

УДК 111.8:339.9

ДЖОН ОЗОЛНЬС,

професор філософії Католицького університету Австралії,
голова комітету з гуманітарних досліджень та етики,
м. Фітцрой (Вікторія), Австралія

ФІЛОСОФІЯ І КУЛЬТУРА: РОЗДУМИ ПРО ГЛОБАЛЬНІ КРИЗИ

Сучасний світ стикається з цілим рядом проблем. Більшість з них є транснаціональними, наприклад, зміна клімату та глобальне потепління. Катастрофа і руйнування ядерного реактора в Фукуямі (Японія), викликані потужним землетрусом і цунамі, вказують на безсилля людини перед природою. Інші кризи, наприклад, світова фінансова криза, також глибоко впливають на людські життя. Остання, безумовно, відповідальна за безліч смертей, які сьогодні важко оцінити кількісно. У ряді країн зменшується грошова допомога, а проекти, які, можливо, допомогли б вирішити проблему нестачі житла, покращити умови санітарії та чистої води не вдається продовжити. Існує необхідність переналаштувати капіталізм так, щоб він служив загальному благу. У розподілі загального багатства країн G20 і країн, що активно розвиваються останні роки, зокрема США, Китаї, Індії, Австралії та Великобританії, спостерігаються кричущі диспропорції. Недавню хвилю протесту, що протекла по всьому Близькому Сходу й спричинила повалення лівійського диктатора Каддафі і президента Єгипту Мубарака, слід розглядати не просто як ознаку внутрішньої нестабільності в цих країнах, але як знак того, що політика гноблення, де б і ким би вона не проводилася, в кінцевому рахунку призведе до закінчення диктатури корумпованих режимів. Ситуація в Сирії особливо гостро вказує на необхідність зміцнення міжнародного права. У цій статті стверджується, що філософія відіграє серйозну роль у роздумах про глобальні проблеми і, на прикладі глобальної етики, показано її центральне місце в експлікації тих цінностей, що лежать в основі пропонованого рішення глобальних проблем. Хоча культури різні, новітня історія показує, що людські істоти мають спільні цінності та цілі.

Globalisation and Global Crises

Globalisation is increasingly to be seen as the recognition that many of the problems faced by the world today are not simply the problems of individual nations. Globalisation may be defined as the multidimensional and interactive processes of political, economic and cultural change across the world resulting in increased social interconnectedness among different peoples [1]. It can also be taken to mean an increased awareness that all human beings and their activities do not occur in isolation, but have effects on those living elsewhere, both human and animal. Globalisation therefore extends beyond political, economic and cultural processes, but includes broader social, ethical and environmental processes that impinge on the way in which human beings interact with one another, the environment and the impact that human activity has on the future well-being of humankind and the planet on which they live. The global crises briefly catalogued here are indicative of the kinds of issues that no individual nation is able to tackle alone.

Changes in weather patterns around the world have seen these changes attributed to global warming and climate change and these, in turn, have been blamed on the activities of human beings. If this is so, then it is not an individual nation that will be responsible for reversing the effects of increased pollution in the atmosphere, the overfishing of oceans and seas, the destruction of the ozone layer, the destruction of rain forests and the depletion of natural resources, but all nations. Many

of these problems are due not only to a short-sighted pursuit of profit, but also a blindness to the damage being done to the environment and so the places that human beings and animals have to live. In some cases, the destruction of the environment can be due to extreme poverty and the failure of developed nations to support those struggling to support themselves in an unforgiving landscape. If the only source of fodder for one's sheep and goats is already degraded and marginalised land, it is not surprising that it degrades even further and it becomes impossible to survive in that environment.

Added to these problems are droughts, natural disasters, wars and other conflicts that have seen a rise in the number of people displaced from their homes and being forced to find somewhere else to live. The mass movement of people around the globe seeking to find asylum and refuge in another country is an increasing problem¹. Apart from outright conflicts, there is also mass migration of people because of governments oppressing their own people and because they come from what are called 'failed states'. That is, places where the government has been either so corrupt or so incompetent that the State can no longer sustain its people.

¹ The UNHCR Report for 2011 indicates that some 42.5 million people have been forcibly displaced, of whom 15.2 were refugees under UN protection. See UNHCR (2012) *A Year of Crises: UNHCR Global Trends 2011*, at URL <http://www.unhcr.org/4fd6f87f9.html> Accessed: 20/5/2013.

Immigration and the attendant problems of resettlement and integration into a host community are problems for all international communities².

Pandemics and epidemics, such as bird flu and AIDS never restrict themselves to national boundaries, but are increasingly problems for the whole world to solve. Outbreaks of foot and mouth disease, such as occurred in Europe in 2001, with a fresh occurrence reported in Britain in 2007, affect markets for fresh meat internationally and containment of such diseases is never just the responsibility of one nation, but the international community. An outbreak of bird flu in China in 2013, fortunately contained because of what was learned in previous outbreaks, provided a salutary reminder of the irrelevance of borders to pandemics and epidemics³. Although wealthier countries are able to stockpile vaccines to prevent disease spreading, it is not so easy for poorer countries. This also can mean that pandemics can enter a country from a poorer neighbour and hence, it is clear that these problems are not restricted to particular nations.

Crime has become multinational, with opium grown in Afghanistan, for example, finding its way through various intermediaries to the streets of many other countries. Trafficking in human beings as well as their organs has also become a lucrative trade [2]. Illegal fishing and the ignoring of bans on fishing protected and endangered species has led to the collapse of fisheries world wide and has the prospect of causing serious damage to communities world wide [3]. Poaching of endangered species is also a significant problem and illegal logging is leading to the destruction of forests, despoliation of land through erosion and the pollution of rivers.

Acts of terrorism are not restricted by national boundaries and government intelligence agencies are under considerable pressure to detect and prevent the mass murder of innocent people. Terrorists may be trained in one country but carry out their acts in other countries and so international cooperation is required in order to apprehend such individuals before they can carry out their deeds. Terrorism has become commonplace throughout the world and is not only directed at Western nations [4-6]. It is therefore a global problem and not just one for individual countries.

Trade in arms continues to be a scandalous problem internationally. The amount of money spent on armaments each year would be more than sufficient to alleviate world poverty, yet only a fraction of this amount is spent on aid. Some of the largest multinational corporations in the world are arms manufacturers and their profits depend on there being combatants involved in conflicts and wars otherwise there would be no one to buy their weapons. Conflicts could not be sustained if there were not weapons to be bought. The connections between governments and arms dealers is also problematic, since most weapons are not manufactured by government owned com-

panies, but by big corporations. The danger of corruption in the award of contracts is an ever present problem⁴.

Differences in national laws governing medical research have also been exploited by medical researchers and by large pharmaceutical companies. This raises the question of whether a researcher should be obliged to follow the moral norms and practices of his own country or those operating in the country in which he hopes to conduct his research. In any case he should follow his informed conscience about how to act, but there are significant concerns when large pharmaceutical companies conduct clinical trials of drugs, that might not be approved in their own countries, in developing countries where there may not be the same controls. This is, of course, only one of many possible cases of exploitation. There is the practice by drug companies of giving very expensive, but efficacious drugs to governments in poor countries at a discount price (or even free of charge) for a trial period, but withdrawing the subsidy and forcing the governments to spend scarce resources on it if they wish to continue to be able to make the drug available. When the drug is being used to help save children with a specific condition from dying it is extremely difficult to deny parents access to the drug. There are significant resource allocation issues which need to be faced, not just in relation to developing nations and the provision of adequate health care, but also for developed nations.

Just like big pharmaceutical companies, transnational corporations and big businesses which have annual turnovers that exceed the GDP of many small countries, operate outside the jurisdiction of countries and have the power to influence world markets in ways that government is completely powerless to do. Corporations do not operate like democracies and are generally single-minded about their purposes: namely, to return a dividend to their shareholders. Various scandals in recent years involving large transnational corporations provide us with examples of the lack of concern for the local populations where such corporations operate. Some examples of such lack of responsibility include the failure of Union Carbide to prevent the gas disaster in Bhopal, India [7], the contamination of the environment by Broken Hill in Ok Tedi, Papua New Guinea [8] and the destruction of the farming land of the Ogoni people in Nigeria by Shell [9].

These are all problems that are not merely national concerns nor challenges for particular regions of the world but are problems for the whole world. As nations such as China and India, the two most populous nations of the world, push forward with economic development, their desire for non-renewable resources grows and there are serious questions to be raised about the sustainability of continued economic growth. The prevailing wisdom in the Reagan and Thatcher years through the 1980s was that economic prosperity could be maintained by continuous economic growth, so that as an economy grew, through a trickle down effect, even the poorest would come to share in the wealth that was being created. Such economic models are still with us, with the world economy dependent on continued economic growth. China, with its vast population, is expanding its economy at a rapid rate, but it is unclear whether the results of this economic growth are being equally shared. The

² Europe, in particular those nations that have accepted large numbers of immigrants from Muslim countries now face real difficulties in integrating these groups into the general community. There is no coincidence that the rise of right wing xenophobic political parties has occurred at the same time as a growth in immigration from very different cultural groups to the host nations.

³ See, for example, the newspaper article in *The Guardian*, which reported that 24 people had died in the recent outbreak. At URL <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/may/01/scientists-concerned-h7n9-bird-flu-outbreak> Accessed: 20/5/2013.

⁴ The United States is by far the largest supplier of arms, accounting for 78% of the world's total trade in military hardware. Horner, D. (2012) "U.S. Dominated Global Arms Trade in 2011", *Arms Control Today*, October, 36-38.

same may be said for countries such as Russia, with its huge reserve of resources, which has adopted a market economy model and has seen enormous wealth being gained by relatively few and many Russians sinking deeper into poverty and despair. In Western countries, a similar story can be told, with countless millions having to struggle on meagre wages, if they have a job at all, while Chief Executive Officers of big corporations enjoy stratospheric salaries and bonuses. An unregulated market and the ascendancy of libertarian conceptions of society have seen the disparity between rich and poor grow considerably throughout the world. Meanwhile, supine governments stand idly by and fail to ensure that all citizens are able to share in wealth being generated.

The Global Financial Crisis, which some claim is over as markets return to apparent normality, nevertheless, continues to reverberate throughout the world. It is evident that there are still considerable problems remaining for the world as governments in various countries struggle with the destruction wrought by an essentially unregulated market. The development of financial products with little connection to classical economic activity, represented by traditional trade in manufactured goods and commodities, and their lack of regulation is one of the reasons that the financial collapse occurred. Although undoubtedly the lending of money to those with little capacity to pay was one of the reasons for the collapse of the sub-prime market, a more serious issue concerns those who not only lent money to people with poor credit records, but also with those who invented various products that had little connection to anything tangible. For example, Collateralised Debt Obligations (CDOs), squared and even cubed, are far removed from the Mortgage Backed Securities (MBSs) which are the base from which these further financial instruments spring. Add to these various hedge funds, for example, Collateralised Debt Securities (CDSs), designed to insure against loss, but which unscrupulous speculators exploited, there is little connection to any tangible goods or services in the series of buying and selling of these financial products. Though it is the case that financial brokers and speculators invented new financial products, none of the desire to make money from money is new. Aristotle remarks that there is no bound to the riches which spring from the art of wealth getting. Those who are engaged in the accumulation of wealth know no limit to its acquisition. Aristotle observes that some human beings will stop at nothing in order to accumulate wealth, since they desire pleasure without limit and to have this, will pursue wealth without limit. They will subordinate every quality they can to its pursuit. "...as their desires are unlimited, they also desire that the means of gratifying them should be without limit." [10]. The practices of speculators and so-called entrepreneurs have been little diminished by the Global Financial Crisis and the U.S. government, which presides over the largest economy in the world, has done little to introduce new regulations.

Although governments around the world took immediate action to limit the Global Financial Crisis by injecting funds into the market, it is by no means self evident that it is the only action that needed to be taken. As a result of the levels of debt to which banks and investment banks were exposed, governments, which is to say, tax payers, were forced to bail out those who ought to have been allowed to collapse. They should have been allowed to collapse and borne the consequences of their actions. It is understandable, nevertheless, why such a course of action was not taken. One of the motivations for governments in propping up such banks was the fear of what

such a collapse would mean for the economy of the country, the possibility of political unrest because of the human cost of so many losing their savings and superannuation, and, purely from self interest, the wrath of the electorate. As already intimated, the worst situation seems to exist in the United States, where there continues to be little regulation and no action appears to have been taken against those who were responsible for the collapse in the first place, as many of them appear to be back trading as usual.

Some governments, of course, care little for the people who they govern and many regimes exist simply to line their own pockets. Some, having attained power, allow themselves to be corrupted by it and become oppressors of their own people. In some cases, this has resulted in military action by neighbouring countries, but this may not have been for altruistic reasons to liberate an oppressed people, but may have been in order to secure long term access to valuable resources. Although the United States has claimed that the war in Iraq was to rid the Iraqi people of a tyrant, many commentators continue to believe that it was to secure Middle East oil.

The regime of Robert Mugabe in Zimbabwe is an example of a corrupt regime which stops at nothing to maintain its power, even at the cost of ruining the country and destroying the lives of countless citizens. Unfortunately, the United Nations and the countries neighbouring Zimbabwe have done nothing to alleviate the suffering of the people of Zimbabwe. Of course, it is not just Zimbabwe which is affected by the Mugabe's corrupt and murderous regime, but the nations surrounding Zimbabwe who have had to bear the brunt of the millions of refugees who are leaving their country in search of food and employment. The actions of Mugabe's regime affect the international community, not just the people of Zimbabwe, though for the latter it is of utmost seriousness since their lives are at stake. The country remains in real difficulties. Similarly, the civil war in Syria not only has resulted in many civilian deaths, but also threatens to destabilise the Middle East. The Assad regime's willingness to sacrifice innocent lives in order to remain in power is a crime against humanity.

Both the situation in Syria and in Zimbabwe raise questions about what actions the International community ought to take in dealing with governments that are oppressing, torturing and killing their own people and so destroying those whom they are obligated to protect. The recent upheavals in the Middle East illustrate well that the situations in Syria and Zimbabwe are not unique and there are numerous conflicts around the world that require the attention of the International community. The Syrian situation, at the present time, is parlous and it is evident that Assad is intent on remaining in power at all costs, even if it means the destruction of his country. That the conflict has been allowed to drag on is at least partly due to the jockeying for control and influence in the region by the major powers, who are seemingly unwilling to find a peaceful solution to the war. What is extraordinary about the situation in Syria, as it was in other countries in the Middle East, is the number of ordinary people who decided that they were not prepared to live under a tyrant any more. The need for a global peace keeping force, independent of national governments, has never been more apparent.

The Role of Philosophy and Culture

At first glance, it does not seem that philosophy has much relevance in the various global problems that we have outlined. These seem to require political and

economic solutions that have little to do with philosophy. It is certainly true that some of the most important problems to be considered require politicians, corporations, scientists and public servants to work together to solve the myriad global crises facing the world. Crises such as that occurring in Syria require extensive political skills and negotiating ability to effect a solution, the global financial problems require economists and financial advisors to find ways of stabilising markets, scientists are needed to predict the possible consequences of changing climate and public servants to implement the policies of governments in relation to all these crises. Philosophy and philosophers do not seem to have any significant part to play.

To conclude that philosophy and philosophers have little or no role to play in the tackling of global crises would be a mistake. It is a mistake because none of the major problems that constitute global crises can be addressed without some analysis of them and without some evaluation of the beliefs and values which are foundational to the assessment of the means to be used in tackling the problem. For example, in considering the civil war in Syria, there is the question of the obligations of neighbouring states to intervene to save innocent lives. This then requires, for instance, consideration of the limits of sovereignty and the application of just war theory, which are both philosophical questions. In considering issues related to the financial crises besetting the world, questions about the aims of business arise and whether profit should be the sole motivation for economic activity. This too, is a philosophical question about the kinds of beliefs and values that underpin the principles on which a particular conception of society is founded. Discussion of what ought to be done in relation to climate change and other environmental matters does not take place in a vacuum, but within a particular value and belief system. Thus, those that do not believe that there is any significant climate change reject any action to alter the use of fossil fuels, while those who do, make every effort to use alternative energy sources. These differences are not based on scientific evidence, but on particular belief and value systems. Philosophers have a role to play in philosophical questions about the conceptual frameworks in which questions about climate change are considered. For example, what is meant by climate change, as it is apparent that climate changes on a daily basis. Sharpening such conceptions is very much a task of philosophy. Finally, it is also clear that the policies devised by governments are also subject to political beliefs and values and so involve philosophical views. A government inclined towards libertarianism, for example, will devise policies that interfere minimally in the lives of its citizens by outsourcing as many functions as it can to the private sector. A more communitarian government will see its role differently and take responsibility for providing services itself. The roles of public servants will correspondingly be different. Philosophy and philosophers, whether this recognised formally or not, play a significant role in the clarification of each of the philosophical position that is adopted.

Neither are the various global crises that we have considered disconnected from culture, since not only does culture influence the way particular issues are viewed, but also how they are addressed. Culture is not disconnected from philosophy in this respect, since broad divisions can be recognised between different philosophical approaches that arise in different cultures. This is not altogether surprising, since we would expect that different environments and experiences will create

different outlooks on the world. A maritime culture, for example, will have different ways of viewing the world to a land-locked community high in a mountain range and remote from the sea. A desert community will have a very different attitude to water, for instance, than one in which flooding is a regular occurrence. Experiences of diverse kinds will affect the way in which different crises are viewed, since these will be reflected in the culture of the particular people. Philosophers are not immune to cultural influences, since their philosophising also takes place within a framework of their own experiences and those aspects of culture that they have absorbed, perhaps unconsciously.

Recognising the culturally bound nature of philosophical thought, if we want to have understand, say, Chinese culture, in any profound way it will not be particularly useful if the only standpoint from which we seek to appreciate it is from that of our own culture. This is the important lesson that both Nagel and MacIntyre seek to teach us in their different ways. Nagel in discussing objectivity and subjectivity, observes that there is no view from nowhere, that our assessments of various problems and issues are never divorced from our own cultural backgrounds and our philosophising is never from a God's eye point of view, but always immersed in a particular time and culture. If we want to obtain an objective a view as we can, we need to step back from our own prejudices and preconceptions, but Nagel notes that in ethics it is never possible to eliminate the subjective [11]. MacIntyre also reminds us that our thinking always takes place from within a particular tradition and this will be informed by our cultural practices [12].

To illustrate the differences, we need to consider how culture affects the way in which philosophy is practised. This is not always easy, as philosophy crosses many cultural boundaries, yet it is possible to see the effects of culture. Because culture includes language, philosophical perspectives will be affected by the language of discourse. Quine reminds us of the difficulty of translating a discourse carried on in one language into another, arguing for the inscrutability of reference and indeterminacy of translation [13]. Gadamer also insists that the achievement of thought takes place within something which is firm, that is, morals, law and religion, which is to say within a cultural tradition which acts as the bedrock for thought [14]. Wittgenstein notes that how the world is viewed will to a large extent be determined by the way in which it is described by language, since it expresses a form of life [15]. It can be concluded that by paying attention to the way in which ideas are expressed in language will provide a means of illuminating how different philosophical concepts are understood.

Given the culturally affected nature of philosophy, however, does not mean that there are not commonalities to be found between different ways of thinking nor that there may not be universal beliefs and values. These, however, will be expressed in different ways and will almost certainly begin from different starting points. For some philosophers, irrespective of their cultural background, and here we can point to Aquinas and Mengzi, as representatives of very different cultures, eras and traditions, an understanding of virtue, for example, will depend on an understanding of human nature and what is thought to be best for human beings. If there is a common human nature and there are good grounds for thinking there is, then though there will be different starting points for conceiving of virtue, what is considered to be good for human beings will essentially be the same. A study of both these thinkers, much beyond our scope here, will show

some surprising agreement about what is the good for human beings.

There will, however, be significant differences in the elaboration of the virtues and the underlying principles supporting each conception of the virtues will be quite different. Aquinas, for example, starts from an Aristotelian and Christian perspective, adding to the cardinal virtues of Aristotle the Christian virtues of faith, hope and charity. Mengzi begins with the idea that human nature is good and that the sprouts of the virtues have been given to human beings by Heaven. That both Aquinas and Mengzi arrive at the conclusion that what is good for human beings is the virtuous life is not that surprising, since both assume the essential goodness of human nature and that human fulfilment demands its continued development. The essential virtues elaborated by each, however, divide up the overall notion of virtue or moral goodness in quite different ways. Setting aside the Christian virtues of faith, hope and charity, Aquinas's cardinal virtues are courage, temperance, justice and prudence, while Mengzi's are humaneness, rightness, propriety and practical wisdom. These have similarities to one another, but are different ways of thinking about virtue overall. Once these virtues are detailed, however, it is clear that the end of the cultivation of virtue for both is human fulfilment and this is union with God or Heaven⁵.

Though the end of the cultivation of moral virtue is moral goodness, the path to this endpoint is not necessarily the same for everyone and all cultures. The contours of what the good life consists in will essentially be the same, but possibly quite different in its realisation. In considering the prospect of a global ethics, we should be cautious, since if the argument we have been presenting is plausible, then the domain of the virtues will be carved differently and this will mean different approaches to how virtue is to be realised. Awareness of this is helpful in the consideration of what brings us together in thinking about the values that underpin approaches to global problems. Moreover, diversity of views about virtue and perspectives on values need not undermine the prospects of agreements about common values and to that extent, can support a global ethics. What should be resisted, however, is the idea that there can be a global ethics that consists of the virtues understood in the same way.

Global Ethics

Normative ethical theories all purport to be universally applicable, so to speak of global ethics or globalised ethics seems to be quite redundant. Hans Kung, however, points out the intent of global ethics as being the acceptance of a certain minimum of common values, standards and basic attitudes. Kung says global ethics is:

"a minimal basic **consensus** relating to binding values, irrevocable standards and moral attitudes, which can be affirmed **by all religions** despite their undeniable dogmatic or theological differences and should also be supported **by non-believers**." [16].

More broadly, we can re-express Kung's definition of global ethics as a minimal basic consensus to values, irrevocable standards and moral attitudes, which can be affirmed by all cultures, despite their many differences. The difficulty, however, is whether the principles of global ethics to which everyone can assent would be robust enough to enable agreed ethical decisions to be made

in a variety of areas, as all that is demanded is a minimal basic consensus. If the path to virtue, understood as human fulfilment, allows for different understandings of virtues, then it follows that there will be different perspectives on what the minimal consensus is about. The right to education, for example, even if it is affirmed by everyone, will not be understood by every nation and culture as demanding the same access to education. In some cultures, the idea that there should be universal access to tertiary education, for instance, is not considered as having the same level of importance as primary and secondary education. Moreover, given the seriousness of many global questions, minimal consensus will not be sufficient for agreement on how to proceed to tackle these issues. The lack of consensus on market regulation, for example, shows how unrealistic the demand for consensus is. In order to make any headway with global problems, several conditions need to be met. In general, amongst other things, there needs to be agreement: (i) about the nature of the problem itself; (ii) about its urgency; (iii) its priority amongst other problems; (iv) who is to take responsibility for tackling the problem; (v) how it is to be tackled; (vi) what resources are needed. Each of these conditions will involve value judgements and while some minimal consensus is helpful, recognition that a particular problem is a common global problem is the most important condition.

While it is unclear whether a sufficiently robust global ethics can be established, philosophy is crucial in providing the reflection that is necessary in thinking about the values which underpin the different perspectives on global issues. Though science can be expected to provide empirical evidence for climate change, for example, it is philosophy which asks for clarification about what is meant by climate change and which establishes the independent rules of evidence that helps in the assessment of the evidence. In relation to its urgency, though it is also a political and economic question, it is also a philosophical question, since for a nation the extent to which it is able to address a question will also depend on other competing problems. The alleviation of poverty, for example, may demand acceptance of a higher level of pollution since the cost of cheap energy from coal is considered less than that from green energy. A country with fewer options in relation to energy may be forced to continue to use sources of energy that it knows are polluting. Philosophy provides the critical reflective resources to enable competing positions and competing values to be evaluated.

Another example that reinforces the importance of philosophy in providing the critical resources to evaluate competing positions is provided by the recent disaster in Fukushima, Japan. Aside from the terrible cost in human life, the catastrophe caused by the earthquake and tsunami to the nuclear power plant at Fukushima has resulted in some rethinking of the merits of generating electricity by nuclear power. The fear is no longer of world destruction by nuclear weapons, though some fear of this remains, but the possibility of a nuclear disaster which affects the global community. The escape of nuclear waste materials into groundwater not only affects the water, but all the life that depends on that water. Airborne radiation does not respect national boundaries either. Exposure to radiation may not have immediate effects, but there are considerable long term health risks. Science provides the data about levels of risk and the actions that need to be taken to limit these risks, but it will be philosophy that is required to evaluate these. A global ethics that remains at a general con-

⁵ How God and Heaven are to be understood is another issue. It suffices to say here that what both agree about is that human fulfilment has a goal.

sensual level will not be enough, but a philosophical analysis that takes into account not only diverse normative ethical theories in its evaluation, but also the effects of culture, will provide a better basis for decision-making, as well as an understanding of the diverse contributions that are made to the making of those decisions.

Although there is a diversity of cultures and values are heterogeneous, the global crises that we face threaten all human beings and hence it is not a matter of choice what are considered problems. Thus, the risks posed by the contamination of the atmosphere by nuclear waste from nuclear power plants are common problems, not simply Japanese ones that occurred as a result of the tsunami that was experienced. The idea of global ethics is premised on the view that there are common aspirations that human beings share and that there is a common good that all hope for. More importantly, human beings share a common human nature which is affected by the same kinds of physical events, such as nuclear radiation. There is no escaping the fact that human beings all need food, shelter, clean water to drink and clean air to breathe. A case can also be made for human beings sharing other kinds of needs, such as a need for peace of mind, need for friends, for freedom of expression and security. These commonalities, arguably, provide the reasons for thinking that though there are diverse perspectives on values and virtues, they converge on the same kind of good for human beings⁶ [17]. It is self-evident, after all, that it is in no one's interest that airborne nuclear radiation should be allowed to circulate in the atmosphere. The need for understanding of diverse values and a sense of the common good in relation to common global problems is urgent and the movement towards elaborating a global ethics is a recognition of this.

The Declaration of Human Rights

As a document that recognises the urgency of consensual approaches to common human problems, the Declaration of Human Rights is a useful starting point, though it is largely a Western document. Despite this, although it is more than 60 years since the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, it remains one of the most significant statements on the principles that should govern the ethical decision-making of all human beings, but, one might add, the leaders of nations, states and corporations who have the power to affect many lives. The U.N. Declaration is not without controversy and many of its principles remain to be implemented in various corners of the world. Nonetheless, it has guided the decision making of the United Nations and the development of its aid programs throughout the world. It remains one of the few documents on which there is some common agreement. More recently, and significantly in the light of what we have been discussing, the rise of globalisation, the U.N. warns, has the potential to erode human rights even further.

The UN Statement on globalisation and economic, social and cultural rights notes the growth of globalisation and warns that market economies and the growth of international financial markets has the potential to influence national policies and affect the livelihoods of a great many people. We have already noted the effect of the GFC on the lives of many people. The statement in relation to human rights says:

"...globalization risks downgrading the central place accor-

ded to human rights by the United Nations Charter in general and the International Bill of Human Rights in particular. This is especially the case in relation to economic, social and cultural rights. Thus, for example, respect for the right to work and the right to just and favourable conditions of work is threatened where there is an excessive emphasis upon competitiveness to the detriment of respect for the labor rights contained in the Covenant. The right to form and join trade unions may be threatened by restrictions upon freedom of association, restrictions claimed to be "necessary" in a global economy, or by the effective exclusion of possibilities for collective bargaining, or by the closing off of the right to strike for various occupational and other groups. The right of everyone to social security might not be ensured by arrangements which rely entirely upon private contributions and private schemes. Respect for the family and for the rights of mothers and children in an era of expanded global labor markets for certain individual occupations might require new and innovative policies rather than a mere laissez-faire approach. If not supplemented by necessary safeguards, the introduction of user fees, or cost recovery policies, when applied to basic health and educational services for the poor can easily result in significantly reduced access to services which are essential for the enjoyment of the rights recognized in the Covenant. An insistence upon higher and higher levels of payment for access to artistic, cultural and heritage-related activities risks undermining the right to participate in cultural life for a significant proportion of any community" [18].

The continued growth of market economies around the world and the erosion of basic services is evident throughout the developed world. For example, though indicators in relation to employment in Western nations are mixed, with some boasting falling unemployment rates and rising wages, others have rising unemployment, especially among the young, and falling wages. In both situations, basic housing is becoming increasingly out of reach of average wage earners and obviously is not accessible to the unemployed. Health, welfare and education services are also becoming significantly out of reach of the poor. The middle class is also shrinking as a result of the redistribution of wealth to the very rich. The situation in developing world is substantially worse. The problems to which we have already alluded are the result of unregulated markets and a lack of consensus over the common good which should be ultimately the aim of human activity. We all have to live together on the one planet and what one person does affect others. Similarly, what one nation, one corporation or one entrepreneur does affects others.

Mass communication, travel and the growing realisation of the interconnectedness of all peoples at the global level has increased the need for human beings to find practical ways to work together to secure the future of the world. One way that has been proposed has been the design of a global ethic which will encapsulate those values on which all people can agree. The problems is that if there are fundamental differences about the nature of the common good this will prove to be difficult. The United Nations Declaration of Human Rights is a beacon which provides some optimism that, though there may be difficulties in gaining consensus on common values, respect for one another may enable creative solutions to emerge from a common desire to find practical solutions to global problems.

Philosophy has a crucial role to play in deliberations about the nature of the common good, about the understanding of values in different cultures and in explicating their foundations. Importantly, even as we seek common ground or a global ethics, based perhaps on the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, cultural and language dif-

⁶ Not everyone agrees with this. Some philosophers, such as Richard Rorty, argue that there is no common human nature, though what exactly he means by this is not clearly explicated by him.

ferences cannot be ignored, since different perspectives from diverse cultures can cast illumination on a particular problem. Global crises require not so much agreement about values, but about common aspirations and about what fulfils human beings. Global ethics, despite providing ethical principles that are unlikely to be ever fully agreed upon, does imply that there are common problems that a common approach might have help to resolve. Philosophy, because it seeks the truth, provides the resources for deliberations about global crises.

REFERENCES

1. Twiss, S.B. (2004) "History, Human Rights and Globalisation", *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 32, 1, 39-70.
2. Ozolins, J. (2009) "Human Beings as Resources: The Ethics of Buying and Selling Human Tissues and Organs", *Ethics Education*, 15, 1, 5-19.
3. Pincock, S. (2010) "Overfishing is a problem in Australia, but we've come a long way in recent years in terms of fishing sustainability, say scientists and environmentalists", available at: <http://www.abc.net.au/science/articles/2010/09/09/3003951.htm> Accessed: 2/4/2011.
4. Pettiford, L. and Harding, D. (2003) *Terrorism: The New World War*, Slough: Arcturus.
5. Freilich, J.D. and Guerette, R.T. (eds.) (2006) *Culture, Conflict, Crime and Terrorism*, Abingdon, Oxon.: Ashgate.
6. Zimmerman, E. (2011) "Globalisation and Terrorism", *European Journal of Political Economy*, 27, S152-S161.
7. Boughton, E. (2005) "The Bhopal Disaster and its Aftermath: A Review", *Environmental Health: A Global Access Source*, 4, 6.
8. Banks, G. and Ballard, C. (eds.) (1997) *The Ok Tedi Settlement: Issues, Outcomes and Implications*, Pacific Policy Paper 27, Canberra: National Centre for Development Studies and Resource Management in Asia-Pacific, Research School for Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.
9. Frynas, J. G. (1998) "Political instability and business: focus on Shell in Nigeria", *Third World Quarterly*, 19, 3, 457-478.
10. Aristotle (1976) *The Politics*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, Book I Chapter 9, [1258a].
11. Nagel, T. (1989) *The View from Nowhere*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 8-9.
12. MacIntyre, A. (2007) *After Virtue*, 3rd Edition, Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press.
13. Quine, W.V.O. (1960) *Word and Object*, Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press.
14. See Gadamer, H-G. (1989) *Truth and Method*, 2nd Revised Edition, tr. rev. J. Weinsheimer and D.G. Marshall, London: Sheed and Ward, 235-236.
15. Wittgenstein, L. (1953) *Philosophical Investigations*, tr. G.E.M. Anscombe, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, para. 19.
16. Hans Kung (2005) *Global Ethic and Human Responsibilities*, Available online at: http://www.scu.edu/ethics/practicing/focusareas/global_ethics/laughlin-lectures/global-ethic-human-responsibility.html Accessed: 27/05/13.
17. Rorty, R. (1989) *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
18. United Nations Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1998) *Statement on Globalization and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*, May, 1998, Geneva: Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights.

Джон Озолинсь

Професор філософії Католицького університету Австралії, голова комітету по гуманітарним дослідженням і етиці, г. Фітцрой (Вікторія), Австралія

ФИЛОСОФИЯ И КУЛЬТУРА: РАЗМЫШЛЕНИЯ О ГЛОБАЛЬНЫХ КРИЗИСАХ

Современный мир сталкивается с целым рядом проблем. Многие из них, все чаще являются транснациональными, например, изменение климата и глобальное потепление. Катастрофа и разрушение ядерного реактора в Фукуяма (Япония), вызванное мощным землетрясением и цунами указывает на бессилие человека перед лицом сил природы. Другие кризисы, такие, как мировой финансовый кризис, также глубоко влияют на человеческие жизни. Мировой финансовый кризис, безусловно, ответственен за множество смертей, которые сегодня трудно оценить количественно. Ряду стран уменьшается денежная помощь, а проекты, которые, возможно, помогли бы решить проблемы нехватки жилья, улучшить условия санитарии и снабжения чистой водой не удается продолжить. Существует необходимость перенастроить капитализм так, чтобы он служил общему благу. В распределении общего богатства стран G20 и стран, которые активно развиваются в последние годы, в частности США, Китая, Индии, Австралии и Великобритании, есть вопиющие диспропорции. Недавняя волна протеста по всему Ближнему Востоку, который привел к свержению ливийского диктатора Каддафи и президента Египта Мубарака, не следует рассматривать просто как признак внутренней нестабильности в этих странах, но, как знак того, что политика угнетения где бы и кем бы она не проводилась, в конечном счете приведет к свержению коррумпированных режимов. Ситуация в Сирии особенно остро указывает на необходимость укрепления международного права. В данной статье утверждается, что философия играет серьезную роль в мышлении о глобальных проблемах и на примере глобальной этики показано, что она занимает центральное место в экспликации тех ценностей, которые лежат в основе предлагаемого решения глобальных проблем. Хотя культуры разные, новейшая история показывает, что человеческие существа имеют общие ценности и цели.

John Ozolins

Professor of Philosophy Faculty of Philosophy and Theology Chair, Human Research Ethics Committee Deputy Chair, Academic Board Australian Catholic University Limited

PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE: THINKING ABOUT GLOBAL CRISES

The world is beset by what seem to be an interminable set of problems. Many of these, increasingly, are transnational, which is to say, that they transcend the borders of individual nations. Issues such as climate change and apparent global warming are fiercely debated, with many arguing that without a change in the way in which

human beings abuse the environment, we are all doomed. The crisis surrounding the destruction of the nuclear reactor in Fukuyama, Japan as a result of the devastation wrought by the massive earthquake and tsunami points to human powerlessness in the face of the forces of nature. It also points to the need to show respect for those same forces. Other crises, such as the global financial crisis, also have had a profound impact on human lives. While it is difficult to quantify, the global financial crisis has undoubtedly been responsible for many deaths also, as aid money decreases and projects which may have helped solve housing shortages, provided sanitation and clean water are unable to proceed. There is a need to reconfigure capitalism so that it serves the common good, rather than the self indulgent needs of venal speculators. Glaring inequalities in the distribution of the common wealth of countries are just as evil in the United States, China, India, Australia and the United Kingdom, to name a few of the G20 nations, as they are anywhere else. The recent wave of protest throughout the Middle East which saw the ousting of the Libyan dictator, Gaddafi and the Egyptian president Mubarak, should not be seen as simply a sign of the inherent instability in those countries, but as a sign that oppressive policies wherever they are met will eventually result in the overthrow of corrupt regimes. The situation in Syria is, of course, particularly parlous and points to the need for stronger international law. This paper argues that philosophy has a serious role to play in thinking about global issues and, using the example of global ethics, shows how it is central in the explication of the values that underpin proposed solutions to global problems. Though cultures are different, it is proposed, recent history shows that human beings share common values and purpose.

© John Ozolins

Надійшла до редакції 18.09.2013

УДК 332.1+ 327(519) (075.8)

СЕМЕНЮК ІГОР,

*кандидат філософських наук, доцент кафедри гуманітарних дисциплін
Класичного приватного університету, м. Запоріжжя*

КОНФЛІКТ МІЖ ПІВДЕННОЮ ТА ПІВНІЧНОЮ КОРЕЄЮ ЯК ВИРАЖЕННЯ ВІДМІННОСТЕЙ ЇХ МОДУСІВ СОЦІАЛЬНОСТІ

У дослідженні аналізуються характерні складові корейського конфлікту. Обґрунтовано, що вплив ідеологічного модусу спричинив значні відмінності в становленні соціальності Північної та Південної Кореї. Ці відмінності знайшли своє місце у двох сферах формування конфлікту між двома державами: нижній, яка визначає традиції, культуру та цінності, та верхній, що формує політичну, соціальну та економічну особливості.

Ключові слова: модуси; соціальність; ідеологія; північнокорейське суспільство; південнокорейське суспільство; цінності; світогляд; політичні складові; економічні складові Кореї; стратегія.

Постановка проблеми. Останні роки (особливо з 2010 року) стали досить складними та стратегічно неврівноваженими для Корейського півострова. Конфлікт між двома Кореями не є чимось новим у сучасних світових координатах, він триває ще з кінця корейської війни 1953 року [9]. Виникає питання - що ж є причиною цих конфліктів між одним народом, який говорить однією мовою та є носієм древньої та самобутньої культури? З точки зору соціальної філософії, ми намагаємось аргументувати більш чітко бачення цієї проблематики.

Аналіз останніх досліджень та публікацій. Великий внесок у дослідження окресленої проблематики зробили А. Алепко, К. Асмолов, М. Воробйов, Л. Петров, А. Федоровський, М. Філіпенко, П. Шарав, А. Бренній, П. Чемберлін, Ім Хак Сун, Пак Чжон Хі, Квек Джон Бі, Лім Сук На та інші. Актуальними є дослідження Лім Сук На та Ім Хак Сун, які відкривають справжню причину конфлікту. Розуміння відмінностей між Північною та Південною Кореєю знаходимо в розробках А. Алепко, К. Асмолова, М. Вороб-

йова. Пак Чжон Хі проливає світло на новосформовану південнокорейську соціальність та відкриває сутність її детермінант.

Метою роботи є з'ясування причин конфлікту між Північною та Південною Кореєю як вираження відмінностей їхніх модусів соціальності.

Виклад основного матеріалу. У конфліктному протистоянні існують дві основних сфери, які виникли внаслідок розходження в ідеологічних та світоглядних парадигмах. *Нижня сфера* - цінності й традиції, що свідчать про наявність чи відсутність "культури згоди" в суспільстві. Цей нижній шар найбільше співвідноситься з власне процедурними факторами й багато в чому визначає орієнтацію на спільні або односторонні рішення. При цьому соціально-культурні та соціально-психологічні передумови конфліктів уплетені в тканину економіко-політичних настільки тісно, що часом їх дослідження видається справою досить складною. *Верхня сфера* визначається соціально-економічними та політичними параметрами [2].