



GLOBALISATION AND ANTHROPOLOGY

JANEZ JUHANT

University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

ABSTRACT

The globalisation of the modern world has been so far oriented primarily towards the economy. Postmodernism as a claim for the possibilities of an individual implies the local and the personal and asks for interpersonal dialogue among the partners. The incidents in the USA, on 11th September, 2001, show us how complicated the process of the critical dialogue between different partners can be. Critical dialogue has become a worldwide necessity if we wish to preserve the mankind. Postmodernism orientates us to transcend the one-dimensional imperialistic globalisation and especially to consider the problems of those who suffer or are in need, as John Rawls shows us in his theory of justice. This strategy requires from all the partners to respect every single man as a person, solidarity and subsidiarity: we have to work locally and we should be oriented globally.

KEY WORDS: anthropology, globalisation, postmodernism, religion, Christianity, person, justice, solidarity, subsidiarity

ANTHROPOLOGY AND GLOBALISATION

Globalisation of the modern world has been so far oriented primarily towards the economy, it nevertheless causes increasingly obvious cultural and socio-political effects as well as those pertaining to the media. The world is increasingly integrating into a common whole, which is for the time being still shapeless, yet very strictly structured - at least in regard to the economy. An important part of this whole is also European integration, which plays a significant role, especially for the countries with a communist past, since the processes of integration are meant to facilitate easy and successful transformation and thus to actualise their socio-political images according to European democratic standards. Modern, predominantly economically oriented, processes of globalisation increasingly challenge the differences and particularities of nations and cultures, which adds to nationalism, xenophobia, and creates new divisions. A glaring example are the problems connected with the flow of people within the European Union, with the leading countries opposing the inflow of new labour force from the countries which are potential candidates for membership, particularly

to the economic migration from Poland. All this confirms that economic lobbies try to simplify the processes of integration and subordinate them to purely economic goals.

Perhaps the task of anthropology, theology and other humanities is to follow their historical mission and further as well as consolidate the pluralism of ideas which is based upon man as a person - the primary factor and foundation of all socio-political integration. Consequently, modern man should be prepared, trained and provided with the appropriate organisational base to be available in the processes of integration, which cannot and must not abolish his personal inviolability. The simplified economic globalisation also presents a threat to the family and other communities (e.g. religious communities) which try to preserve the interpersonal model as a basis for societal relations. In addition, the role of the nation is also rendered uncertain by these processes.

SPLIT OR DIFFERENCE – THE PROBLEM OF MODERNISM

In his treatise on postmodernism, *Saturated Self*, Kenneth Gergen says, »Thinking that totalises has a certain flaw. Such systems not only cut, subjugate and destroy alternative forms of social life, but also pave the way to split. To be convinced of “the truth” of an explanation means to consider alternatives as stupid or redundant, that is to say, to either mock or silence the external world. Fighting stances are developed in which people talk only to those who agree with them, at the same time means are sought to destroy the credibility and influence (as well as lives) of others. All this is paralleled with an increasing sense of self-righteousness. Once modernism imposed its hegemony, religion, for example, lost its place in university curricula and was replaced by science, the industrious replaced the eloquent, school prayer was replaced by school councillors, organisational loyalty of systemic analysis and psychoanalysis were replaced by cognitive therapy.” (Gergen:1996, 397).

The problem of totalitarian thinking was reinforced by the modern absoluteness of different particularisms and it became especially exuberant in conceptual, economic, social and political liberalism, as well as in collective dialectical communism and nationalism (e.g. nazism, fascism). Totalitarianism of thinking made its influence felt in different variants elsewhere, too, in all the “monumental episodes” whose end is announced by postmodernism. The characteristic of totalitarian thinking, as clearly recognised during our experience with communism, is the exclusion of other options and the establishment of absolute standpoints which were even presented as being based on the so-called scientific paradigm. Retroactively, many people wrongly conclude that such totalitarianism of thinking is perceptible only in the conceptual and socio-political order of medieval Christianity. Yet more and more increasingly precise studies of medieval thought confirm the old commonplace truth of its pluralism which started to fade with modern particularism. This was partly facilitated by the predominant and exclusive thomistic particularism of the last few centuries that was provoked as the antipode and competition to particularistic modern modes of thinking. The so-called ancient societies (e.g. Greek and medieval) were not facing the problem of totalitarian thinking because, among other reasons, the structure of their societies was all-inclusive, so their conceptual, economic, moral, political and civilisational options were preserved and maintained on common, primarily cosmological or theological grounds (Horster, 1999, 22). Such societies had common frameworks within which was

determined the role of an individual who knew how to integrate and also had to integrate into the whole. Slaves, of course, were not a part of this whole – they were outside this framework although they, too, enabled the society to produce culture. Many-sided human activity in these societies required no particular argumentation since all people recognised the common ground (which was God, according to Thomas Aquinas (Akviski, 1999, 338)). The split of thinking was prevented by the universal agreement and willingness to live together, which in turn enabled and provided common conceptual, linguistic and cultural bases. Hellenism already caused a certain turbulence and challenged classical Greek thought, but it also provided classical Greek philosophy with the fitting wider conceptual basis to be later on supplemented and completed by Christianity. Athens (philosophy), Jerusalem (Judaism and Christianity), and Rome (legal order) (Woschitz, 1984; 16-45) are like pillars of mutual influencing and supplementing, which were in the Christian empire (German) also given the political framework (Kallscheuer, 1994, 46-49) upon which all subsequent processes were based. It was this organisational and political framework that reinforced reasons for subsequent conceptual splits, as confirmed also by the schism in the 11th century (Dvornik, 1960, 634). The society was a global whole in which heterogeneous processes took place without destroying its equilibrium. Novalis says, “They were beautiful, glittering times when Europe was a Christian country, when Christianity had the right of domicile in this humanely shaped part of the world, only one great communal interest bound the most remote provinces of this vast Christian kingdom.” (Novalis, 1963).

This “Christian kingdom” was getting more and more specific political, economic-social and cultural contours which marked the conceptual and societal foundations of Plato’s Republic, Aristotle’s Logic, Metaphysics, Ethics, and Politics as well as Augustine’s City of God. This kingdom got its utilitarian political frameworks in the medieval state and obtained the (final) foundation in scholastic frameworks of thinking. Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274) provided a momentous definition for this systemic framework by scholastically treating and synthesising Christianity and Aristotelian thought. This synthesis thus became the basis of ecclesiastical philosophising. Scholastic systematists (Gr. *synistemi* – »I am putting together«) can be thus given the main credit for determining the scientific paradigm par excellence which introduced definitions, consequently also limitations and splits, in the field of humanities as well as in other sciences. These thinkers knew that “every determination is negation” (*Omnis determinatio est negatio*) and pointed out that man can not put together everything, as Kant later put it. Our cognition and action remain within the limits of direct experience, we should be aware that managing the whole is beyond our abilities. For this reason, only some scholastics, the so-called nominalists (e.g. William of Ockham, 1285 – 1347), pointed out the significance of that which is available to direct experience and therefore individual in nature, they emphasised that only faith can equip man to comprehend the whole. Martin Luther (1483 – 1546) from this notion derived the principle that only faith (*sola fides*) saves man, whereas modern science took and confirmed systematism from the scholastic scientific paradigm, especially through the Enlightenment, which regained prominence after the Romantic period. This systematism tried, through and above scientific partiality, to enforce totalitarian knowledge which is possible only if accompanied by an ideology that suggests modern man can become the master of himself and the world. This is the problem of modern “monumental episodes”. In this aspiration lies hidden man’s primordial need to recognise the world as a whole.

Peter Sloterdijk convincingly explains this primordial need for global wholes in his work *Sphären II*, by citing Hans Blumenberg, who says that a city (polis) is “the continuation of a cave with other means” (Sloterdijk, 1999, esp. pp. 251-326). Man wants a well-rounded dwelling place. The basis of human existence is a sphere (Gr. *sphaíra*) which genetically begins with mother’s placenta, that is why Sloterdijk subtitled his first book (*Sphären I*) *Bubbles (Blasen)* – man comes from mother’s placenta and will seek its pristine nature also in the world, he seeks a nest to safeguard his existence. Freud says that man wants to “crouch in the nest”, to be like “a sheaf in the nest”. Modern era has according to Sloterdijk put an end to this wholeness and security of man’s life by triggering global splitting processes which attributed absolute qualities (determined, ultimate) to individual entities (national, scientific, ideological) and thus broke up the global. Parallel systems were developed and their common symbolism failed. The problem of the present globalisation is how to construct the global symbol – not only comprehensible to all people but also enabling us to identify with the symbols of partial systems. Here appears the problem of how to preserve man’s identity or security within the sphere without having to cut off his contacts with others in the light of the fact that he can not secure his well-rounded symbolic whole all by himself. This whole can no longer be secured by a state nor by any scientific, political or other ideological system. The only path to unity leads through the individual’s openness to others and his readiness to associate with different people. According to Cristoph Menke, it was G. F. W. Hegel who put an end to the traditional universal image of reality by double decomposition, namely, by bringing attention to (1) the discrepancy between an individual and the polis-like (politically regulated) community, and (2) the discrepancy in an individual himself, which divided man into a being of self-realisation (inner, emotional, spiritual) and an external legal-political being (Menke, 1996; 239). Menke thus points out an important yet often overlooked dimension of Hegel’s thought. As a philosopher of identity and difference, Hegel is an important harbinger of the modern split into an individual’s happiness and the external collective equity of a political community. This dimension was again emphasised by Nietzsche and Heidegger as well as by other existentialists. The new or modern organisation of the world and living under the influence of science and technology introduces a split into the old unified “objective world” of man and his environment by dividing man into individual experiencing and comprehending on one side, and the objective world of science and technology or social-sociological functioning on the other, the latter is not interested in individual experience but only in the technical-rational functioning of socio-economic processes. The completion and culmination of this process is modernism as the prevalence of technical reason from the Enlightenment and its analytic, splitting, and dividing process with the strategy of splitting man as a person and subjecting him to the frameworks and procedures of the process.

FROM MODERN TO POSTMODERN FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIETY

Keneth Gergen establishes in his work *Oversaturated Self* that the romantic ideal of inner man failed to assert itself, although it provided a basis for the majority of modern concepts of personality: for (moral) sense, passion, suffering, love (*amor*), for conviction based on experience or faith etc. The romantic notion and image of man was, despite the importance of man's feelings, ousted and outshone by the enlightenment-rational image of the man of science and technology which carried on the scholastic ideal of systemic man and rejected man's romantic elements. Freud based the study of man's "instinctual" elements on rational analysis of human personality. His rational image of man is the product of the psycho-analytic method. Man's world is believed to be governed and determined by analytical concepts of science, technology, progress, machinery, production, processing by media and computer. The image of man is according to the psychologist Carl Rogers determined also through self-creation, yet this is not an intrinsic, authentic man, but analytically planned, manufactured man. Man is created by technical-operational as well as by other modern planning frameworks and bases for tailoring his image. These processes have a long tradition which in its first phase began with Low Tech: railway, mail, car, telephone, radio, film and mass production of books. In the 80s, five big countries (USA, West Germany, Great Britain, Canada, and the Soviet Union) together published from 50,000 to 80,000 books per year. In the last phase of modernism, at the dawn of postmodernism, man and society are managed by High Tech – air traffic, television, video and other sophisticated media technology, electronic processing and connections. These agents immensely increase man's abilities for communication. Yet mutual relationships are at the same time becoming planned and stimulated by technology and the media. Paradoxically, we now often know more about people we see on television, e.g. Schumacher, Zahovič etc., than about our neighbours or even our loved ones. Possibilities and the number of relationships are increasing. We can imagine the past and the future (with the help of films and the Internet), the future is becoming increasingly familiar because it is planned, for this very reason it is becoming limited, it clearly presents its traps and exposes us to new uncertainties which even threaten our own existence. This was very explicitly manifested by the recent attack on Pentagon and WTC towers on 11 September 2001. Relationships are therefore multiplied and regulated on the technical-instrumental level. This expands the possibilities and even increases the intensity of (also intimate) interpersonal relationships, yet within new, stereotypical, casual and arbitrary frameworks. Such operating in turn expands man's possibilities and increases tension because man is not able to reach or obtain these possibilities for his own use. The biggest problem is the fact that individual subsystems no longer prove adequate because they renounce interaction and because each subsystem, despite the state-of-the-art means of communication, follows its own separate logic. Establishing mutual co-ordination (for example, between the rich and the poor, between industrial lobbies and ecologists, between "imperialists" and terrorists etc.) demands exceptional efforts because such a task requires examination of even the most fundamental procedures and strategies in individual fields such as science, politics, social security, and even religion. As an example: academicians could once communicate within the relatively uncomplicated field of communication by simple scientific patterns while today this communication is carried out within universities or even individual faculties and disciplines in unlimited forms through electronic links

restricted only by time. The greatest difficulty here is the fact that this communication despite technically unsophisticated connections requires adjustments of (different) languages and their premises. Additionally, man as a person feels more and more unimportant and impotent in the face of boundless data, their variants, and the means of their acquisition itself. The independence of individual scientific systems also reduces the possibility of rationally evaluating the whole, everything becomes a matter of persuasion and acceptance, in which the mind can not give final, explicit and reliable answers. Thus appears the paradox that it was precisely the man of reason who created circumstances which made rational decisions of little consequence. Consequently, the world's foundations are shaking and the Earth opens to that which has no foundation, as Blaise Pascal put it. What does remain, then, to be called the truth? Has the theory of relativity captured with its absolute velocity also man's everyday life and now dictates business operations in the world? Are there really no objective foundations left? To paraphrase Kant - what about the absolute value of man and the state of his freedom? Everything seems to lack foundation, does that entail the fall of freedom together with its bearer - man as a moral being?

FREEDOM: AN INDIVIDUAL AND THE SOCIETY

Modern society has emphasised an individual as a subject and thus poses the question of freedom and man's relation (as a free being) to his community. Already classic liberalism (J. Lock, A. Smith) was opposed to the arbitrary and absolute rule of an individual, it advocated subordination to the law, yet it encountered problems while trying to establish the mechanisms which should limit the absolute power. That is why Adam Smith included in his writings about economy some theological dimensions, namely, God will punish capitalists and rulers who do not respect equity in economic operations. Such restricting and regulatory mechanisms or theological argumentation had lost their influence through the secularisation that later on accompanied development of liberalism. The theological principles had shaped particularly the American society (Kallscheuer, 1994, 127) while modern pragmatic liberalism provides primarily economic freedom and rights of individuals, it is not concerned with equity and thus ignores the functioning of the society as a whole (Jamnik, 1998; 34). Without regulatory mechanisms, which are applicable to the entire democratic state, and without ethical or theological elements, the functioning becomes problematic or even impossible. Who else could in such circumstances prevent an individual from expanding his economic activities beyond all reasonable limits? Here comes the question of freedom and personal values as well as their place in the society as a whole, or the question of values' priority in regard to the entire community, therefore the question of their general acceptability. It is about the mutual consent that was demanded by John Rawls (Rawls, 1971) and by the philosophers of the so-called communitarian theory of society. Charles Taylor in his book with the same title characterises the morbidity of modernism as degenerated individualism. Taylor enumerates three characteristics of this individualism: (1) shifting the source of morality from the cosmic order to the interior of individual subject; (2) absolute shift of responsibility to the individual, (3) who carries out his personal responsibility also outwards in agreement with others, because he is the exclusive bearer of moral behaviour. Modern man is thus through the aforementioned technical-industrial development of modernism in these processes transforming from the so-called

authentic subject into a new (moral) function. The subject's freedom and morality are now only procedural, determined by the frameworks of action. Taylor sharply criticises this and concludes, "Scientism, faith in science, has completely swallowed morality". If this is happening, according to Taylor, only in Western democratic societies, then the problem is even greater in all post-communist countries, where all systems of control fell apart while the new are being established very slowly. The problem of freedom was particularly aggravated in Marxist societies due to the so-called scientific-scientistic design of society which turned man upside down and tried to anthropologically adjust him to the sociological model of the "scientific collectivistic society". Post-Marxist societies also bear the consequences. Josef Tischner expresses these consequences and problems of post-Marxist man by the title of his book – *Unfortunate Gift of Freedom* (Biel 1996; 171). The economic-procedural effects of globalisation have appeared brutally and inhumanly precisely in the post-Marxist societies, because of transition, absence of legal regulation as well as economic-material concepts of man. A striking example is Russia, though these effects can be easily seen in our country as well.

After the fall of communism it seems that the world is even faster sinking into the new single-mindedness of technical-economic and therefore procedural globalisation. The latter is anthropologically questionable, because it places man among antiquities, as the German-American social critic Günther Anders (Anders, 1992) wrote at the beginning of the 20th century. This state of affairs is also confirmed by the protests of various groups (terrorism represents a deviation in these processes). Francois Furet says in his book *The Passing of an Illusion* that societal models of fascism, nazism, and communism served primarily as a technique and for the rule of the masses (Furet, 1995). Marxist system is only a subtle form of organisational, political and conceptual-anthropological globalisation of man and his society. The major problem is therefore how to join individuals into a whole by "insight and will" (Fichte), not by revolutionary force and violence. In 1905 Nikolaj Berdjajev wrote that *homo sovieticus* is no longer "gentle, kind-hearted, easy-going, bearded, generous Russian man, now he is a shaved, malevolent, aggressive and active man" (Berdjajev, 1952, 257). It is no surprise then, as Herwig Büchele (Büchele, 1996) stated, that the exploitation of man is most brutal in modern post-communist liberalism. Surprising is only the fact that brainwashing collectivism turned so quickly into exploitative, procedural liberalism and thus into extreme individualism. Among important reasons is the Marxist violence, which allowed no dialogue. Similarly, economically oriented processes of globalisation now attempt to reduce alternative social processes into a monologue by which multinational corporations try to silence those who oppose one-way globalisation, even though in principle they can not circumvent this dialogue. Despite this, the dialogue in European integration, OPEC or WTO faces numerous problems. The demonstrations of dissatisfied people or those who disagree with the processes which are planned at the meetings of the eight most industrialised countries (G8 in Seattle, Venice, and in New York) indicate the necessity of broadening the scope of dialogue in these processes to prevent the world from becoming the world of one third of rich and two thirds of increasingly poor. These facts at least conceptually contributed to the tragic events on 11th September 2001 in New York. Postmodern man is becoming aware of difficulties pertaining to democracy and understands K. Popper, who says that governing and the temptation to resort to violence go hand in hand, so the art of democracy is about how to remove the ruling class without bloodshed (Popper, 2000; 208). It is wise to preserve the memory and not to simply forget

how impenetrably and systemically communists protected their power, the same holds true for all other past and present despots. Democracy is therefore man's guarantee for freedom and is even today far from something that can be taken for granted while the shortcomings of democracy are usually manifested during crises. If people are not prepared to protect it they can lose it, too; it turns easily into dictatorship, as proved by nazism, communism and other totalitarian systems which took advantage of democratic levers on their way to absolute power. Taylor thus believes that dialogue as the path of freedom to others is the basis of democratic or anthropologically acceptable economic operating, he is convinced that we are mutually obliged by dialogue and through others qualified as people in the first place. Man is begotten through others, he comes into this world through others, and starts to live as a human being through others. Only the human framework presents man with the possibility of life and is thus the second foundation of his identity and at the same time of his openness to develop as an individual, consequently, it is the foundation of the entire community (Taylor, 1991). This is also the guiding principle of postmodern identity as the revolt against modern, one-way technical-productive globalisation trends. Postmodern culture thus requires dialogue between different partners who cannot claim any priority, they are all already bounded by their premises and thus in principle forced into the position of dialogue.

POSTMODERN GLOBAL STRATEGY

Modern global strategy primarily pursues the goal of unifying world economic processes, which includes also political and cultural integration, although the latter, too, is dictated by economic interests. Economic globalisation is guided and supported by means of the media and advertising, which are interested primarily in economic efficiency, consumerism and profits. This creates a one-third society of the rich and two thirds of the increasingly poor (Natter&Riedelsperger, 1988). Globalisation itself conditions and speeds up the postmodern tendency to render all paradigms or trends relative and establish the basis of rendering socio-economic, political, and cultural foundations of human life and action. By doing this, it also limits or renders relative their bearers or the groups, which have to strive towards a more equitable society, because they are forced to accept more and more (all) partners. This represents a firm foundation for a societal strategy which is to a larger extent based on dialogue. Churches and religions are also entangled into these postmodern processes, they can play a very significant role, especially Christianity, because it is a religion of dialogue. Appropriate "strategies" of economic operations should be designed for these new postmodern global environments, and the assumptions on which the society should exist and function must be re-examined. Churches and postmodern culture again bring to our attention man's symbolic conditionality and foundation which determine the world as the world of symbols. According to Kant (Kant, 1956, B XVI), we project the world which is in Veber's words the interim world between facts and the Self, as pointed out also by phenomenologists (Veber, 1921; 4 sl.). Neither facts nor the Self can be expressed in absolute terms. Since every person or a group of persons has their own world, persons and groups should endeavour to exchange or pass on their world through dialogue with others. They should pay attention to the authenticity of their world, here man's emotions play very important role. That is why psychologists nowadays emphasise emotional intel-

ligence and not exclusively rationality as was the case in the period of modernism. All this reinforces the significance of an individual as the protagonist in all events and experiences of the world. Furthermore, this demands internalisation of human speech and culture in general, which will also benefit man's religious sense. Postmodern culture abolishes the myth of ideals capable of progress and puts forward more lasting values of man as a person, it stimulates co-operation. It prefers the culture of relationships to individualism and thus stimulates genuine co-operation. It does not establish absolute systems, but enables us for continual dialogue, correction, and the search after the authenticity of our speech and actions. Postmodern culture is thus stimulating for democratic processes and the culture of dialogue. It provides our world with important adjustments for the one-sided attempts of imperialist globalisation. The alternative movements, too, in this sense express their disapproval of narrow-minded economic globalisation carried out by the World Bank or the eight most industrialised countries (G8). The disastrous consequences of these processes are probably among important reasons for the recent tragedy in the USA. Emphasising personal standpoints also brings to light the differences, postmodern culture thus revives some aspects that European culture borrowed from the Judaes-Christian tradition, which is based upon man as a person. Although the world ethos (Küng, 1990) is, as a sort of conglomeration of different religious ideas and systems, an utopia, the ethos is a necessity for man's life, we have to agree upon it in order to secure our survival on the planet and confirm it with our standpoints and attitudes. Such an ethos is necessarily permeated by dialogue and, by taking into account different partners, represents an opportunity for exchanging and deepening different conceptual and religious viewpoints in a dialogue, thus an opportunity to find common ways of shaping the frameworks which would ensure survival of a particularly lost and discriminated man also by verified cultural and religious foundations. It is a human ethos, so anthropology as the fundamental science, in Kantian sense, has a very important role in these processes. Postmodern identities constitute personal and communal identifications, which should be, now more than ever, agreed upon as well as carefully and open-mindedly understood and embedded into the globe (sphere) of the world, as suggested by Peter Sloterdijk. Churches, especially the Catholic church, are already spread all over the world and can play an important role in these processes. The question is whether churches, especially the Catholic church, pay enough attention to man's oscillating and even drifting within these global strategies to be able to understand his situation and stand by his side during these processes. The social theory under the influence of Judaes-Christian and Greco-Roman cultural patterns has in history provided the basis for conceptualising man as a person. Only those societies which guarantee respect for all people, especially for those who are disadvantaged, marginal or threatened in any other way, offer a suitable basis for enforcing human rights. The UN (UNO) is now preparing the Declaration of Responsibility, which will facilitate solidarity and substitution beginning from below and will provide those in lower strata with opportunities to realise their goals without help (if they do not need wider supportive co-ordination); it will strengthen democratic society and also ensure circumstances for real dialogue, partnership, and the joint search for the truth about man and the world. Such functioning of the society binds us to genuine responsibility which would help avoid the seven deadly sins of the modern world: unprincipled politics, trading without morals, riches without work, education without values, science without humanness, unconscionable pleasure, desiring success without effort and without giving up something in exchange. Anthropology, as a science about man, has the task of preserving the basic

principles which serve man's survival and also of stimulating modern man towards responsibility and thus towards morality and justice. In view of modern globalisation trends, it is important to get properly organised at the interpersonal level so as to enable the community, in its role of the agent of exchange and dialogue, to actualise man and the humane. This can be done only on the condition that we persevere in dialogue in all directions and at all levels. Only thus will it be possible to defy any globalising (economic-monopolist) unification of the world and thus to ward off the new enslavement of man.

POVZETEK

Globalizacija danes poteka predvsem po ekonomskih kriterijih. Postmodernizem kot zahteva po uveljavljanju posameznega pa vključuje lokalno in torej osebno ter zahteva medsebojni dialog ob upoštevanju vseh partnerjev. Dogodki v ZDA 11. 9. 2001 razodevajo, kako zahteven je ta proces medsebojnega kritičnega dialoga, ker so partnerji pač vedno različni. Kritični dialog pa je danes svetovna nujnost, če hočemo ohraniti človeka. Postmodernizem pa nas usmerja k preseganju enostranske imperialistične globalizacije in zahteva upoštevanje posebno prikrajšanih in prizadetih kot je v svoji teoriji pravičnosti pokazal John Rawls. Takšna strategija pa zahteva od vseh partnerjev upoštevanje (vsakega) človeka kot osebe, solidarnost in subsidarnost: treba je delati lokalno in biti usmerjen globalno.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: antropologija, globalizacija, postmoderna, človek

REFERENCES

- AKVINSKI,** T., (1999). Izbrani filozofski spisi, 338-341, (Sth. I,q.2,a.3)
- ANDERS,** G., (1992) *Antiquiertheit des Menschen*, I,II, München.
- BERDJAJEV,** N., (1953). *Selbsterkenntnis, Darmstadt und Genf.*
- BIEL,** R., (1996). *Lebens- und Todeszeichen der Kirche in Polen*, Innsbruck.
- BÜHELE,** H., (1996). H., *Eine Welt*, Innsbruck ect.
- DVORNIK,** F., (1960). *Morgenländisches Schisma*, in: *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche VII*
- FURET,** F., (1998). *Le passé d'une illusion*, Paris (Laffont S. A. 1995).
- GERGEN,** J.K., (1996). *Saturated Self*, Basic Books, 1991.
- HORSTER,** D., (1999). *Postchristliche Moral. Eine sozialphilosophische Begründung*, Hamburg (Junius).
- JAMNIK,** A., (1998). *Liberalizem in vprašanje etike*, Ljubljana (Nova revija).
- KALLSCHEUER,** O. (1994). O., *Gotteswort und Volksstimme*, Frankfurt (Fischer).
- KANT,** I., (1956). *Kant*, (Weischedel, Insel Verlag) I.
- KÜNG,** H., (1990). *Project Welthethos*, München.
- MACINTYRE,** A., (1989). *Kratka zgodovina etike*. Ljubljana 1993. Taylor, C., *Sources of the Self, Making of the Modern Identity*, Cambridge (UP),
- MACINTYRE,** A., (1991). *The Malaise of Modernity*, Anansi (Ontario).
- MENKE,** C. (1996). *Tragödie im Sittlichen. Gerechtigkeit und Freiheit nach Hegel*, Frankfurt/M..
- NATTER&RIEDELSPERGER** (1988). *Zweidrittelgesellschaft*, Wien (Europa).

NOVALIS, (1963). **Monolog. Die Lerhlinge zu Sais. Die Christenheit oder Europa.**

Hymnen an die Nacht. Geistliche Lieder. Heinrich von Ofterdingen.

POPPER, K., (2000). **Alles Leben ist Problemlösen**, München.

RAWLS, J. 1971: **A Theory of Justice**, Cambridge (Ma-HU Press).

SLOTERDIJK, P., (1999). **Sphären II .Globen**, Frankfurt.

TAYLOR, C., (1991). **The Malaise of Modernity**, 33

TAYLOR, C., (1996). **Sources of the Self.**

VEBER, F., (1921). **Sistem filozofije**, Ljubljana.

WOSCHITZ, K.-M., (1984). **De homine**, Graz.