Carrying out a moral evaluation of globalization is dauntingly difficult, for besides the fact that it is a phenomenon very much still in the making, it is one that is deeply contested. There are those who argue, for example, that in face of its inevitability, gestures of approval or disapproval are equally pointless — it should, therefore, simply be allowed to run its course. Others, myself included, train their attention upon its susceptibility to transformation by social actors, human agents operating in freedom. My own perspectives on globalization derive from an ethical framework combining elements from the value ethics of Max Scheler and the discourse ethics of Jurgen Habermas. In Scheler’s view, whether a deed is to be called good, or whether it is to be called evil, “rides on the back of the deed.” It is a function, in other words, not of what lies ahead of the deed, not of its end, not even of what results from it, but of the extent to which it is able to actualize a value against the background of a hierarchy of values. A deed is good if it actualizes a higher value in place of a lower one, or a positive value in place of a negative value; it is evil if it actualizes a lower value in place of a higher value or a negative value in place of a positive value. The lowest level of values is comprised of sensory values: the pleasant and the unpleasant, technical values, luxury values. At a higher than sensory values are the vital values of the noble and the vulgar, pertaining to the well being of man. At a higher level still than the vital and sensory values are spiritual values: justice/injustice, truth and falsehood, and the aesthetic values of the beautiful and the ugly. The highest level of values is comprised of the values of the holy and unholy. The contrary view, that the morality of a deed is a matter of what lies ahead of it, in Scheler’s view, is insupportable. For then, of its “end” it could be said that it “justified the means.” Worse still, we would have to set aside making any kind of a moral judgment relating to any deed until infor-
mation came in as to what resulted from it.¹ Clearly, however, the moral issues relating to globalization cannot be brought under consideration in isolation from all reference to its consequences for peoples and societies, its short and long term effects upon them. At this juncture, the discourse ethics of Habermas is relevant. Habermas deploys the Kantian criterion of universalizability in his interrogation of social issues which essentially holds that for a contested norm to be valid and consented to, “all affected can accept the consequences and side effects its general observance can be anticipated to have for the satisfaction of everyone’s interests (and these consequences are preferred to those known alternative possibilities for regulation).”²

The Essence of Globalization

That countries in Asia, Europe, and the Americas have been engaged in capitalistic or “free” trade with one another for over a century is not new. What is new is that the trade presently being conducted across national boundaries is headed toward the creation of a single, integrated free market.³ Markets are becoming “denationalized,” that is to say, “national markets are increasingly mere subsets of a world-wide international or … transnational marketplace.”⁴ This is true of goods and services, finance and capital, and labor. Many manufactured goods, for example, no longer originate in one country but are the composite products of an “elaborate international web of suppliers and assemblers.”⁵ Capital can move freely across nations at the speed of electricity. Apparatuses such as mobile phones and the internet, which underwrite
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⁵ Ibid., p. 28, citing Iain Carson, The Economist, p. 5.
abundant information, as well as the ability to instantaneously and relatively inexpensively share this information worldwide, coupled with plentiful and highly mobile investment funds, have removed the natural barriers to free trade and have made it global.6

Economic globalization, however, is not the whole story of globalization. Marx’s insight, reconstructed by Habermas, that the mode of production can never be isolated from social relations, points to the influence of the material on the cultural, political and spiritual aspects of human existence. Global free trade makes it necessary for people to change their work habits and lifestyles, to retool themselves if they are not to fall behind. States must be prepared to liberalize their trade and investment policies, which means relinquishing part of their sovereignty to such international organizations like the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF).7 By means of “interpenetrating processes of societalization, individualization, the consolidation of the international system of societies, and the concretization of the sense of humankind,”8 globalization has overcome limitations of place, and brought about such a homogenization of cultures that the particular is universalized and the universal is particularized.9 In a word, globalization has engendered what Paul Ricoeur has called the “universal civilization.”10 Universal civilization is characterized, first of all, by a scientific spirit, which “unifies mankind at a very abstract and purely rational level, and which, on that basis, endows, civilization with its universal character.”11 This scientific spirit accounts for the spread of technics, its second characteristic. The accumulation of tools and their improvement, with the help of the scientific spirit that disseminates them, enable mankind to develop like a single artificial being, approaching in the process a certain cosmopolitanism, making
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the earth truly round. Its third characteristic is rational politics, with states evolving from a dictatorial form to a democratic form of governance. Its fourth characteristic is the rational economy; economic science and technics integrate and converge because of their cultivation by the human sciences, which knows no national boundary. Its final characteristic is perhaps its most obvious: a universal way of living manifested in standardized housing and clothing, transportation, news programming, comfort, leisure, a world-wide culture of consumption.\textsuperscript{12} All these factors contribute to make a universal civilization the phenomenon that we now call globalization. In the words of Vaclav Havel, “we live now for the first time in human history – in a new era when our planet is enveloped by a single civilization.”\textsuperscript{13}

\textit{The Positive Values of Globalization}

A universal civilization is a positive value in itself. A universal civilization is good because, as Paul Ricoeur points out, it makes available the basic necessities of life to the greater masses of people. This is not only true for material needs such as food, clothing and shelter but also for non-material needs of human existence such as literacy and communication. Because of globalization, more people can now read and write, can relate and communicate with one another in greater speed than before. There is greater access to work made possible by the migration of workers to foreign countries, increased trade and economic cooperation, and the transfer of technology. A universal civilization brings out, in addition, certain truths or values whose validity is universal.\textsuperscript{14}

Foremost among these values is \textit{liberty}. This is readily seen in the removal of barriers to free trade. With the liberalization of economies, increasing numbers of people opt to develop business partnerships with everyone else in the world. With the deregulation of the domestic economy, markets are open to foreign competition, and the whole world becomes a marketplace. State-owned assets are privatized, giving them to private individuals and firms to manage unhampered by government

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 271-274.
\textsuperscript{13} Quoted in “Globalization: Challenges and Opportunities,” p. 27.
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Ibid.}, footnote #24, p. 46.
bureaucracy. Companies can move from one country to another, or at least engage the services and materials of several countries in the different phases of production. With the click of a mouse in the computer, capitalists can send their investments anywhere they want. Globalization appears to be giving support to the view that the capitalist economy works better than the socialist one. Other values promoted by global capitalism are fairness and transparency, honesty or integrity. Investments, after all, can be expected to flow into a country only when its rules of competition are perceived to be fair and transparent, and when official graft and corruption, and cronyism, have been brought under control. The Asian crisis of 1997 is instructive here, given that it resulted from the failure, not of global capitalism, but of capitalism in the region to become truly global.15 As analysts have shown, the worst-afflicted Asian economies were those the economic fundamentals of which had been deemed the most untrustworthy, owing to the lack of transparency in government bookkeeping, a corporate culture that did not value transparency and stockholder accountability, insider trading, nepotism, influence peddling, cronyism, general corruption, the lack of openness, and over-reliance on technocratic elites.16

Socio-politically, globalization appears to be supportive of the values of democracy and of human rights.17 The free-market economy has brought about the gradual erosion of “bureaucratic authoritarianism” in many East- and Southeast Asian countries, and given rise to the flourishing of civil society.18 The flourishing of civil society is the necessary structural condition for the creation of democracy. Civil societies serve as the mediation between the government sector, on the one hand, which is authorized to curtail individual human rights for the sake of the public good, and the business sector, on the other hand, which routinely promotes individual interests even if these develop at the expense of the common good. The autonomous formation of civil society is a testimony of the promotion of the value of democracy and human rights by globalization. It is in this context that one can place the

15 Ibid., p 30.
16 Ibid., p. 31.
17 Ibid., p. 34.
18 Ibid., p. 35.
enhancement of the power of consumers and private citizens to influence corporate behavior. Because of the wide dissemination of information available on the internet, individuals and private groups can voice out their criticism against poor quality products, graft and corruption (e.g. Transparency International), violence (e.g. 1997 Nobel Prize winner Jody Williams’ campaign against land mines) and other human rights violations.

Its critics aver, of course, that quite the reverse of promoting democracy globalization works against it by putting pressure upon participating nations to submit to the demands of regional or global free-trade agreements, and in effect to surrender their national sovereignty. How, they say, could globalization be turned to the will of the majority of the people in the nations involved, when it seeks to subordinate their legitimate desires to international commitments and to their so-called obligations to the world community? The rejoinder to such objections is that by insisting upon that rule of law that accords rights and liberties to individuals, reduces bribes, kickbacks, and other forms of corruption, globalization promotes the stability of the global economic order and enhances long-term stable growth in the countries concerned. With global economic growth, the prospect for a global democracy is not far behind.

The democratization and liberalization of globalization brings about a cultural homogenization. Homogenization of cultures is a direct consequence of globalization. With homogenization, cultural differences are leveled, resulting in increasing similarity in lifestyles, popularly expressed as “McDonalization” or “Cocalization” of cultures. The favorable result of homogenization is civility. We can take as the emblem for this the polite table manners (no more spitting and throwing of garbage on the floor or street), and conditions of cleanliness in McDonald’s restaurant restrooms. On a deeper cultural level, civil-
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ity means the avoidance of ethno-nationalism, ethnocentrism, ethnic rivalry, bigotry, racism, and the violence that results from them. Civility "is the necessary condition for "spiritual civilization" (as the Chinese call it), and, along with democracy, for genuine world peace," that "perpetual peace" which Kant associated with cosmopolitanism.\footnote{Ibid., p. 34.}

Finally, globalization helps promote global peace and solidarity. An example of this is the Philippines' people power revolution which, because it was beamed live all over the world, became the inspiration for other peaceful transitions of power, such as the crumbling of the Berlin Wall, the restoration of democratic rule in South Korea, the fall of Milosevic in Yugoslavia. When famine or a natural disaster strikes, globalization brings it to the attention of peoples all over the world, enabling countries and organizations to mobilize and fly in food, medicine and clothing to the affected country. In the cultural milieu globalization enriches human interaction and mutual understanding. In today's global wired world, we are now able to see how other peoples live. The literature, music, arts of peoples and countries are now being transmitted and picked up across borders, bringing a better understanding and appreciation of our fellowman. We now know that our aspirations do not greatly diverge: we hurt where others hurt, weep where others weep, rejoice where others rejoice, desire freedom where others desire freedom. Such a knowledge of our common humanity and such heightened interaction with other cultures help create greater global cooperation and peace.

\textit{The Negative Values of Globalization}

In the economic sphere, the first negative effect of globalization is massive poverty. The intent of globalization to expand markets and increase production efficiencies with the minimum interference has caused hundreds of millions of people, mostly in developing countries, to be left behind. Globalization "has been a major factor in rendering increasing numbers of the world's people hungry, homeless, destitute, illiterate and powerless in all areas of their lives."\footnote{Asia-Europe Joint Consultation on Challenging Globalization, \textit{Challenging Globalization, Solidarity and the Search for Alternatives} (Hongkong: Hongkong University, 1999), p. iv.} About 22% of the world's popu-
lation, or over 1.3 billion people, survive on less than one dollar a day, and around 1.6 billion live on $2 a day. Income inequalities have increased, with the world’s richest 20% sharing among themselves 85% of the world’s wealth, the most powerful players among which, of course, are the transnational corporations (TNC) or multinational corporations (MNC). The top 300 TNCs of 40,000 TNCs account for about 25% of the world’s assets. The Bretton Woods institutions, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), originally established as mechanisms for rebuilding the economies of the nations devastated by World War II, continue to provide loans to developing countries now in huge debt, but they, at the same time, dictate to client nations their economic policy, which often is made to be subservient to TNC interests. With the use of the new telecommunication technology, capital can readily be transferred from developing countries, “speculation replacing investments, thus destabilizing developing countries, and disproportionately rewarding a select few who are already immensely wealthy.” Globalization has only created extraordinary opportunities for a few and uncertainty for many. “Global capitalism has created the nouveaux riche and the new destitute, overpaid executives and underpaid workers.” The many who have suffered from globalization are laborers, peasants, women and

children. The sharp increase in competition in the global market has resulted in the proliferation of sweatshops, underpaid workers in inhuman working conditions, child labor, exploitation of women forced to work on monotonous jobs, forced prostitution, undervalued domestic labor, a decline in the number of people working in agriculture, migration of labor, downsizing, retrenchment, unemployment. The resulting poverty marginalizes and fragments people, societies, and nations. Poverty is immoral because it degrades their dignity and deprives them of their right to survive, of their right to life. The right to life is the source of all other rights. The Human Development Report 2000 states: "A decent standard of living, adequate nutrition, health care, education, decent work and protection against calamities are not just development goals. They are also human rights." As globalization expands, many poor countries are finding themselves being marginalized.

Such a neglect of human rights brings about as well the concomitant loss of freedom and democracy, and of social justice. In the first place, the new technologies are not free. Many countries have few decent libraries, computers, and telephones. This alone deprives their populations of access to knowledge and technological amenities. Furthermore, scientific research and applications are increasingly being privatized and commercialized.\textsuperscript{35} The hegemonic TNCs, operating upon the global stage, have in some cases compromised national sovereignty, and in some cases curtailed the ability of individuals and small firms to do business. Since, in addition to manufacture, the TNC's handle money on the international scale, the decisions they make relating to the movement of short-term capital are bound to have effects on the living conditions of millions of people the world over.\textsuperscript{36} If they do not merely seek to influence the nation's tax and environmental regulations, they tend to dictate it outright. When they get into trouble, they seek a bailout either from their country of origin or from their country of investment, which they can count on getting because they are so large they


have become essential to the economic system of the nation. So as to be able to compete with them, smaller firms have had to resort to mergers and/or drastic cuts in the cost of production, with respect especially, to labor. Labor standards and basic worker's rights are neglected for the sake of company advantage.

On the societal level, globalization has created a market society. That is because global capitalism "feeds on values that permeate the mentality of people across the world, notably through mass media and advertising." A market society emerges "when the attitudes, norms and values attached to economic transactions and economic efficiency invade all domains of public life and permeate all social relations." Globalization in its move towards an integrated free market economy "submerges the richness of human values and diversity into the single dimension of economic value or just doing business for its own sake or for the sake of profit." A market society is characterized by a culture of materialism and consumerism, by the cult of money. Relationships, scientific research and technology, even time, are monetized, motivated by profit and power. Happiness is identified with the satisfaction of material needs, with self-gratification, and freedom is equated with individualism without responsibility. This narcissistic hedonism has given rise to the growth of criminal activities, corruption, piracy of trade secrets, dishonesty, avoidance of taxes, get-rich-quick schemes like legalized gambling, and the decline of activities and organizations based on dedication and generosity. "The global economy unleashes all that
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is selfish about human nature without a global sensibility necessary for
the well-being of humans and our natural environment." Indeed, glo-
balization has brought destruction to our natural environment. Ironically,
globalization, which should have made people aware of the oneness of
nature, has mindlessly over-exploited the earth’s common resources: the
minerals, farmlands, petroleum, trees, the air we breathe and the water
we drink. Coming generations will, as a result, need to contend with a
culture’s wasteful consumerism and its attendant problems, including
pollution and garbage disposal.

In the cultural sphere, the homogenization of cultures by globaliza-
tion has resulted in the dismantling of social diversity and pluralism of
cultures. Just as bio-diversity is essential for the survival of life in the
planet, social diversity and pluralism are the critical elements in the
survival of vibrant societies and communities of human beings. Global-
ization in its drive for economic efficiency homogenizes cultures
through the power of mass media to create mass markets for products
of mass production, destroying social diversity in art, music, education,
health-care, economic development, agriculture, textile, pottery, etc.
The standardization of life styles undermines the culture’s self-reliance
and identity; it compromises its best sources of connection and par-
ticipation as a distinctive culture in the global community. This cri-
sis of cultural identity is accompanied by the subtle destruction of tra-
dition and the domination of a centralized culture.

Worse than this loss of tradition, there occurs what Paul Ricoeur
characterizes as the gradual destruction of the “creative nucleus of great
civilizations and great cultures.” This nucleus is the “basis of which

47 John Dalla Costa, “The Ethical Imperative: Why Moral Leadership is Good Busi-
ness,” quoted by Gerald F. Cavanaugh, S.J., op. cit., p. 44.
48 Rajest Tandon, “Civil Society, the State and Role of NGOs” in Isagani R. Serrano
49 Economy, Ecology and Spirituality, p. 19; “Civil Society, the State and Role of
NGOs” p. 124.
50 Ibid., pp. 124-125.
52 Kim Chan-ho and Moon Soon-hong, “The Issue of Culture and Cultural Identi-
we interpret life,” “the ethical and mythical nucleus of mankind.” Without this creative nucleus, we can stay on the level of mediocrity of elementary culture even while we surf the web to know of other cultures, or worse, become intolerant of other cultures. Without this nucleus, we can lose our critical mindedness and become passive consumers of the mass media and public opinion polls, and democracy becomes a sham, lacking substance. Without this creative nucleus, we can lose our connection to the transcendent Being, our spirituality.


In what follows, I would like to make a number of proposals as to what could be done to avoid or rectify the negative consequences of the globalization process, in the business/economic sector, on the level of culture, in civil society, among governmental and international apparatuses, and with respect to individuals.

The biggest challenge facing global capitalists is to work out another form of capitalism other than state-directed capitalism and laissez-faire capitalism: responsible capitalism. A responsible capitalism is “a capitalism that is responsible for promoting the well-being, both economic and political, of all, of ‘society’ as a whole.” In such a capitalism, “the good of society and the good of individuals are inseparable and mutually reinforcing ... to bring about genuine solidarity, based on an ethic of mutual recognition of rights.” In the concrete, corporations must be willing to take into account not only the markers of profit, but the long-term interests as well of consumers, workers, stakeholders, the environment, and the local community. They must take into account the economics of community. The community is a natural economic unit. Within an economics of community, economic power is decentralized, distributed and rooted in the place and community.
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“Localism is the urge of individuals and groups for a concrete and physi-
cally and psychologically limited expression of their interests, emotions,
and aspirations.”63 Spirituality and the community, and not money, de-
define the dominant ties in such an economics; long-term returns are
more important than short-term returns of individual investors, thus
preserving the ecological resources of the community.64 Management
practices, including accounting, follow the principle of subsidiarity.65
In such a non-monetary economy, wealth is stored in things that have
intrinsic value, e.g. productive land, animals, wisdom, human relation-
ships.66 In both responsible capitalism and an economics of com-
nunity, an ethical manner of conducting business is imperative. Business
transactions must be governed by the ethical principles of the common
good, human rights, justice and fairness, virtue ethics and the ethics of
care. The commitment to the value of equity is central to alleviate pov-
etry and to establish a sustainable relationship between the human
economy and the natural ecology.67 Concretely, this means the estab-
lishment of businesses that generate employment and produce essen-
tial goods for society’s marginals, and that promote democratization
and economic justice in terms of protecting worker’s rights and wel-
fare.68

Turning now to the problem of that homogenization of cultures
which results in a uniformity of lifestyles, permit me to say that the pro-
liferation in our own time of (principally non-western) religious fun-
damentalist movements,69 is related to the increased search, in face of
their contemporary loss, of such fundamentals as tradition, identity,
home, in a global context.70 It points, as such, to the need to husband
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and conserve both cultural identity and diversity, because "culture structures and orders everyday life...imbues personal experience with meaning and significance."71 Culture, after all, is that complex of values and evaluations residing in concrete attitudes towards life, tradition, change, fellow citizens, foreigners, and tools.72 Culture is expressed superficially in the habitual customs and factual morality of a society, less superficially in the traditional institutions, and deeply in the symbols and images making up the basic ideals of a nation, the cultural resources of a nation.73 It is in culture that we find the civilizing and humanizing values of hard work, self-reliance, filial piety, respect for life and nature, thrift, prudence, honesty and integrity, values which exist in all cultures and have stood the test of time.74 It is in culture that "religious traditions offer indispensable 'ethical resources' for the provision of common goods that transcend single human being,"75 and provide the spiritual conviction and motivation of people to promote peace, development and democracy.76

So how do we preserve cultural identity and diversity in face of the homogenizing pressures of globalization and the rise of the information highway? This question is no small one for Asian cultures, given their spirituality, community, bonding to place or habitat, harmony - values under siege from globalization. Obviously, we begin by taking genuine pride in and possession of our culture, without compromising our spirit of tolerance. We begin by promoting, at home, school, and the general local environment those human values which are imbedded in the local culture, literature, and arts. This would entail for Asian cultures, at the very least, the preservation of their diverse
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architectural heritage: the Angkor Wat of Cambodia, Indonesia’s Borobudur, the Golden Pavilion of Kyoto, Manila’s Jai Alai Building, and many others. I mention tolerance above because the value of tolerance is important for the encounter of our culture with another culture. It must be remembered, however, that genuine tolerance means not simply a passive acceptance of a different culture but a celebration of that difference, giving that difference the right to participate in human development. One would hope in this regard that the information highway, on every level of its operation, could be transformed into a two-way street.77

How does a culture preserve itself? This calls for the critical interrogation of tradition emphasized by Habermas in opposition to Gadamer, and the preservation of that creative cultural nucleus proposed by Paul Ricoeur. The critical interrogation of tradition is necessary because tradition can be a source of domination and dogmatism. A “cultural tradition stays alive only if it constantly creates itself anew.”78 This entails imbibing the population at large “with a scientific orientation and technical know-how, even as it nurtures their grounding in ethical values which have sustained ancient cultures and advanced civilization through millenia.”79 “Only a culture capable of assimilating scientific rationality will be able to survive and revive ... only a faith which integrates a desacralization of nature and brings the sacred back to man can take up the technical exploitation of nature.”80 This means in the concrete the use of technology to preserve and document one’s oral tradition, “not just in order to repeat the past but to take root in it in order to invent.”81

What about civil society? Civil society, it must be remembered, plays an active role in the promotion of democracy, protection of human rights, and service to the common good. As against the uniform, homogenous strategies of globalization to diverse conditions and situations, civil society ensures a particular response to particular needs and
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situations.\textsuperscript{82} In constitutes, so to speak, the interface between the state and the economic/business sector, and supplies, as such, the voice of dissent to the domination of the state and/or the large corporations, and includes, though is not limited to, environmentalists, labor unions, consumer watchdogs, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and people's organizations (POs). These latter individuals and groups apply pressure on national governments, corporations, and international organizations, to focus in what they do, not exclusively upon the exigencies of international capital, but upon the welfare and basic needs of the local people.\textsuperscript{83} They embody, as such, democracy from below, drawing their mandate from local communities.\textsuperscript{84} Globalization has fostered the growth of civil society and has increased its global reach through networking and alliances. Nevertheless, the danger lies in civil society being engulfed in the abstract developmentalism of a capitalist modernity that pays no regard for human rights. As the political conscience of society, civil society must guard its separate identity and autonomy, avoid assuming direct governmental responsibility while maintaining its critical cooperation with government and business corporations.\textsuperscript{85} In this connection, civil society needs to take the posture of place advocacy.\textsuperscript{86} Place consciousness is the radical other of globalism, its critique, and offers locations for new kinds of activity that reaffirms the priorities of everyday life. Place advocacy is grounded in a locality whose boundaries are not fixed but flexible and porous, not closing out the extra-local.\textsuperscript{87} Place advocacy by civil society "insists both on openness of places to the outside world, and the need to transform places to resolve questions of inequality that are internal to them. On the other hand, essential to place consciousness is recognition of the diversity of places (especially but not restricted to urban versus rural places), which requires local solutions to place problems, rather than imposition of
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an abstract blueprint.” Some examples of place advocacy by civil society are indigenous, ecological and social movements, urban movements protecting neighborhood, elitist communitarian movements, and organizations of displaced farmers.

Turning now to the subject of government and international agencies, let me begin by saying that their task in globalization is to alleviate poverty, reduce the gap between rich and poor countries. This can be done directly by increasing overseas development aid. Indirectly, competition should be tempered and markets regulated. One concrete proposal is to revive the proposed “Tobin Tax” on international currency transactions to discourage short-term speculation and introduce some stability to financial markets. Another proposal is to cut arms spending and recycle foreign exchange reserves within a region so that poor countries can benefit from lowering high interest rates. Certainly, nations could work out new mechanisms of cooperation in, say their common battle against poverty as opposed to maintaining a cut-throat disposition towards one another.

Then there is the challenge of promoting a global democracy. By a democracy is meant the real “material” democracy in contrast to the formal one. Real democracy includes the individual freedom of economic initiative and the provision of economic opportunities to a maximum number of people. No real democracy could exist in a country in which there is widespread misery and extreme conditions of material inequality among people. The democratic nature of market economy has to be protected and restored through regulations and incentives. To promote democracy, it is imperative to promote economic and social justice at all levels of the world economy. The promotion of the global democracy includes, of course, the promotion of a large variety of institutions and cultures. Globalization ought not to reduce the world to a small homogenous village. Local cultures and
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cultural diversity add to the richness of the world and they should be protected and joyfully accepted in the globalization process, allowing for multiple "modernities" and alternative visions of modernization and democratization.  

To undertake this twofold challenge, institutions with global responsibility need to be created and strengthened. For the global economy, this means, at the very least, the IMF, World Bank, Bank of International Settlements, and the International Standard Organization; for the environment, the UN Conference on Environment and Development; and for international law, the International Criminal Court. Stronger links should also be established between and among regional entities like the European Union and the ASEAN.

For the state, promoting social justice means creating the conditions and framework for as many people as possible to contribute meaningfully to economic activity and for the equitable distribution of income and wealth. The technological innovations of globalization should not lead to massive unemployment and the disappearance of small enterprises and independent professions. Promoting democracy means treating individuals or citizens as equal in terms of political participation, respecting their dignity irrespective of wealth, status, knowledge and power. Institutional arrangements are needed to carry out this democratic ideal, by making government officials transparent and accountable, allowing freedom of expression and association of citizens, ensuring respect for the rule of law, respecting rights of minorities, and nurturing traditions and multiple forms of life. For Asian cultures, the state must safeguard the value of the family.

Turning to the individual, what can he or she do to neutralize the negative effects of globalization? One answer to this question is provided by Scheler’s notion of person. For Scheler, every person as a moral
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subject is a “person acting with others, as a man with others."\textsuperscript{102} Every finite person is both an individual person and a collective person.\textsuperscript{103} Now, “globalization … is not only or even primarily about economic interdependence but about the transformation of time and space in our lives. Distant events, whether economic or not, affect us more directly and immediately than ever before. Conversely, decisions we take as individuals are often global in their implications.”\textsuperscript{104} Thus, paraphrasing Scheler with Giddens notion of globalization, every person is also a global person. Rectification begins with the self. The first challenge to the global person is to live simply, so as to slow down the expanding spiral of wasteful, luxurious living and social/global competition.\textsuperscript{105} This recalls to mind the motto: “Live simply so others can simply live.” If living simply “produces surplus income … let it be given to those for whom the necessities of life are still luxuries beyond their reach.”\textsuperscript{106} What is more, the individual person must “draw no profit whatever from clearly unjust sources,” and “diminish progressively [his] share in the benefits of an economic and social system in which the rewards of production accrue to those already rich, while the cost of production lies heavily on the poor.”\textsuperscript{107} To these two suggestions of Fr. Arrupe to the gathering of Jesuit alumni of Europe in 1973, I would like to add “a healthy balance of cultural rootedness and cosmopolitan outlook.” Cultural rootedness is becoming life-centered. It does not mean rejecting modern technology or returning to pre-modern living but restoring the social, spiritual and economic connections of the individual to nature, place, and community that global development has disrupted.\textsuperscript{108} A cosmopolitan outlook, on the other hand, is a necessity for survival in the global order. A cosmopolitan outlook is one whose mental and emotional horizon is the planet. It means internalizing
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universal values, especially human rights and fundamental freedoms, having a sense of active solidarity with the achievements or problems and suffering of people of different regions and cultures, and believing in the common heritage and common good of humankind.\(^{109}\) The challenge of the individual person in globalization is to strike this "healthy balance between preserving a sense of identity, home and community and doing what it takes to survive with the globalization system."\(^{110}\)

Conclusion

Where do all these proposals for rectifying globalization lead us? They lead us to Scheler’s notion of true solidarity. Genuine solidarity is "unity of independent, spiritual, and individual single persons ‘in’ an independent, spiritual, and individual collective person."\(^{111}\) (One can substitute ‘global’ for the ‘collective’.) In genuine solidarity, every finite person is at the same time a member of the global person. In genuine solidarity, everyone is responsible for oneself and for the other, and everyone is ultimately responsible to God. Essentially, what makes solidarity possible is the mutual reciprocity and reciprocal valueness of all moral and social acts, especially love. It is love that builds solidarity, for my love for the other increases my capacity to love all others, and the other’s response of love effects not only the value of myself but of all others.\(^{112}\) Needless to say, love presupposes justice, and genuine justice leads to love. In solidarity, globalization assumes a human face.

---


\(^{111}\) Max Scheler, *On Feeling, Knowing and Valuing*, p. 246.