

Keynote Address for the 1st International Congress of Korean Studies

Reciprocity and Globalization in the Modern Age:

Between Self and Others*

Haechang Choung

The Academy of Korean Studies

The hope of Isaiah Berlin, who longed for a "decent" society and held the sense of reality in esteem over and above abstract or conceptual thinking, was a modest one.(1) However, his pragmatic quest - minimum guidance by government and maximum freedom of individuals - for a decent society must have been an "unreal" ideal or simply dreamlike. Looking back at the last few centuries of human history, the overall cultural climate nowadays suggests that such a hope will not be easily realized. While the globe seems to shrink daily, correspondingly transforming into a global village, conflicts among peoples and cultures deepen; we could cite many such examples across the globe. Such phenomena force us to reconsider basic ideas about humans, culture, and civilization.

Let me open by considering a definition of culture. Culture, like the etymology of the word, i.e., "cultivating the soil" suggests, cannot be called culture if the soil is not continuously turned. Without supplying air, water and fertilizer through working the soil with a plow, the soil becomes barren. Providing but a single type of fertilizer will also rob the land of its vitality. It has been said that, "a culture that does not react and change with time is as good as a dead one or it is dying, or at best it maintains a fossilized form of existence."(2) This barren land in which culture cannot grow is none other than ideology. We witnessed up until a few years ago what happens when countries armed with ideology pursue Thracymachos' ideology, i.e., might-makes-right. Now ideological conflicts seem to have faded away and globalization has entered in its place. Though globalization has accelerated the interchange of people and material goods, its driving force and basic matrix is the reciprocity of cultures. Yet, we should keep in mind that globalization cannot be another ideology nor the key to all problems in the world.

We are now in the midst of the processes of globalization. Regardless of whoever leads it or by what mechanism it is propelled, globalization is not something we can choose from various alternatives but rather an irresistible task and destiny.(3) Unlike the postmodern debates of the last quarter of the twentieth century which were carried out as if they had nothing to do with Asia or the non-Western hemisphere, globalization does not designate something regional. For globalization is an ongoing process of making the world into one village which requires no reckoning of a modern or postmodern identity. In this respect, unlike the postmodern controversies which stemmed from demarcating between the advent of a new period and the end of an earlier one, globalization should be understood as a phenomenon in the unfolding of world history. Just like post-modernity, globalization may seem to be a Western idea but in

reality it embraces the entire world. No element of world civilization is immune from the structures that globalization is shaping.

Put another way, globalization is bringing the world together. However, at the same time, voices of localization are also being raised due to the desire to be not buried in the avalanche of globalization and preserve self identity. Resultant from these binary tendencies, the world is experiencing a new mode of disruption. Thus we now witness the coexistence of such contradictory trends as globalization and localization, and integration and dissolution. In the history of humankind, there has never been a period like today in which a majority of the global inhabitants recognize that they indeed share a common world. Thus the fate of the world will "rest so largely on the success of cooperative undertakings by those who represent very different worlds within that common matrix."(4) Under such a situation, minimizing disintegration and conflicts and maximizing solidarity and unification will be the common hope of the people. In order to realize this hope, a search for the common values of humankind is an urgent task. It is natural that there always are similarities and differences between predispositions and circumstances of cultures and individuals within a culture. Correspondingly, it is inevitable that there should be tension between those who seek differences and those who look for sameness.

Though we should seriously consider the common value of a worldly dimension and are all fundamentally 'human', one's own people and the realities of one's own country always come first. For I am none other than a member of my family, the community that I belong to, and my nation or country, before I am considered as a member of the world. Of course, if such awareness is intensified, it could result in narrow nationalism and thus lead to the mistake of running counter to the larger current of globalization. The nationalist who cannot tolerate others is one whose world is constructed upon a single pole. "It is . . . next to impossible for a singularist . . . to be tolerant and sincere . . . as far as respect for another's way of life is concerned."(5) It is also problematic to seek only pluralism in order to avoid such singularism. For pluralism is prone to become a vulgar relativism which allows anything, or a kind of universalism, which tends to cloud one's own identity. We should guard against the possibility of such misjudgment, but at the same time, we must keep in mind that one's family affairs cannot be considered separately from society or nation, and that events in one country can affect the whole world since the world is fully interconnected in multifarious ways.

The three East Asian countries, Korea, China and Japan, have been at the crossroads of Eastern and Western civilizations for the last hundred years. This turmoil is well-represented in Korea where the amalgamation of the ancient and modern resulted in a violent breakdown of traditional value systems. Since world-historical universality is already latent in recent Korean experience, Korean ethical self-reflection might provide some contribution to the formation of the common values of humankind.(6) Korea and Japan have played auxiliary roles of creating East Asian culture under the umbrella of China. It is now necessary for them to escape from the narrow domain called East Asia and seek the common values of the global village. However, just like globalization should not be Americanization, the quest for common values should not mean the extension of Western values.(7) With this awareness, our task will be to appraise how

people with various cultural traditions live together in the global village that becomes smaller due to the power of capital and information technology.

To this end, we must acknowledge that there are differences among people and cultures, both of which have been shaped by history. "We are, after all, creatures of history, and we must concede our finitude and fallibilism."(8) Even though history, time and time again, reminded humans of their fallibility through various means, the collective memory did not last long enough not to repeat the errors of their predecessors. Instead of having a tolerance rising from sincerely admitting one's own humble finitude, history is full of infantilistic arrogance. If one evaluates different cultures and value systems from his or her own standpoint, it is overlooking the simple fact that others would do the same. Nevertheless such common sense has often been neglected. Of course, there are limits as to how different one culture and value system can be from another. That is, in order for them to be perceived as one culture or value system, there must be some common reference by which they are reflected and judged. In this case, supposing a value-neutral standard introduces something basic that every society, every community and culture can agree upon. This viewpoint may summon forth well-worn universalism or essentialism to the scene. The reason why the issue of minimum agreement is raised, notwithstanding such a risk, lies in the fact that globalization is a quest for common values no matter how naive it may turn out to be. Minimum ethics that humankind should share do not have to be based on human nature or universality. History has taught us to utilize our long experience throughout.

In fact, the driving force of globalization that ties the world into one today is not genial ethics nor a sudden discovery of universality but rather the capitalism and information technology that originated in the West.(9) The power of capital and information technology accelerate the interchange of both human and material resources which result in a blurring of political ideology. This is the substance of globalization today. Of course, attempts at crude forms of globalization were also made in the past: many wars of conquest and colonization witnessed in history were compelled universalization by the stronger. That is to say, it was the coerced implant of one value system and worldview onto another, regardless of agreement. So disguised, this policy of supremacy has continuously been exercised in various forms of globalization. If any country goes against the current of globalization, its survival comes into question. Though it is rather difficult to expect that agreeable universal values can be derived from such forces like cold capitalism and information technology, it is also true, paradoxically, that such power provides humankind with the opportunity to coexist in this global village.

With this in mind, we should also remember that each people, for thousands years, has lived with its own culture, religion, and values in its own geographical and historical atmosphere. Ever since the modernization process, i. e., Westernization, began, the uniqueness of each country's traditional way of life has continuously collapsed, although resisting this current is also on the rise. Furthermore, localization gains moral support to a considerable degree.(10) Of course, it would be anachronistic retrogression to stubbornly cling to one's own values. There has always been cultural interchange combined with unavoidable clashes of cultures. Also there has always been the

subordination of weaker cultures/worldviews by stronger ones. Such mingling of cultures resulted in violent rejection or fertility of mutual understanding, or subordination and / or extinction of the weaker cultures. Culture can be compared with language. If one does not understand another's language, interaction does not occur. "[A] living culture is like a living language which keeps changing (though slowly) over a period of time, assimilating new idioms and phrases, new structures and forms. . . . A dead language does not change nor does a dead culture."(11)

Perhaps if we do not change, we will soon be trapped in a dead-end alley. However, if we only try to find something extraordinary such as universal values or norms, we may inevitably face the danger of falling into empty 'oughtness' such as cosmopolitanism or love for humanity. As mentioned above, our task should be ethical self-reflection at the center of the confused crossroads of East-West and Old-New. Further, this work should be carried out with an understanding of the reciprocal nature of culture.

The first thinkers who envisaged becoming world-citizens beyond the barriers of their own political communities were the Cynics and the Stoics of ancient Greece whose germinal thought was realized by the historical experiences of first Alexander the Great and later the Romans.(12) Perhaps even before these philosophers, some Chinese or Greek mythology could be interpreted as imagining globalization. Surely, myth is nothing but the world of fiction accumulated over a longer period, but it is also a deep reservoir of thought in the sense that it invokes much inspiration. In a sense, the first world-citizens in Greek mythology were Olympian gods who provided humans with the idea of togetherness between gods and humans, humans and nature, and so on. Legendary kings in Chinese myth also filled the same function.

Globalization in any means points to the togetherness of world residents. Togetherness requires that there must be a certain order. This order will be the common ground which can blend racial, geographical, cultural differences. It is nothing more than human reason that performs this function. Reason means order. Order can be maintained because a human armed with a rational mind does not insist on only their own way. This ability for self-restraint or self-control is what separates humans from animals. Self-control may not be a need in a world where only one person lives, but it is a must for the 'us' who form a community. According to Etzioni, social order is one of two cardinal virtues (the other being autonomy) needed for a worldwide moral code.(13) These two virtues may be in conflict because one "favors that each person will follow his or her own course; [the other] sets limits on our choice."(14) From antiquity forward, such an order, apparent in various dimensions like family, state, and so on, was maintained by the authority of a father figure or by physical coercion. Although the primary effect of such order is preservation of peace, it was usually maintained through one-sided imposition. Today's globalization should be carried out not by such a patriarchal system or unilateral coercion but by reciprocal cooperation.

What does it mean to be reciprocal? Without returning to Plato's assertion that the state is the individual writ large, we know that an individual's relationship with others is not so different from relationships between states. From this, we might be able to link together the concept of humans as social animals together with our effort to find a

common realm in globalization. The oft quoted statement by Aristotle, 'man is by nature a political animal' holds some very intricate implications. 'Political' here means primarily a city-state like Athens, but more generally it means belonging to an organization or society. As is well known, it indicates that humans can lead a life worthy of being termed 'human' only when they live with others and thus become part of a community. At first glance, there does not seem to be anything revelatory about this definition. After all, it is quite natural to consider ourselves social animals. Humans can live like humans only within a society composed of individuals. However, individuals within a society must interact with each other and accordingly, there are many complex issues veiled by the casual stipulation of humans being a social animal. For example, why are humans labelled as 'social animals' instead of a 'rational animal,' when it is their capacity to think rationally that makes social life possible? In order to maintain a social relationship with others, humans have learned to discipline, control, and regulate their animal nature, instincts, and desires.(15)

Reconciling or harmonizing animality and sociality” is a vexing problem. The subject and the predicate in Aristotle's statement show rather clearly the tension and duality existing between the private and public domains. On the one hand, humans act as selfish beings to satisfy their interests and desires; conversely, humans act as altruistic beings to moderate their own interests in order to co-exist with others and further serve others. What is important here is not judging whether humans are innately good or bad, nor to determine whether the realities of life are geared to power-seeking or realizing rational reason, but rather elevating and edifying human animality to sociality. In such an attempt, we must bear in mind that animality itself is not always dangerous or evil. Furthermore, it is true that humans cannot be considered as human without animality. Unfortunately, the long tradition of Western Christianity and metaphysics, as well as Confucianism, has been to forbid the animality of humans as something lowly and vicious.(16) It is no wonder why postmodernists have emphasized human instinct, sensuality, feelings and, more broadly, body, in order to understand humans and counterbalance our past history of suppressing animality.

Human social relationships are determined according to how the relationship between oneself and others is established. Should I put primary concern and importance on myself? Or should I allow and allocate more value and meaning to others? Regardless of whether we take the former or latter position, both cases require an understanding of oneself. That, in turn, requires a careful examination of the age in which one lives. The transition from the medieval to the modern age was made possible by the awakening of the consciousness of self, which had long been dormant. Such consciousness of self, i.e., the concept of subject, functions as the most secure foundation for modern society. The modern mind armed with rationality nourished the mathematical, scientific man who ruled as well as regulated nature. By objectifying all existing objects, including humans, modern humans tried to build a castle of necessary truths, which were immutable and eternal. Such truths were supposed to bind all by their universal applicability. Although the concept of human as a conscious subject played a vital role in opening the realm of revolutionary science-technology and economic prosperity, it has also been accused of making human existence empty. This one-sided understanding showed no concern for the ontological predicaments of humankind and thus neglected the disastrous

byproducts of science and technology. The deep-rooted practices of modern thought, which transform the relationship of I-and-others into that of subject-and-object and give priority to mind over body and other objects of nature, tore down the bridge connecting the self to the outside world. Instead of looking at myself and the natural world as reciprocal partners, the modern mind considered the natural world as something to dominate and exploit.(17)

What happened as a consequence? The individual confronted alienation and anomie, which had the effect of imprisoning them in their inner cell of consciousness. Franz Kafka vividly described this situation of modern humans in his novel *Die Verwandlung*. When he transformed his main figure, Gregory Samsa, into an insect, he intended to demonstrate the existential inanity of humans. To state briefly, Samsa, much for all his mundane and ordinary life, was an inner dwarf who had continuously been losing his own uniqueness and meaning. Such dwarfishness was actualized and captured in the image of a tiny insect.

The modern view of humans was prepared for the project of putting the world and the universe on a stable foundation with a clear understanding of self. What was the result of viewing the self as a subject? Did each individual create their own unique world and thus live in a world of security? Are they completely free of anxiety resulting from uncertainty? Did they find that Archimedean point from which they could eradicate all the vacillations of life?

The Archimedean point is the base of stability that protected humans from the confusions and uncertainties of life. Generally, this point had been supernatural power in various forms. However, god, who had long been the source of philosophical justification and the protector of humans from the insanities of the world, was not able to relieve humans of the anxieties caused by the realities of modern life. Descartes saw that humans faced the existential task of establishing a foundation for knowledge and existence. Otherwise, humankind would be unable to escape from the darkness of confusion. "Cartesian Anxiety" is the fear of falling into the trap of relativism if we do not find a secure base for our existence. The rationality of humans is supposed to be the torch for this quest.

Despite the desire for spiritual security by the unification of self, modern humans have seriously suffered from the disintegration of self and loss of identity. How, we might ponder, could this happen to a creature who possessed reason, the highest faculty ever known to this world? As often argued, the cause of such a fall was brought about by the objectification and materialization of humans. Perhaps it would be beneficial for us to pay close attention to the above definition of humans as social animals.

Humans crippled themselves by ignoring and excluding their animality as only a secondary aspect. Animality(18) together with rationality compose the entirety of humans, of what we can label as human-ness." Yet, the modern *logos*-centric thought of humans disregarded this and thereby accelerated feelings of emptiness and a lack of self-dignity. Considering fully that the self is closely related to the world, we must

renew our understanding of the self in order to solve the problems concerning society and state.

In the same manner that an individual can obtain meaning through their relationship with others, a state can only obtain meaning through interchange with other states. What, then, happens when a state interacts with another? We can easily surmise that a state sometimes acts selfishly in its own interests and other times acts altruistically for the sake of co-existence with other states. Consequently the interaction between states is understood either as that of domination and subordination or that of mutual cooperation and exchange. History shows that these two contradicting situations have intricately and frequently crossed.

History has also shown that we seek sameness when encountering other cultures. But the sameness here has a tendency towards assimilating others to us. For the others are given to us and we think that we can provide the criteria to judge others since ours is superior to others'. Such an idea leads us unknowingly to endorse cultural imperialism. In a sense, it is ubiquitous in all cultures. We often judge other cultures by comparison with our own. In other words, all of us have some degree of cultural imperialism. Even those who seek a universalistic position are usually mute on this. Recognizing and blessing the differences of other cultures means that each culture in some manner contributes to the understanding of each other. Of course, from one's own viewpoint, not all the differences between cultural traditions can be worthy of attention. Those which encourage creative thinking and open up novel possibility and cast fresh problems are worthwhile. Etzioni finds this in moral discourse. According to him, "[c]ross-cultural moral dialogues build on substantive global values, values that lay a claim on all and are not particular to any one community or society."(19)

What is important here is how to reduce conflicts and tensions and promote harmonious interactions among states. Christianity envisioned the unification of the world with God as mediator; the Roman Empire by military force. Dante, as well as Kant, once expounded the idea of establishing one unified world government to make possible the harmonious governing of the world's various peoples. It became the philosophical basis for founding the United Nations (UN). Although the UN actively plans many projects and activities globally, they, in all respects, are merely carried out under a limited alienation of sovereignty from member states. This is a good example of how difficult it is to achieve, in reality, such a noble idea as the harmonious unification of the world. For all this, the reason why humankind still pursues such optimistic and naive dreams is because it desires to escape from the wretched human condition by overcoming a pessimistic view of history.(20) Such cosmopolitan ideas often turned out to be an aggressive form of imperialism in the realities of history. Two world wars in the twentieth century clearly demonstrate that world unification was attempted not by voluntary participation of every state but by military force.

In order to further our understanding of globalization, its preceding form, the nation-state, should be examined.(21) Most modern states usually take the form of a nation-state. During the processes of industrialization in the West, European states competed for and established colonies worldwide. Under such a pressured atmosphere, each state

could achieve internal solidarity rather easily with the nation at its centripetal point. Although it is true that each nation was formed through blood, area, culture, history and language, the concept of the nation was fixed only when the modern sovereign state was established. This ideal of a nation sometimes functioned as the driving force for development and played a positive role in the formation of national consciousness. However, it also generated some negative effects. The concept of nation would degenerate into nationalism that placed priority on one's own values and interests and excluded others. Furthermore it was often misused as a political ideology to justify an anti-democratic political structure.

At any rate, the present nation-state system will continue for some time. Above, we saw that in the modern age, which began with the rational self, not only was social solidarity among individuals impossible, individual existence was empty as well. Just as modern humans actualize and differentiate themselves from others through subjective consciousness, the modern state substantiates itself through sovereignty and frontier, as well as ethnicity, language, and culture. The state clearly defines its boundaries, which is one reason for the extreme enmity and confrontation between nation-states. Take for instance the age old antagonism between the countries of Islamic and Christian cultures and the recent vicious fighting among different ethnic and religious groups in the Balkans.

Similar to the birth-death life cycle of the individual, each state repeats the process of coming into existence, growing, and disappearing.(22) During these processes, each state creates new dynamic structures and thereby constantly rearranges the world order. If we agree to this, to find appropriate ways to curb each state's individual pursuit of selfish interests becomes very important. In Plato's words, the state is the individual writ large. Just as the individual can be selfish or altruistic, the same is true of the state. Just as the individual's selfish tendencies can be tailored for mutual benefit, so too can the state's selfishness.

Individualism for self-realization should be protected under any conditions, but its extreme form, i.e., egocentrism, should be avoided. Although the responsibility of the state is to promote true individualism, it should not allow the extreme form of individualism, i.e., extreme patriotism, and its extension, imperialism. Human beings share universal values as well as the particular ethos that comes from various cultures and thought. Thus the perpetual task of humankind is to recognize such particularity while at the same time to prevent its degeneration into exaggeration or extremity.

From the end of the 1980s when the sharp ideological confrontation between democracy and communism came to an end, the size of the world rapidly diminished. As Marxism, which objects to the capitalist economic system and demands evolutionary social transformation to cope with the problems and inconsistencies of liberal democracy, faded away, the economic system of liberal democracy has spread rapidly. In addition, the evolution in information communication, especially the daily use of the Internet since the 1990s, has provided the decisive means through which the world is being united together under a capitalist economy. The construction of the Internet information highway and continuous market-opening have played crucial roles in globalization.

What is more important is that the globalization of culture has been accelerated due to the revolution in telecommunications.(23) Additionally, the entry of new international political organizations, the worldwide problem of environmental pollution and nuclear arms have all accelerated the intimate cooperation among states.

Globalization provides individuals, states, and various civilizations with opportunities to get to know each other better. However, for all its positive functions in various sectors of contemporary world, there is an uneasy feeling among people that globalization has occurred in an unbalanced manner by overly concentrating on economy and science-technology.

Although globalization has not only made the individual's external conditions but also habitual thinking similar, it has yet to promise individuals inner maturity and growth.(24) Let us ask whether such similarities of external conditions actually accompany a homogeneous effect on the inner maturity of individuals. With some exceptions, contemporary humans are exposed to an overflow of information, having the freedom to choose their own life-world, and thus seem to have a seemingly greater opportunity to achieve self-realization. However, all of this could be interpreted as foreshadowing a bigger fall. The improvement of the political-economic conditions for individuals substantially reduced the burden of subsisting. Nevertheless, we wonder whether people actually think that their personal identity is in the making and thereby feel that they live better. Rather, each individual seems to be diminished inwardly by his inability to harmonize and integrate the external with the internal.

Jaspers warned that the price of scientific development would be paid with anxiety and despair that humans could not bear. Anxiety comes in proportion to the achievement of modern humans in science-technology. "What, in all the millenia of human history and pre-history, no god had been able to do for man, man has done for himself. It is natural enough that . . . he should discern the true inwardness of being."(25) To create the atmosphere for such a task, we should distinguish the merits and demerits of liberal democracy and the capitalistic system, which form the backbone of the dominant political-economic system of the modern age. The victory of liberal democracy over communism could equate to the superiority of the former, but it does not guarantee the perfection of liberal democracy. Unless individual self-realization and self-creation actually emerge, the liberal democratic system is just another system.

The modern age is an era of individuality. Individual self, thing-hood and state, and so forth, are considered independent entities. As a result, the world has become fragmented and friendly interaction among individuals, states, and between humans and nature has correspondingly become rather difficult. With the increasing emphasis on epistemology and thereby with the strengthened concept of subject, modern humans were able to apprehend and store information about external things. The outcome of such a view was the rapid development of scientific technology and the economy. External development has been accomplished so rapidly that individuals have not been permitted the time necessary to comprehend the changes. Unless we control this aggressive speed and attempt to revitalize communal solidarity, our current situation will further deteriorate.

The conflicts and tensions each state experiences in the process of globalization are what individuals experience in the socializing process. As no individual person can survive alone, so too can no state. Likewise, as no individual depends exclusively on others for their existence, so too does no state. This implies how difficult it is both for individuals and states to maintain their self-identity while maintaining interaction with others. By opening up the thick doors of the self and remembering the universality of human qua human and the universality of nature as life, we can attend a meeting with other individuals or states not in opposition or conflict but in cooperation and friendship.

There is no absolute way to make the world a better place to live. But idealists who firmly believe in their own worldview spend time attacking others who do not agree with them. Those single-minded idealists such as Hitler, Stalin and Pol Pot are the ones who were convinced that they were moving in the right direction. In order not to repeat such errors we must practice thinking clearly about the alternatives and choosing, with humility, among them. Also we must be fully aware that our choices could turn out wrong and those of others could be right.

Nowadays we have lost the beauty of simplicity because everything has become too complex. People wander in a labyrinth without knowing that they are trapped. Even those few who are aware of this are too tired to escape. However, as Berlin pointed out, there is no other way but to face reality. Frankly admitting that there never was utopia and never will be, and that our best hopes lay in the sobriety of the realist, we can try to create a decent society, Berlin's "dream", that tries to minimize suffering and avoid forcing people into intolerable choices against their own will.

Notes

* Dr. Michael Pettid and Mr. Rupert Atkinson read the earlier drafts of this paper and made many valuable comments. I owe them many thanks for their thoughtful assistance.

(1) *Four Essays on Liberty*, Oxford U., 1982

(2) Bimal K. Matilal, "Pluralism, Relativism and Cultural Interaction," Eliot Deutsch, ed. *Culture and Modernity: East-West Philosophic Perspectives*, Hawaii, Univ. of Hawaii, 1991, p. 152.

(3) Objections can be raised against this assertion, but most would accept it without much ado. Cf. Lee Hong Gu, "Ethical Problems and Perspective of Globalization", The First Common Value Forum, Korean National Commission for UNESCO and The Academy of Korean Studies, 2002, p. 17 (Korean); Lim Hyun Jin, *Transformation of the World in Globalized Era and Development of Korea*, Seoul National Univ. 1998, p. 5. (Korean)

(4) Eliot Deutsch, ed. *Culture and Modernity: East-West Philosophic Perspectives*, Hawaii, Univ. of Hawaii, 1991, preface, xii.

(5) Bimal K. Matilal, p.144, 145.

(6) Lee Hong Gu, p. 19.

(7) There are others who readily admit Westernizing effects. Cf. Onuma Yasuaki, "In quest of Intercivilizational Human Rights: Universal vs. Relative Human rights Viewed from an Asian Perspective" *Universal Ethics and Asian Values*, International Conference sponsored by the Korean National Commission for UNESCO, 1999.

(8) Mitilal, p. 152.

(9) Cf. Lim Hyun Jin, p. 7. In a similar vein, he argues that globalization is the logic of the advanced capitalist countries.

(10) In fact, we have witnessed in many places how the justification of one's own value system in collusion with religion can terrorize the whole world.

(11) Matilal, p.152.

(12) Sung Yum, "Christian Origin of World-Citizen Thought: the Medieval Philosophical Background of the Idea of Globalization" *Philosophical Basis of Globalization*, Chohakkwa hyunsilsa, 1999, p. 63). (Korean)

(13) Amitai Etzioni, "Toward an Asian-Western Set of Virtues", *Universal Ethics and Asian Values*, p. 30.

(14) Ibid., 31.

(15) Thomas Hobbes rejects Aristotle's definition of man as social animal. According to Hobbes, man is by nature a self-seeking animal. He loves himself only and others to the extent of how they can contribute to his pleasure.

(16) Aristotle despises men who do not belong to society as subhuman.

(17) Cartesian dualism considers the mind as a ghost in the machine.

(18) For example, instinct, desire, intuition, unconsciousness.

(19) Etzioni, p. 50.

(20) Jung Jae Shik, "Ethical Problems and Perspectives of Globalization", The First Common Value Forum, p.4. (Korean)

(21) Cf. Son Ho Chul, "Globalization and the Direction of Nation-State", *Globalization and the Development of National Culture*, The Academy of Korean Studies, 1996, p. 53. (Korean)

(22) Cf. Son, p. 77-88 for weakening of nation-state and its criticism.

(23) Cf. Shim Kwang Hyun, "Task and Prospect of Development of Localized Culture in the Era of Globalization, Localization and Information", *Globalization and the Development of National Culture*, p. 163. (Korean)

(24) Many people eat McDonald hamburgers, drink Coca-cola and enjoy Hollywood movies, without pondering what all of this will come to. They also listen to both classical and pop music, wear name brand clothes made in Italy or France, sleep in apartments made of concrete or in cozy hotels. The global spread of such similar forms of lifestyle, i.e., food, clothing, and shelter has increasingly erased the differences and uniqueness of people. In this respect, it is not surprising that youngsters in South Korea can communicate with Westerners more easily than those in North Korea, despite sharing a common racial heritage. If I see young women with lips painted in black on the streets of Myong-dong in Seoul, I can easily surmise that women in Tokyo, Paris, Milano and New York are wearing a similar color.

(25) Karl Jaspers, *Man in the Modern Age*, Garden City, N.Y., Anchor, 1957, p. 21.