

Daniela FOBELOVÁ
Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica
Faculty of Arts. Department of Ethics and Applied Ethics
daniela.fobelova@umb.sk

GLOBALLY AND LOCALLY IN THE CONTEXT OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Summary. It is necessary to understand globalisation as a long-term process of the reciprocal convergence of the various interests of people on the planet at all the levels of social life. It is a process which is predominantly cultural, economic and political. On the other hand, there are also local interests of people that may be incompatible with globalisation. The process of “glocalisation” could represent some solution: i.e. the interconnection of global and local. This study deals with the both positive and negative phenomena of globalisation process.

Keywords: globalisation, localisation, glocalisation, global ethics.

GLOBALNIE I LOKALNIE W KONTEKŚCIE ZRÓWNOWAŻONEGO ROZWOJU

Streszczenie. Konieczne jest, aby rozumieć globalizację jako proces długofalowego wzajemnego zbliżenia różnych interesów ludzi na naszej planecie na wszystkich poziomach życia społecznego. Z jednej strony jest to proces przede wszystkim kulturowy, gospodarczy i polityczny. Z drugiej strony, są też lokalne interesy osób, które mogą być niezgodne z globalizacją. Proces "glokalizacji" może stanowić pewne rozwiązanie, czyli wzajemne połączenia globalne i lokalne. Artykuł przedstawia zarówno pozytywne jak i negatywne zjawiska globalizacji.

Słowa kluczowe: globalizacja, lokalizacja, glokalizacja, etyka globalna.

All scientific fields give special attention to globalisation as a new and former social phenomenon. It has taken centre stage in social sciences and also laymen at the turn of 1980s and 1990s due to geopolitical changes and urgent challenge primarily presented by the authors dealing with global environmental (ecological) issues, for example the “use” of natural sources. The advocates of this phenomenon - globalisation - praise increase in the

volume of traded goods, regionally conditioned economic growth, the growth of well-being, the development of information and communication technologies and consequently people's satisfaction.

On the other hand, there is a large group of people who warns against poverty of the vast majority of mankind, the loss of national cultural identities, values, customs, traditions, the uncontrolled increase in power of supranational companies and the continuing devastation of the Earth, which also leads to decreasing trust in democracy in action.

Two sides, two faces, two images of one phenomenon. Therefore, Roland Robertson as a current significant theoretician introduced the term glocalisation – to emphasize the co-presence of processes of the globalisation of local and the localisation of global. This term is understood in a different sense by Zygmunt Bauman who had to look for his “personal local”. In particular, he devotes his attention to the incongruity of globalisation processes.

“Globalisation not only unites, but also divides, it divides just when it unites – the causes of the division of the globe are the same as those that support its unification. Besides developing global dimensions of trade, business and information flow, the process of localisation, fixing to some place also starts to move.”¹

The etymological base of the term globalisation consists of the word globe in the sense of the reduced scale of our planet the Earth. Thus, we can understand its meaning as a process related to all people who inhabit our planet; i.e. in various spheres. It should be a long-term process of convergence among the interests of all people at all levels - cultural, political, economic as well as in mass media, in war, finance, migration, environment, and even at the religious level of social life. Many authors are of the opinion that we look for a global model of modus vivendi for the third century (I. Rolný, L. Lacina, H. Kúng, M. Nussbaum, J. Habermas, K.O. Apel). Others are more sceptic, they condemn globalisation, multiculturalism and postmodernism as a new form to subjugate people and countries (N. Chomsky, D. Held and others). D. Held and his colleagues categorise various opinions in discussions about globalisation into three main types:

- Hyper globalisers believe that globalisation spreads fast and influence us more and more, and thus our lives are subordinated to the discipline of global market.²
- Sceptics are of the opinion that several statements about globalisations are exaggerated. In fact, the world market comprises three main blocs: Europe, Asia-Pacific area, the North America. In 1996, they stated that there was no model how global economy looks like.³
- Transformationalists understand globalisation in a larger sense than global economy. For them, globalisation is a driving force for fast social, political and economic changes that reshape modern societies and word order.⁴

¹ Bauman Z. 1999. Globalizace. Praha. Mladá fronta.

² Ohmae K. The End of the Nation State. Free Press, New York 1995.

³ Paul Hirst a Graham Thompson, Globalization in Question: the International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance.

⁴ Held, etc. Global Transformations. 1999. s. 7-9.

At the beginning of the third millennium, some other authors worked out global trends for the development of mankind till 2015 in the form of four variants. We evaluate them in relation to their fulfilment.

1. variant "ubiquitous globalisation": the most favourable variant; favourable influence of technologies, economic growth, normal demography; the majority of people will benefit from globalisation; the expansion of new technologies will ensure a considerable global economic growth supported by political consensus in relation to the liberalisation of economy; despite the fact that global cooperation will prevail and will result in various international agreements and in reducing many internal conflicts and conflicts between states, many of those who live in developing countries will not benefit from globalisations and will not be able to overcome difficulties they face;
2. variant – "devastating globalisation": The world's elites benefit from globalisation, but the majority of population does not. Population grows, the shortage of natural resources increases, which is a heavy burden for many developing countries. All these will result in increased population's migration and escalate conflicts between countries. Technologies in the conditions of instability may become a source of additional threat, because they can be misused by subversive and criminal organisations. The world economy will be divided into three parts: 1. developed countries - continues in their development; 2. other countries – slow growth or negative growth, 3. illegal economy – its growth will increase. The influence of political institutes, national and international authorities becomes weaker, internal conflicts increase, which makes worse social instability and tensions in society, and all these results in danger of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.
3. variant – "regional competition": regional competition will increase, which will result in three most developed regions – Europe, America and Asia dealing with their own problems, and the countries behind the borders of these regions will fail in looking for resources and political support, thus becoming the source of instability and internal conflicts.
4. variant – "post-polar world": the USA will more focus on their own problems resulting from slowing down economy and subsequent stagnation. The increasing economic and political tension between the USA and Europe will end the Euro-American alliance (not only NATO), and Europe will become more closed, more relying on its own possibilities and regional institutes. Economic and political crises in Latin America will increase the interest of the USA in this region, and their presence and influence in Asia, with a relatively stable development of Japan and China, will be decreasing. Then, after the both Koreas unite, there will be a period of long lasting rivalry between Asian powers, which will escalate war preparations and activities in the sphere of the production of weapons of mass destruction. In case a conflict situation will develop in Asia, the both global and regional institutes will become powerless, because not only developed countries will be divided, but also undeveloped countries will find themselves in much worse situation.

1. Cultural globalisation

Many discussions about cultural globalisation are influenced by two contradictory understandings of the main trend of this process. On one hand there are those who see a dominant American culture as a result of cultural globalisation; i.e. absolute “westernisation“, and on the other hand those who prognosticate a global culture typical of variety, diversification, cultural blends, and offer new concepts of culture such as “hybridization“, “creolisation“, “multiculturalism“ or “melange“, “syncretism“, “mestizaje“, „transculturalism“ and so on. All the concepts respond to the changed cultural significance of special distance/proximity.

It also changes the traditional understanding of the universal phenomenon of mankind – culture. According to this traditional understanding culture is perceived through a territorial division. The culture of presence is understood as a “translocal learning process“.

Major concerns result from a new possible understanding of global culture as the only one supranational culture recognised by the world. We can form two groups from the above mentioned concepts of global culture. One group comprises the concepts of culture and its representatives who reject the traditional Herder’s concept that is based on the territorially conditioned cultural terms such as “multiculturalism“ or “cultural mosaic“. Current situations in Europe and generally in the world signal that these cultural concepts failed. Slavoj Žižek is a typical representative of this line of thinking. In his publications, he analyses socio-cultural diagnosis according to which the idea of intolerant fundamentalism – ethnic, religious, gender, sexist – is considered one of the most serious dangers which can be only eliminated with a permanent resistance (in particular militarily and economically) with the essential help of spreading the idea of multicultural tolerance. Žižek questions whether we can understand the idea of multiculturalism as an ideology of actual, global capitalism. Ultimately, S. Žižek considers multiculturalism a certain form of indirect racism which takes a prominent place of universality. According to S. Žižek, multicultural universalism is a real “eurocentrism“, and multiculturalism (the hybrid coexistence of diverse cultural animate worlds), a massive presentation of capitalism as a global world system. Finally, S. Žižek⁵ suggests something paradoxical – “what we need today is double dose of intolerance“, and thus he exposes the concept of multiculturalism to sharp criticism. Thus, new and newer cultural concepts emphasising other aspects such as individual cultural identities, migration based communities, culturally united groups, global currents and others, come to the fore.

Globalisation also represents localisation, and exactly in the sense of its author Roland Robertson, it is a process of glocalisation. (Robertson, 1998)⁶.

⁵ Žižek S. 1998. Ein Plädoyer für Intoleranz. Wien. Passagen.

⁶ Robertson R. 1998. Glokalisierung: Homogenität und Heterogenität in Raum und Zeit, [in:] Beck U. 1998. Perspektiven der Weltgesellschaft. Frankfurt a.M. s. 192-220.

Global culture in the sense of glocal represents, according to Aristotelian spirit, a centre, middle way between global and local. Polarisation of these two processes only leads to confusion. The objective of this process is to unite and not to divide, contrast or contradict (in relation to historical questions about time and space, theoretical and methodological questions about universalism and particularism through coherentism).

The issues of cultural globalisation should be understood and subsequently implemented “a good middle way” as suggested by R. Robertson, though it is an idea taken from Asian cultural environment (“speech” of Japan advertising). Robertson offers a concept of culture where the issue of space (geographic facts) are given a comparable significance as historical considerations (historical facts). So that globalisation could be understood adequately, it is necessary to examine the local contexts of the acceptance and acquisition of its results. Therefore, contextualism should be supported by ethnographic research. The opinions of Arjun Appadurais are important for ethnological studies. According to this author, there are five spheres which he understands as dimensions of global cultural currents such as ethnical, media, technical, financial and conceptual.⁷ Other authors add sacral sphere related to international religions networks and the sphere of gender – gender roles.⁸

Appadurai is of the opinion that the modern world is influenced by the general turns of all possible pasts. He uses the term imagination to which he attributes significance for modern subjectivity. According to him, the relation between imagination and social life is global and important for global culture.

According to A.S. Ribeiros and Stuart Hall, culture is diluted in all the spheres of social practice, it is a result of discourse strategy with potential to stick to identity.

Religion is a key aspect of culture. It also relates to global culture and religion is associated to universal visions (H. Kűng). First, we will define the term “universalistic ethical” and we will focus on the projects that try to implement it.

According to ethical universalists, moral has a basic structure that is not changed in other contexts. This basic structure can be deduced from the answers to the question what it means to be a human being who acts correctly or reasonably, and it neither will be determined by the theories of human naturalness nor by the way of living of a specific culture. It can be created a priori (I. Kant) and its existence need not to be verified in any concrete culture. According to a priori understanding of morality without taking into account concrete traditions (according to Aristotle for example – phronesis and subsequent action), formalistic approach ignores various forms of practical reason resulting from the ideas of virtue or values in a concrete cultural context or any other specific way or style of life.

⁷ Appaduari A. 1996. *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis/London. (4. Aufl. 1998).

⁸ Sreberny A. 2000. *Feministischer Internacjonalismus: Zur.: Imagination und Konstruktion globaler Zivilgesellschaft*. [in:] Brukhorst, H. Kettner, M. (Hg.): *Globalisierung und Demokratie. Wirtschaft, Recht und Medien*. Frankfurt a.M. s. 289-309.

The project of Hans K ung-Global Ethics for a New Global Order and the project of World Ethos for Policy and Economy represent attempts to call for an interreligious dialogue with the ambition to implement universalistic ethics. In the project, there we do not find arguments for acceptance, but only some proposals, a form of practical philosophy with political ambitions. In the structure of this project, we can see the line of procedure from cultural diversity (global culture) to universal ethics. At first sight almost innocent and peaceful message. The leitmotiv of these project is represented by the conviction of author that peace for nations and civilisation is not possible without dialogue between religions, and there will be no new world order without global ethics.

The conclusion and proposal made by H. K ung is ultimately totalitarian. The decision in the proposal is based on the superiority over the dogmatic differences of global ethics which is understood as “ethical minimum common for all religions, cultures and civilisations“. At the same time, it emphasizes the fact that the new world order cannot be achieved by means of diplomacy, humanitarian aid, military intervention or international law. The new world order can be facilitated with common visions, ideals, objectives and values, the increasing global responsibility of some part of people and their leaders, uniting and interconnecting ethics. H. K ung is of the opinion that global ethics neither should represent a new ideology nor a superstructure, eclectic patchwork of various religious and philosophical positions, supplementing holy writs. It is a minimum basis of consensual relations for binding values, uncancellable standards and moral requirements accepted by all the religions that will be supported by non-believers, too.⁹ The project represents a “voluntarily activity”, faith, the conviction of individuals from religious confessions without any tools and arguments why to give up and accept something voluntarily, or the conviction that somebody will “voluntarily” accept only single moral norms and values. If this universal position is normal and productive in science as an intercultural product, it does not work with morality. The subjective space of human perception is anisotropic and human minds do not represent the places with equal value in the space of relationships marked as moral.

The projects of universal and global ethics with its universal moral values and norms are only acceptable under a specific presumption; i.e. they will accept the axiom that is known in advance, they can represent only one from many variants of ethics in addition to other normative ethical theories, or that they are not single and unchangeable variants of ethics. It means that its authors should be aware of the fact that they are the integral part of ethics’ rich multiversal history. Reality points out that world, national and other religions find it problematic.

Many other international projects operate on the same basis with the help and participation of the ethicists for example K.O. Apel, M. Walzer, J. H sle and others. In their efforts to find common values, they accomplish the objectives of the Universal Ethics Project by means of

⁹ K ung H., 2000, *Sv etov y  tos pro politiku a hospod rstv *. Praha. Vy hrad.

looking for ethical consensus and universal communication. The frameworks of this project are based on the processes of globalisation with the objective to create global ethics as a planetary ethics of shared responsibility (K.O.Apel) or intercultural justice. What are the trends of global culture? P.L. Berger named one trend as “(sub) culture of international yuppies“ ... young successful urban professionals. Their values are such as fast career, big money, success and narcissism. The second subculture is named by Berger as an international universal club; i.e. the worldwide association of prosocial oriented academic writers. The third subculture is named by Benjamin Barber Mc World, and its bearer is an imaginary global middle class characterised by consumerism with features of passivity, dependence, the admiration of celebrities from the spheres of sports, film, music.

There are many pitfalls of globalisation¹⁰. Which of two faces of this “divine phenomenon” will prevail, we will only see in future.

Bibliography

1. Appaduari A., 1996, *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis/ London (4. Aufl. 1998),
2. Bauman Z., 1999, *Globalizace*. Praha. Mladá fronta.
3. Beck U., 1998(a), *Perspektiven der Weltgesellschaft*. Frankfurt a.M.
4. Beck U., 2004(b), *Čo je globalizácia?* Bratislava. Vydavateľstvo Spolku slovenských spisovateľov.
5. Fox J., 2002, *Chomsky a globalizace*. Praha Triton.
6. Held etc., 1999, *Global Transformations*. s. 7-9.
7. Kot J., Jedlińska R.: *Integracja i nowe zjawiska w procesie regionalizacji i globalizacji*. Studia i materiały. *Miscellanea Oeconomicae*. Rok 17, nr 1/2013, s. 333-344.
8. Kranz-Szurek M., *kultura lokalna a globalizacja kulturowa próba oceny zjawiska*. *Roczniki Nauk Społecznych*, tom 4(40), nr 2/2012, s. 11-35.
9. Kuzior A.: *Globalny kaleidoskop identity, [in:] Identita Diferencia Zbornik prispevkov zo 4. slovenského filozofického kongresu*, (eds.): Karul R., St’ahel R., Toman M. SFZ pri SAV a FiU SAV, Bratislava 2010, s. 302-307.
10. Kűng H., 2000, *Světový  tos pro politiku a hospodářství*. Praha. Vyšehrad.
11. Lipovetsky G., 1998, * ra prázdnoty*. Praha. Prostor.
12. Ohmae K., *The End of the Nation State*. Free Press, New York 1995.

¹⁰ See also: Kot J., Jedlińska R.: *Integracja i nowe zjawiska w procesie regionalizacji i globalizacji*. Studia i materiały. *Miscellanea Oeconomicae*. Rok 17, nr 1/2013, s. 333-344; Kranz-Szurek M., *kultura lokalna a globalizacja kulturowa – próba oceny zjawiska*. *Roczniki Nauk Społecznych*, tom 4(40), nr 2/2012, s. 11-35; Kuzior A.: *Globalny kaleidoskop identity, [in:] Identita – Diferencia Zbornik prispevkov zo 4. slovenského filozofického kongresu*, (eds.): Karul R., St’ahel R., Toman M. SFZ pri SAV a FiU SAV, Bratislava 2010, s. 302-307.

13. Hirst P., Thompson G., *Globalization in Question: the International Economy and the Possibilities of Governance*.
14. Robertson R., 1998, *Glokalisierung. Homogenität und Heterogenität in Raum und Zeit*. p. 192-220, [in.:] Beck, U. 1998. *Perspektiven der Weltgesellschaft*. Frankfurt a.M.
15. Sreberny A., 2000, *Feministischer Internationalismus: Zur: Imagination und Konstruktion globaler Zivilgesellschaft*. p. 289-309. [in.:] Brukhorst H., Kettner M. (Hg.): *Globalisierung und Demokratie. Wirtschaft, Recht und Medien*. Frankfurt a.M.
16. Žižek S., 1998, *Ein Plädoyer für Intoleranz*. Wien. Passagen.

Omówienie

Konieczne jest, aby rozumieć globalizację jako proces długofalowego wzajemnego zbliżenia różnych interesów ludzi na naszej planecie na wszystkich poziomach życia społecznego. Z jednej strony jest to proces przede wszystkim kulturowy, gospodarczy i polityczny. Główną cechą globalizacji powinien być fakt, że nie jest ona oparta na zjednoczeniu *prima facie* (politycznych, religijnych i innych) świata. Z drugiej strony, są też lokalne interesy osób, które mogą być niezgodne z globalizacją. Proces "glokalizacji" może stanowić pewne rozwiązanie, czyli wzajemne połączenia globalne i lokalne. Kroki te są podejmowane w sensie zrównoważonego rozwoju ludzkości na trzech poziomach (kulturowym, ekonomicznym, politycznym). Jednak widzimy, że proces globalizacji nie zawsze jest bezpośredni i udany dla ludzkości. Artykuł przedstawia zarówno pozytywne, jak i negatywne zjawiska globalizacji.