at first was languid. Now, at the end of this millennium these questions of globalization emerge with a full and fascinating force.

Why now rather than then? This would seem to relate notably to the end of the Cold War, especially if this be traced deeply to the roots of the modern outlook as a whole. At an earlier colloquium in Manila, Professor Lu Xiaohe[1] pointed out how, at the very beginnings of modern times, Giovanni Battista Vico (1668-1744) identified the limitations of the new way of thinking as bearing the potential to lead to violent opposition for lack of an adequate capability to take account of the unity of the whole. If the Cold War was the denouement of this fatal flaw, and the world is no longer structured in a bipolar fashion, then it is no longer the parts which give sense to the whole, but the converse: the global is the basis of the meaning of its participants.

Proximately, this is a matter of communication and commercial interchange, but their full deployment depends in turn upon a politique of positive human cooperation in an integral human project. Thus today we reread Kennedy's words about bearing any burden in defence of freedom in terms of his positive context, namely, his invitation to all humankind to transcend limiting divisions and to join together to make real progress. Of this his promise to break beyond a divided planet and go to the moon by the end of that decade was symbol and harbinger. The process of globalization transcends regional concerns not to deny them, but to respond to them from a more inclusive vantage point in terms of which all can have their full meaning and the opportunity to work together to determine their own destiny. This is the heart of the issue of globalization and cultural identities.

Until recently the term `globalization' was so little used that it warranted only two lines in Webster's Unabridged International Dictionary.[2] For the term `global,' however, three meanings are listed:

- the first, geometric, namely, a spherical shape;

- the second, geographic, namely, the entire world, with the connotation of being complete. This was extended by the ancient Greeks to signify perfection itself: Parmenides spoke of the One, eternal and unchanging as being spherical.

- the third, qualitative, namely, the state of being comprehensive, unified or integrated.

It is interesting to note that Webster's saw this third character of global as implying "lacking in particularizing detail" or "highly undifferentiated." Today's challenge is more complex and more rich, namely, to achieve a comprehensive vision whose integration is not at the expense of the components, but their enhancement and full appreciation.

For insight on these issues I would turn to Nicholas of Cusa, born almost six hundred years ago (1401-1464) at a special juncture in Western thought. Often he is described as the last of the medievals and the first of the moderns. In the high middle ages Thomas Aquinas and others had reunited the traditions of Plato and Aristotle on the basis of the Christian discovery of the special significance of existence. In this synthesis primacy was given to Aristotle whose structure for the sciences began with*Physics* as specified by multiple and changing things, whence it ascended to its culmination in the unity of the divine life at the end of the *Metaphysics*.[3] The ladder between the two constituted a richly diversified hierarchy of being

John Dewey[4] stressed -- perhaps too strongly -- the relation of that ancient hierarchic world view to the Ptolemaic system in which the earth is the center around which the sun and the planets revolve at a series of levels in a finite universe. He traced the development of the modern outlook to the change to the Copernican heliocentric model of an infinite but undifferentiated universe.

Nicholas of Cusa bridged the two. He continued the sense of a hierarchical differentiation of being from the minimal to the infinite, but almost a century before Copernicus (1473-1543) he saw the earth as but one of the spheres revolving around the sun.

His outlook with regard to the relations between people was equally pioneering. As Papal legate to Constantinople shortly after it had been taken by the Turks -- much to the shock of all Europe -- Cusa was able to see the diversity of peoples not as negating, but as promoting unity.

These broad and ranging political, scientific, philosophical and theological interests qualified him as a fully Renaissance man. In time he was made a Cardinal in Rome, where he was buried. (As a student my interest in his thought was stimulated by living for many years but two doors from his tomb.) More recently, I directed the dissertation of Dr. David De Leonardis,*Ethical Implications of Unity and the Divine in Nicholas of Cusa*.[5] Expanded by the addition of sections on economic, social and religious unity, this was published by The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy in 1998. This paper emerges from that exploration which is summarized in the set of tables drawn from that work and appended here as figures I-VIII.

It will proceed by looking first at the manner of thinking involved and second, at Cusa's reconciliation of unity and diversity in a harmony which Confucius might be expected to find of special interest. On these bases, thirdly, it will look at the special dynamism with which this endows his sense of being. Fourth, it will sample briefly some of the implications which this global vision could have for contemporary problems of economic, social and religious life, sketched in figures 4-7 and to be explored more extensively in the separate sessions of this conference.

GLOBAL THINKING

History

Any understanding of the work of the mind in the thought of Nicholas of Cusa must be situated in the context of the Platonic notion of participation (*mimesis* or image) whereby the many forms fundamentally are images of the one idea. For Plato, whose sense of reality was relatively passive, this meant that the many mirrored or were like (assimilated to) the one archetype or idea. Correspondingly, in knowing multiple things the mind as it were, remembers having encountered and been impressed by, or assimilated to, the one archetypic idea which they image, all converging progressively toward a supreme One. For Cusa, with Plato, this appreciation of the One remains foundational for the knowledge of any particular. Here it is important to note how Cusa reconceives the nature of this One, not only, but also, in global terms.

To this Aristotle, whose thought began from the active processes of physical change, added a more active role for mind. This not only mirrors, but actively shapes the character, if not the content, of its knowledge. As an Aristotelian Aquinas too considered the mind to be active, but in the end the objectivity of its knowledge depended upon a passive relation to its object: beings "can by their very nature bring about a true apprehension of themselves in the human intellects which, as is said in the*Metaphysics*, is measured by things."[6]

Cusa's sense of "mind" unites both emphases: the original measures the image, which in turn becomes like, or is assimilated to, the original. Sense knowledge is measured by the object; this is even part of its process of assimilation to the divine mind.[7] But as E. Cassirer[8] notes, Cusa shifts the initiative to the mind operating through the senses, imagination, reason and intellect. Rather than being simply formed by sense data, the mind actively informs the senses and conforms and configures their data in order that the mind might be assimilated to the object. Thus both "extramental objects and the human mind are measures of cognitive assimilation, that is to say, we become like the non-mental things we know, and we fashion the conceptual and judgmental tools whereby we take them into ourselves as known."[9]

But in saying this Miller seems not to have reached the key point for our concerns for global awareness -- or of Cusa, for that matter. This is not merely the classical realist distinction between what is known, which is on the part of the thing, and the way in which it is known which reflects the mind by which the thing is known. Cusa has added two moves: First, the One of Plato is not an ideal form, but the universe of reality (and this in the image of the Absolute One); second, the human mind (also in the image of the divine mind) is essentially concerned with this totality of reality in terms of which global awareness with all its knowledge is carried out.

Discursive Reasoning

In his study on mind,[10] Cusa distinguishes three levels of knowledge, the first two are discursive reasoning, the third is intellection. The first begins from sense knowledge of particular material objects. This is incremental as our experiences occur one by one and we begin to construct a map of the region, to use a simile of L. Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*.[11]

But for Cusa the knowledge of the multiple physical things by the lower powers of sensation and imagination raises the question of the unity of things which must be treated in terms of the concepts of reason and intellect.[12] For the forms in things are not the true forms, they are clouded by the changeableness of matter.[13] The exact nature of anything, then, is unattainable by us except in analogies and figures grounded essentially in the global sense grasped by our higher powers.[14]

But while sense knowledge is inadequate for a global vision, Cusa considers innate knowledge or a separate world of ideas to be unnecessary and distractive. Hence, he concludes (a) that sense knowledge is required; (b) that both the physical object and the mind are active in the assimilation

or shaping of the mind, (c) that in this process the mind with its global matrix is superior in that it informs or shapes the work of the senses, and (d) that it is unable fully to grasp the nature of the object in itself.

As a result discursive reasoning as regards physical objects is limited in a number of ways. First it is piecemeal in that it develops only step by step, one thing at a time, in an ongoing temporal progression. Hence, on the macro level discursive reasoning can never know the entirety of reality. On the micro level it cannot comprehend any single entity completely in its nature or quality. This is true especially of uniqueness or identity which for humans are their personal and cultural identities.

The paradox of attempting to think globally in these terms is that as we try to form overall unities we abstract more and more from what distinguishes or characterizes free and unique persons so that the process becomes essentially depersonalizing: hence the drama of globalization as the central phenomenon of the present change of the millennia.

In the 20th century the technological implementation of depersonalization reached such a crises that millions were crushed or exterminated -- hundreds of thousands in pogroms, six million in the holocaust, 50 million in the Second World War, entire continents impoverished and exploited. In effect the limitations Cusa identifies in discursive reasoning simply are now no longer tolerable, and new modes of thinking are required in order to enable life to continue in our times.

Cusa recognizes a second type of discursive reasoning, namely, that of mathematics, which does not share the limitations noted above. But here the objects are not living beings, but mental objects of the same nature as mind. Hence the mind can pivot on itself, using its own resources to construct and process concepts and to make judgments which are exact because they are concerned with what is not changing or material.[15] This is Humes's world of relations between ideas.[16] But as it deals only with the formal, rather than the existential, it cannot resolve the above-mentioned human problems but serves to exacerbate them to the degree that its mode of discursive reasoning becomes exclusive.

Intellection

Hence Nicholas of Cusa turns to a third mode of mental assimilation, which is beyond the work of discursive reason, namely, intellection. Eugene Rice contrasts the two approaches to knowledge by likening discursive reasoning to a wayfarer walking through a valley and encountering things one by one, whereas intellection is like being on a hill whence one surveys the entire valley all at once.[17] The latter view is global and the particulars are understood as component parts; each thing has its proper reality but is also an integral constituent of the whole. It is important to note that the unity of the scene as known by intellection is constituted not by a mere assemblage of single entities juxtaposed in space or time, but by multiple participations in a unity. (Indeed, as we shall see in the next section, the multiple things in the physical order also are limited images of the whole.)

Were we to express this in terms of modern thought, the distinction of analytic and synthetic modes of thought would help, but not at all suffice. With Descartes the moderns undertook a search for knowledge that was clear in the sense of identifying the simple natures of each thing and distinct in the sense that such knowledge should be sufficient at least to be able to distinguish one type of thing from all others.[18] This gave primacy to the analytic process of distinguishing all into its component set of simple natures. The supposition was that these were finite in number, that they

could all be identified clearly and distinctly by the mind, and that they could then be reassembled by equally clear and distinct links in a process of synthesis.

This has marked the modern mind and set its goals and its limitations. Having determined that only what was clear and distinct to the human mind could qualify for inclusion, due to the limitations of the human mind, it was inevitable that the uniqueness of each entity would be omitted as not clear to the human mind and that organic character of the whole also would be omitted because synthesis could assemble only what was clear and distinct.

For Cusa in contrast, intellection is knowledge in terms not of the parts, but of the whole in which all participate. Here the intellect grasps the meaning and value of the whole. It works with the imagination and reason to work out the full range of possibilities and to grasp how the many fit together: it "depends not upon the number of things which are known, but upon the imaginative thrust of the mind" to be able to know "all the multifarious possibilities which are open to being."[19] Finally it is guided by the senses to know which of these possibilities are actual. The significance of the actual beings is not merely what we can garner by the senses, but what is known primarily in terms of the whole by the intellect.

The Aristotelians build knowledge from concrete, changing and hence limited things. Cusa's more Platonic heritage has him build knowledge rather in the global terms of the whole and ultimately of the One of which the mind as well as things are the images. Where these were but form for Plato, for Cusa they are existent, sharing in the active power of being.

The Enlightenment was so intent on knowledge that it wound up tailoring all to what it could know clearly and distinctly. As with the Procrustean bed, what did not fit these specifications was lopped off and discarded as hypothetical or superstition. Cusa's attitude is notably different for it includes humility before reality, which it recognizes, and even reveres, especially where it exceeds the human capacity for clarity of conception and power of control.

The human mind, he would recognize, has limitations at both ends of the scale of being. Even a minimal being cannot be exhaustively known. Like attempting to make a polygon circular, no matter how many sides are added, more remain always possible; a circular shape can never be attained in this manner. Such knowledge, though partial and incomplete, is valid as far as it goes, but it always can be improved upon. One can only project the circle by the thrust of the imagination.

Knowledge of the Absolute, in contrast, cannot be improved upon. Moreover, it is basically unreliable, for there is nothing to which the Absolute can be compared.[20] Hence, the negative way of saying what God is not and the recognition of our ignorance in that regard constitute the relevant real knowledge, for which reason Cusa entitled a major work: *On Learned Ignorance*.[21]

We have seen the limitations of knowledge constructed on the basis of multiple limited beings understood as opposed one to another. Unity constructed thereupon not only never manages to grasp such beings fully but simply discards what is not known. Thus the uniqueness of the person cannot be recognized and is lost. Conversely, the unities which can be constructed of such contrasting reality remain external and antithetical so that, to the degree that it succeeds, discursive reasoning is in danger of oppressing the uniqueness of the participants. This is the classical dilemma of the one and the many; it is the particular challenge of globalization in our day and the basic reason why it is feared as a new mode of (economic) imperialism and oppression.

Cusa's suggestion of another mode of thinking whereby we think in terms of the whole is promising, indeed essential for our new age. But it faces a great test. Can it take account of diversity? If so, how can this be understood as within, rather than in opposition to, unity? Is it possible to conceive diversity as a contribution to unity rather than as its negation?

Parmenides had shown unity to be the first characteristic of being by opposing being to non-being. In these terms each being was itself and nothing less. But such reasoning in terms of the opposition of being to non-being bespoke also contrast and opposition between beings, each of which in being itself was precisely not any other being. Today the global reality makes it necessary to ask whether there are more positive and relational modes of conceiving multiplicity.

A GLOBAL STRUCTURE OF UNITY AND DIVERSITY

To summarize then, we have seen the new global political, cultural and economic phenomena in which we are situated and in terms of which we are called to act. In looking toward the thought of Nicholas of Cusa, we saw that such a global response requires a new dimension of thinking. The characteristic modern discursive reasoning with its analytic approach of breaking all down to its minimum components and reassembling them synthetically, proposed by Descartes in his *Discourse on Method*, proceeds essentially in terms of parts rather than of the whole, of the discrete without taking account of the overall unity.

As pointed out by Dr. De Leonardis, this entails that relations between peoples and conflict resolution can be carried out only in terms of compromises which leave no one satisfied and plant the seeds of further conflicts. Now, if the means for conflict are so powerful as to be capable of overwhelming the means for survival, we are faced with the imperative of finding how to proceed in terms of a capacity to grasp the whole.

This pointed to Cusa's power of intellection, joined with that of the imagination, to project what we cannot clearly conceive of the individual person and the divine, to protect what we can only acknowledge of our creative freedom and that of others, and to promote the growth of which we are capable but which lies hidden in a future which is not yet.

As such, knowledge is directed toward an ordered reality -- ours and that of the entire globe -- the central questions are not merely epistemological, but ontological and ethical, namely, what is the global whole in which we exist, and how can we act in relation to other peoples and cultures in ways that promote a collaborative realization of global community in our times?

Unity

In response to this question Cusa would begin by identifying four types or levels of unity:

1. Individual unity -- the identity by which each exists as itself in contrast to others.
2. The unity of each individual being as within the whole of being. This is important in grappling with the issue of globalization in our times and is within the focus of the remainder of this chapter.
3. The unity of the universe by which the individuals together form not merely a conglomeration of single entities, as with a pile of rocks, but a unified whole which expresses the fullness of being. This may be the central contribution of Cusa's thought for a study of globalization.
4. Absolute unity -- the One which, being without distinction, plurality or potentiality, is all that being can be, the fullness of being, and hence not subject to greater or lesser degree.[22]

The fourth is central and foundational for a metaphysics of the issue of globalization. Here, however, we shall focus rather on the ontology and its ethical implication. This directs our

attention to the second and especially the third of Cusa's senses of unity to which the recent development of a global awareness also corresponds, namely, to the whole or total universe in which we have our being, live and intersect with nature and with others.

This has been appreciated in various ways in the past: in the totem which was the unifier for the life and universe of primitive peoples, in the myths which united gods and nature in a genetic whole, in the One of Parmenides as the natural first step for metaphysics, and in the eschatologies and the classical hierarchies of being, to cite but a few. Now, however, after a long period of analytic and atomic thinking, under the impact of technologies which make conflict too costly and inundate us with global communications, there is special need to take up once again this sense of unity.

Contraction

The situation is delicate however, for in so doing it is imperative to avoid the kind of abstractive thinking described above, in which personal uniqueness is dismissed and only the universal remains.[23]

Cusa's solution is found in the notion of contraction, that is, to begin from the significance of the whole and to recognize it in the very reality of every individual, so that the individual shares in something of the ultimate or definitive reality of the whole being. One is not then an insignificant speck, as would be the case were I to be measured quantitatively and contrasted to the broad expanse of the globe. Rather I have the importance of the whole as it exists in and as me -- and the same is true of other persons and of the parts of nature.

The import of this can be seen through comparison with other attempts to state this participation of the part in the whole. For Plato this was a repetition or imaging by each of that type of the one ideal form. Aristotle soon ceased to employ the term participation as image (*mimesis*) because of the danger it entailed of reducing the individual to but a shadow of what was truly real. Cusa too rejected the separately existing ideas or ideal forms. Instead what had been developed in the Christian cultures was a positive notion of existence as act[24] whereby each participant in being was made to be in itself. This is retained by Nicholas of Cusa.

But he would emphasize that the being in which this person or thing participates is the whole of being.[25] This does not mean that in a being there is anything alien to its own identity, but that the reality of each being has precisely the meaning of the whole as contracted to this unique instance. To be, then, is not simply to fall in some minimal way on this side of nothingness, but rather to partake of the totality of being and the meaning of the whole of being and indeed to be a realization of the whole in this unique contraction or instance. It retains its identity, but does so in and of the whole.

De Leonardis formulates this in two principles:

- Principle of Individuality: Each individual contraction uniquely imparts to each entity an inherent value which marks it as indispensable to the whole.
- Principle of Community: Contraction of being makes each thing to be everything in a contracted sense. This creates a community of beings relating all entities on an ontological level.[26]

Let us stop at this insight to explore its implications for diversity. Generally, multiplicity and diversity are seen as opposed to unity: what is one is not many and vice versa; to have many beings is to imply contrast and even possible conflict. When, however, each individual is appreciated as a

unique contraction of the whole, others which are distinct and different are complementary rather than contradictory; they are the missing elements toward which one aspires and which can help one grow and live more fully; they are the remainder of the whole of which I am part, which supports and promotes me, and toward whose overall good my life is directed. Taken together they enhance, rather than destroy, the unity. This, of course, is not true of Parmenidean absolute and unlimited One which is the complete and full perfection of being, the fourth instance of unity cited above. But it is true of the third of the above unities which are precisely the reality of global unity, and the second type of unity which is its components seen precisely as members of the global whole.

Hierarchy. After the manner of the medievals, Cusa saw the plurality of beings of the universe as constituting a hierarchy of being. Each being was equal in that it constituted a contraction of the whole, but not all were equally contracted. Thus an inorganic being was more contracted than a living organism, and a conscious being was less contracted than either of them. This constituted a hierarchy or gradation of beings. By thinking globally or in terms of the whole, Cusa was able to appreciate the diversity of being in a way that heightened this ordered sense of unity.

Lovejoy wrote classically of *The Great Claim of Being*[27] in which each being was situated between, and in relation to, the next lower and the next higher in the hierarchy. We had, in other words, our neighbors with whom we shared, but there was always the danger that we were correspondingly distanced from other beings. Thus the sense of the human as "lord of nature" could and did turn into exploitation and depredation. Cusa's sense of beings as contractions of the whole unites each one intimately to all other realities in one's being, one's realization, and hence one's concerns. This converts the sense of master into that of steward for the welfare of the parts of nature which do not possess consciousness or freedom. These become the ecological concerns of humankind.

Another approach, built upon this sense of each distinct being as equal inasmuch as each participates in the whole, would image overall reality as a mosaic. But Cusa's sense of each of those pieces as also a contraction of the whole went further by adding the importance not only of each to the whole as in a mosaic, but of the whole in and by each being. Unity then is enhanced and is the concern of each being to the full extent of its own reality understood as an integral participant in the whole.

However, both these metaphors of a chain of being and of a mosaic are static. They leave the particular or individual beings as juxtaposed externally one to the other. Neither takes account of the way in which beings interact with the others or, more deeply, are even constituted internally by these relations to others. What Cusa sees for the realm of being is relationships which are not external juxtapositions, but internal to the very make-up of the individuals.

Internal Relations. This internal relationship is made possible precisely by a global sense of the whole.[28] For this Cusa may have drawn more directly from the Trinity, but this in turn is conceived through analogy to the family of which individuals are contractions, especially as this is lived as the interpersonal relations of a culture grounded in such a theology. The philosopher can look into that social life as a point of manifestation of being. Indeed, hermeneutics[29] would suggest that this constitutes not only a *locus philosophicus* whence insight can be drawn but also the prejudgments of philosophers which constitute the basic philosophical insights themselves. The critical scientific interchange of philosophy is a process of controlled adjustment and perfection of these insights.

In a family all the persons are fully members and in that sense fully of the same nature. But the father generates the son while the son proceeds from the father. Hence, while mutually constituted by the same relation of one to the other, the father and son are distinct precisely as generator and generated. Life, and all that the father is and has, is given from the father to the son. Correspondingly, all that the son is and has is received from the father. As giver and receiver the two are distinguished in the family precisely as the different terms of the one relation. Hence each shares in the very definition of the other: the father is father only by the son, and vice versa.

Further, generation is not a negative relation of exclusion or opposition; just the opposite -- it is a positive relation of love, generosity and sharing. Hence, the unity or identity of each is via relation (the second unity), rather than opposition or negation as was the case in the first level of unity. In this way the whole that is the family is included in the definition of the father and of the son each of whom are particular contractions of the whole.

To highlight this internal and active sense of contraction and hierarchy Cusa uses also the analogy of a seed.[30] This is able to develop and grow only by heat of the sun, water from the clouds and nourishment from the earth. Hence each of these elements of the whole are interrelated in mutual dependence. Moreover, thereby the seed brings new being into existence -- which in turn will be creative, etc. Finally, by this action of the sun and clouds, the seed and the earth as contractions of the whole, the universe itself is made fruitful and unfolds. But this is identically to perfect and fulfill the universe. Hence, the plurality of beings, far from being detrimental to the unity and perfection of the universe, is the key thereto.

Explicatio-Complicatio. Cusa speaks of this as an *explicatio* or unfolding of the perfection of being, to which corresponds the converse, namely, a folding together (*complicatio*) the various levels of being the perfection of the whole is constituted. Hence Cusa's hierarchy of being has special richness when taken in the light of his sense of a global unity. The classical hierarchy was a sequence of distinct levels of beings, each external to the other. The great gap between the multiple physical or material beings and the absolute One was filled in by an order of spiritual or angelic beings. As limited, these were not the absolute; yet as spiritual they were not physical or material. This left the material or physical dimension of being out of the point of integration.

In contrast, Cusa, while continuing the overall graduation, sees it rather in terms of mutual inclusion, rather than of exclusion. Thus, inorganic material beings do not contain the perfection of animate or conscious being, but plants include the perfections of the material as well as life. Animals are not self-conscious, but they do integrate material, animate and conscious perfection. Humans include all four: inorganic, animate, conscious and spiritual life.

Thus, the relation to all others through the contraction of being is intensified as beings include more levels of being in their nature. On this scale humans, as material and as alive on all three levels of life, plant, animal and spirit -- play a uniquely unitive and comprehensive role in the hierarchy of being. If the issue is not simple individuality by negative and exclusive contrast to others (the first level of unity) but uniqueness by positive and inclusive relation to others, then human persons and the human community are truly the nucleus of a unity that is global.

A DYNAMIC GLOBAL ORDER

Thus far we have been speaking especially in terms of existence and formal causality by which the various beings within the global reality are in specific degrees of contractions of the whole. To this, however, should be added efficient and final causality by which the ordered universe of reality takes on a dynamic and even developmental character. This has a number of

implications: directedness, dynamism, cohesion, complementarity and harmony.[31] Cusa's global vision is of a uniquely active universe of being.

1. *Direction to the Perfection of the Global Whole*: As contractions of the whole, finite beings are not merely products ejected by and from the universe of being, but rather are limited expressions of the whole. Their entire reality is a limited image of the whole from which they derive their being, without which they cannot exist, and in which they find their true end or purpose. As changing, developing, living and moving they are integral to the universe in which they find their perfection or realization and to the perfection of which they contribute by the full actuality and activity of their reality.

This cannot be simply random or chaotic, oriented equally to being and its destruction, for then nothing would survive. Rather there is in being a directedness to its realization and perfection, rather than to its contrary. A rock resists annihilation; a plant will grow if given water and nutrition; an animal will seek these out and defend itself vigorously when necessary. All this when brought into cooperative causal interaction has a direction, namely, to the perfection of the whole.

2. *Dynamic Unfolding of the Global Whole*: As an unfolding (*explicatio*) of the whole, the diverse beings (the second type of unity) are opposed neither to the whole (the third type of unity) or to the absolute One (the fourth type of unity). Rather, after the Platonic insight, all unfolds from the One and returns thereto.

To this Cusa makes an important addition. In his global vision this is not merely a matter of individual forms; beings are directed to the One as a whole, that is, by interacting with others (the third type of unity). Further, this is not a matter only of external interaction between aliens. Seen in the light of reality as a whole, each being is a unique and indispensable contraction of the whole. Hence finite realities interact not merely as a multiplicity, but as an internally related and constituted community with shared and interdependent goals and powers.

3. *Cohesion and Complementarity in a Global Unity*: Every being is then related to every other in this grand community almost as parts of one body. Each depends upon the other in order to survive and by each the whole realizes its goal. But a global vision, such as that of Cusa, takes a step further; for if each part is a contraction of the whole, then, as with the DNA for the individual cell, "in order for anything to be what it is it must also be in a certain sense everything which exists."[32] The other is not alien, but part of my own definition.

From this it follows that the realization of each is required for the realization of the whole, just as each team member must perform well for the success of the whole. But in Cusa's global view the reverse is also true, namely, it is by acting with others and indeed in the service of others or for their good that one reaches one's full realization. This again is not far from the experience of the family, but tends to be over looked in other human and commercial relations. It is by interacting with and for others that one activates one's creative possibilities and most approximates the full realization of being. Thus, "the goal of each is to become harmoniously integrated into the whole of being and thereby to achieve the fullest development of its own unique nature."[33]

CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS FOR CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

There is much more to be said on these topics. The role of the imagination should be exploited to understand the nature and role of cultures. If a global outlook be evolved in which unity is

promoted by diversity, then the progress of world unification could be, not at the cost of the multiple cultures, but through their deployment and interaction. Strategy could move beyond the dichotomy of business and begging to the true mega project for the new millennium, namely to develop a global community in which all are looked upon with appreciation, and progress is evoked by mutual respect.

For this Cusa's global view has pervasive implications. To overcome past human tendencies to subdue and exploit nature, some would want to eliminate the unique role of humans in the hierarchy of being. Cusa would recognize the equality of all as irreducibly individuals within the whole. Yet he would also recognize the unique position of humankind in that hierarchy as integrating all possible levels of the being, inorganic, living, conscious and spiritual, within the One existing being. To express that humankind realizes all the types of possibilities of life, Cusa uses the term "poss-est".

This, however, is not a license to plunder and exploit the rest, but it is a commission and destiny to assist in bringing out of others and of the whole the realizations not otherwise possible for them. It is then the view of Teilhard de Chardin[34] that it is precisely in man that we must look for further global evolution.

The relation of person to person also is shaped notably by such a vision. Generally it has been seen that order rather than conflict is the condition for the exercise of freedom. This is to appreciate the whole globally, rather than merely as a set of contrasting individuals. It is this context which truly enables and promotes the exercise of human freedom.

To see each as a contraction of the whole provides each not only with equality, but with definitive status as endowed by the significance of the whole. I cannot be instrumentalized, much less reduced either abstractively or concretely to a least common denominator. Thus equality can be promoted without the reductionism entailed by egalitarianism. At the same time, by thinking in global terms it becomes possible to see that diversity is the key to enriching the whole and thereby drawing it closer to the fullness of perfection.

De Leonardis says this well when he concludes that:

> human endeavors can be successful only to the extent that they achieve this integration whereby the isolation of the lone individual is overcome by social participation and the emptiness of alienation is transformed by unifying love into an active and liberating communal existence.[35]

NOTES

1. Lu Xiaohe, "G.B. Vico and the Contemporary Civil World", in Wang Miaoyang, Yu Xuanmeng and M. Dy, *Civil Society in a Chinese Content: Chinese Philosophical Studies XV* (Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1997), pp. 37-45.

2. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language Unabridged* (Springfield, MA: Merriam, 1969).

3. XII, 71072b 26-19.

4. *Reconstruction in Philosophy* (Boston: Beacon, 1920).

5. (Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1998).

6. *Idiota de Mente / The Layman: about Mind*, tran. and ed. Clyde Lee Miller (New York: Abaris, 1979).

7. Trans. D.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinnes (New York: Humanities, 1961).

8. *The Individual and the Cosmos in Renaissance Philosophy* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963).

9. *De Veritate*, q. 1, 8. "Truth in the intellect is measured by things themselves," *ibid.*, I, 5.

10. *De Mente*, 4, p. 53 and 55.

11. Miller in *De Mente*, intro., p. 24.

12. *De Mente*, 7, p. 63.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 65.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 59.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 65.

16. *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (Chicago: Regnery, 1960), pp. 14-21.

17. Eugene Rice, "Nicholas of Cusa's Idea of Wisdom," *Traditio* 13 (1957), 358.

18. Descartes, *Discourse on Method*, 2.

19. D. De Leonardis, p. 60.

20. Henry Bett, *Nicholas of Cusa* (London: Meuthin, 1932), p. 180.

21. Trans. G. Heron (London: Routledge, Kegan, Paul, 1954).

22. G. McLean, *Plenitude and Participation: The Unity of Man in God* (Madras: University of Madras, 1978).

23. *Of Learned Ignorance*.

24. G. McLean, *Tradition, Harmony and Transcendence* (Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 1994), pp. 95-102.

25. *Of Learned Ignorance*, pp. 84-88.

26. De Leonardis, p. 228.

27. Arthur O. Lovejoy, *The Great Chain of Being* (New York: Harper, 1960).

28. *Of Learned Ignorance*, I, 9-10.

29. H.-G. Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (New York: Crossroads, 1975).

30. *Dato Patris Luminum* in Jasper Hopkins, *Nicholas of Cusa's Metaphors of Contraction* (Minneapolis: Banning, 1983), p. 25.

31. De Leonardis, pp. 233-236.

32. *Ibid.*, p. 235.

33. *Ibid.*, p. 236.

34. *Phenomenon of Man* (New York: Harper, 1959).

35. De Leonardis, p. 241.