САНКТ-ПЕТЕРБУРГСКОЕ ОТДЕЛЕНИЕ РОССИЙСКОГО ИНСТИТУТА КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИИ

КАФЕДРА ЮНЕСКО ПО КОМПАРАТИВНЫМ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯМ ДУХОВНЫХ ТРАДИЦИЙ

ФИЛОСОФСКО-КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЧЕСКИЙ ИССЛЕДОВАТЕЛЬСКИЙ ЦЕНТР "ЭЙДОС" (САНКТ-ПЕТЕРБУРГСКИЙ СОЮЗ УЧЕНЫХ)

МОСКОВСКОЕ БЮРО ЮНЕСКО

МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫЕ ЧТЕНИЯ ПО ТЕОРИИ, истории и философии культуры



излается пол эгилой ЮНЕСКО

ДИФФЕРЕНЦИАЦИЯ И ИНТЕГРАЦИЯ МИРОВОЗЗРЕНИЙ: ЭКЗИСТЕНЦИАЛЬНЫЙ И ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЙ ОПЫТ



Издание осуществлено при финансовой поддержке РФФИ и Министерства культуры РФ

> Главный редактор: Любава Морева

Редакционная коллегия:

Алина Венкова, Александр Гогин, Татьяна Дегтярева, Анна Конева, Лев Летягин, Дмитрий Спивак, Виктория Черва, Борис Шифрин, Alessia Dagnino, Skye Burn

> Дизайн обложки: Игорь Панин

Редакция сердечно благодарит Международную Ассоциацию «Русская культура» за дружескую поддержку и содействие в подготовке настоящего издания к публикации ST. PETERSBURG BRANCH OF THE RUSSIAN INSTITUTE FOR CULTURAL RESEARCH THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION MINISTRY OF CULTURE

UNESCO CHAIR ON COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF SPIRITUAL TRADITIONS

THE PHILOSOPHICAL AND CULTURAL RESEARCH CENTRE «EIDOS» (ST. PETERSBURG ASSOCIATION OF SCIENTISTS AND SCHOLARS)

UNESCO MOSCOW OFFICE

INTERNATIONAL READINGS ON THEORY, HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF CULTURE



under UNESCO auspices

DIFFERENTIATION AND INTEGRATION OF WORLDVIEWS: EXISTENTIAL & HISTORICAL EXPERIENCE



Financial support: Russian Federation Ministry of Culture, The Russian Foundation for Basic Studies

> Editor-in-chief: Liubava Moreva

Editorial Board:

Alina Venkova, Skye Burn, Victoria Cherva, Alessia Dagnino, Alexander Gogin, Tatjana Degtyareva, Anna Koneva, Leo Letyagin, Boris Shifrin, Dimitri Spivak

Designer: Igor Panin

With thanks to the International Association «Russian Culture»

MHOЖЕСТВЕННОСТЬ ВОЗЗРЕНИЙ, ЕДИНСТВО МИРА И ПОИСК ЦЕЛОСТНОСТИ ЧЕЛОВЕКА: ЕДИНСТВО БЕЗ УНИФИКАЦИИ? DIVERSITY OF VIEWS, UNITY OF WORLD AND SEARCHING FOR INTEGRITY OF HUMAN BEING: UNITY WITHOUT UNIFICATION?



COMMUNITY, CHARACTER AND TRUST IN A GLOBALIZED SOCIETY

Concepción NAVAL University of Navarra. Spain

- 1

What are the challenges facing education in a globalized world, in the knowledge society? How can globalization and diversity be combined? Is globalization the same as homogenization? Why is there so much fear and so much suspicion of the phenomenon of globalization? How can citizenship and diversity be connected together? What about the media, the new information and communication technologies — what part do they, or could they, play in this process? Why does the process of accelerated globalization trigger a need to reinforce one's identity, as a kind of reaction? What are the dangers of globalization, and how can we confront them?

Globalization is generally perceived as a threat because it is seen as a force which imposes uniformity as well as universality. Uniformity is regarded as an impoverishment in two senses: it brings with it both mediocrity and hegemony. The psychological response is that of the victim, the person under threat, something akin to the whining culture in other areas of life, the psychology of the minority or the exile. In short, globalization is seen as a threat to cultural diversity.

What stance should we adopt towards this phenomenon? On the extremes, there is a position which is bitter, angry and intransigent (reject

13

everything, barricade ourselves into our castle); and an opposite one which is sugary and ingenuous (accept everything without discernment, to the extent that we can no longer say who we are, where we are going, or what is happening to the world). But it is better not to accept passively the uniformity produced by globalization. Today, there are means of combating this: through the media, for example. One thing which is important is not to accept uncritically the supposed received ideas of the majority, but to develop a constructive critical sense which can help to improve the communities of which we form a part. As Malouf says: "The law of the majority is not always synonymous with democracy, freedom and equality; sometimes, it is synonymous with tyranny, subjugation and discrimination" (Malouf, 1999: 184).

From the educational point of view, perhaps one of the most confusing aspects of globalization is that of its impact on people, their character and their social relations, aspects which are closely interrelated, depending on whether we take a psychological or a sociological approach.

It is relatively common in western society for the human person to perceive, more or less clearly, a feeling of rupture, the absence of a narrative which organizes his or her conduct, a sense of risk, cloudiness, limitation, failure, fear, lack of meaning (because the way in which his or her work or life in community are organized is impossible to interpret), of being trapped, of drifting. As a result, when there is a rapid change, people feel perplexed, confused, mistrustful, afraid of failure, and finally, have an ambivalent sense of both desire for and fear of the "we".

But, since "where there is danger, there also lies salvation", in Hölderlin's words, this state of things presents itself to us as a genuine social and educational challenge, which should lead us to pay greater attention to the moral, affective and civic (or social) aspects of education.

What personal consequences derive from the attitude of "nothing long term", which our present society has installed as a basic component of its wardrobe? How can we pursue long-term objectives for education in a society which lives for the short term? How can lasting social relations be maintained? How can a human being develop a narrative which conveys his/her identity and life story in a society that is made up of episodes and fragments? "How do we decide what is of lasting value in ourselves, in an impatient society which centers on the immediate?" (Sennett, 2000: 10).

Sennett provides a response in his book The corrosion of character which

seems to me to be extremely revealing:

"a broader sense of community and a fuller sense of character: these two things are what is needed by the growing number of people who, in modern capitalism, are doomed to failure" (Sennett, 2000: 142).

These two vectors can be the base which organizes the rest of the exhibition: the recovery of the notion of character, and the concept of community or natural human sociability with all the consequences that these bring with them. That is, the recovery of moral and civic education in their widest sense.

Character is a rich classical expression that has been salvaged by contemporary pedagogical literature, which encompasses rather more than the modern concept of "personality". Character is partly the long-term, lasting aspect of what is generally meant today by "emotional experience". Conflict arises in the face of the difficulties present today which hinder the consolidation of character into lasting narratives: loss of the sense of commitment; fear of risk-taking because this has become a cause of depression and disorientation; supposed conflicts between character and the experience of disconnected time, and so on (Sennett, 2000: 30).

"The label nothing long-term disorientates planned action, dissolves the bonds of trust and commitment, and separates will from behavior" (Sennett, 2000: 30-31).

In fact, the notion of the habit, something that is constant in our lives, produces a certain discomfort or malaise in contemporary people, as they are more accustomed to constant change. Routine, which degrades and breaks down our lives in a kind of pathological repetition, is confused with the constancy that protects and helps us to build up our lives.

As Castells so rightly says, in a slightly different perspective: "what matters, more than qualifications, is a general educational capacity which includes general knowledge, the capacity of association, of knowing what tools you need for the work you have to do, where to find them, how to acquire them and how to apply them. In other words, a general intellectual level, which implies a complete redefinition of the education system: the social capacity to build bridges between work and education" (Castells, 1998a, 1998b).

Talking of globalization inevitably leads us to the subject of humanistic education, which focuses on the person as a whole, and therefore does not exclude esthetic, affective, moral, civic or social aspects, or, if we prefer, aspects of the human heart, insofar as the heart encapsulates and unifies the whole person.

It is increasingly clear that the future is in the hands of the people who have a humanistic vision and focus, because this is what makes possible serene dialogue, enables defense and respect of the dignity of people and things, helps us to know the limits of things and our own limits, opens reality to us, and makes us capable of overcoming the outer dispersal which our society causes.

In all this, it is implicit that our interest in the educational process implies a concept of the person, of social reality, of inter-subjective relations, of action and of ethics. Any educational process which is not based on these basic issues will be reduced to an instrumental process of information transfer or purely technical training of the individual, in a technocratic and dehumanized context, which does not in any way respond to the expectations that await it in the new society.

On the other hand, inextricably linked with all of this, a desire arises to recover the meaning of *community* (the human being's social nature). As Sennett says, in the context of a story he narrates about a father and son: "Harry seeks, in electronic communications, the meaning of community which Henry, his father, enjoyed when he went to the general assemblies of the porters' union – but Harry finds his online communications are brief and rushed. It is like the problem of the children: when you aren't there, you find out about everything later" (Sennett, 2000: 19).

The fleeting nature of friendship and local community, which are a constant complaint of our days, forms the background to a more acute concern which is latent: the family. How can we protect family relationships? This question is present in the heart of many men and women today. Values like responsibility, behaving honorably, commitment – how can we encourage these in the present climate? What real influence does the family have? And if we weigh all these things up, which has the greatest influence on young people: the family, the school, internet, peer groups, the neighborhood?

The web is sometimes presented as the panacea which will restore the lost connection with others, but the web can also weaken social bonds. The web can turn into an inhospitable frontier.

If we are examining the phenomenon of globalization, we must of necessity pay special attention to moral and civic education. This education must, of course, begin in the family, in the media, in the streets and the neighborhood, and it must continue in the school, even though this is far from being the main actor in this scenario. This leads us to develop a moral and

civic education which pays attention to cultural differences and deficits. In the knowledge society, education must fulfill this transcendental mission: it must propose and consolidate areas of belonging. These are probably the two great challenges facing education in the globalized society: 1) to recover the sense of belonging ("place"), or the defense of space, and 2) to offer an alternative to instrumentalism, the faceless power of the web-society. Here, in part, lies the tension between globalization and localism.³

We are in special need of an education which can deal both with the global and the particular or local. Place acquires importance, as it becomes a community when there is a we who live there, who make it habitable: "community evokes the personal and social dimensions of place" (...) and "one of the incidental consequences of modern capitalism is that it has reinforced the value of place and awakened a desire for community. All the emotional conditions which we have explored in the workplace inspire this desire: the uncertainties of flexibility; the absence of trust and deeply-rooted commitment; the superficial nature of teamwork; and more than anything, the specter of not achieving anything in the world with oneself, of "making a life for oneself" through work. All these situations push people to seek another place, another arena where affection and depth are possible" (Sennett, 2000: 144-145).

The city is thus a key place insofar as it is a system from which the global problems of humanity can be addressed locally. In this context, there are two vital concepts within the framework of the city: its viability – efficient communications and transport networks, services and trees – and its habitability - family accommodation, shopping areas, places for working and walking, schools, and in general all the intimate, private places where people can rest (De Pablo, 1998).

"The role of the cities in the Information Age is to be means of producing innovation and wealth, but even more, means that are capable of integrating technology, society and quality of life in an interactive system, in a system which produces a virtuous circle of improvement, improvement not only of the economy and technology, but also of society and culture" (Castells, 2000).

In short, the city is the human space where we learn to live together. But cities are the scene of complex phenomena, such as, for example, the concentration in space of ethnic minorities within the city, particularly in the suburbs of large conurbations in which minorities in fact constitute the majority of the population. This is a characteristic phenomenon of our societies: the era of global information is also that of local segregation. The phe-

nomenon of the concentration of underprivileged ethnic minorities in particular places often leads to an intensification of poverty, deterioration of living conditions and urban services, worsening of unemployment rates, and a rise in crime rates.

The multicultural city is in a sense a city that is enriched by diversity, but with the risks that this entails; at the same time, it is also a city which bears the brunt of the breakdown in social solidarity and is threatened by waves of human violence (Borja and Castells, 2000). There is also a further problematic area, one which is difficult to discuss, which is the emergence of floating populations that are directly related with the globalization of the money flow and of communications. This is a new urban reality to which cities have yet to find a solution.

The thorough-going social evolution which our western society is staring in the face has contributed to the appearance of a new society which has been called the knowledge society. Today, we talk of a knowledge society, but we might equally well talk about a "learning society". There is ample evidence of this transformation, such as the explosion in concepts such as "lifelong learning", or the link established between such important problems for the social conscience as unemployment, and the need to develop educational processes to provide an adequate response that might point to a solution.

The role of education in the communications society, then, is precisely to mediate between the local and the global. Hence the title of this article: "Education (moral or civic) in a globalized society (the knowledge society). Education is what makes it possible for information to become knowledge. "Education is not just placing the child in the school, or ensuring that there are good schools. In the first place, education must begin from a developed educational system so that the people who come out of it are capable of independent thought, are self-starters who can manage their own learning for the rest of their lives. But there is more to it than this (...), there is the concept of the city which educates: not only is the school an element in education, but there is a notion that the whole of a local society can educate, through various interactions, cultural activities, relations with the media, and including elements of citizens' participation. This is the set of local social relations which produces an interactive information system, which develops the educational capacity in a broad sense, not restricted simply to the acquisition of knowledge" (Castells, 2000).

But sometimes this desire for community which we experience can be a defensive feeling, which leads us to reject the foreigner, the immigrant, the stranger. It is therefore necessary to have a pedagogy of acceptance, recognition of personal biographies, which are more than ever linked to non-academic settings. It is also important to emphasize the close relationship between learning, affectivity and personal identity, although there is no space to explore this more deeply here.

We are responsible, Ricoeur would say, because there is someone who trusts in us: "because someone depends on me, I am responsible to other for my action" (Ricoeur, 1992: 165-168). I can only keep up the demands on myself because I know that there is a witness, someone who trusts me, who needs me. But who needs me? This question could be posed by someone lost in the society of the masses, or the society of the individuals, in which we live.

III

The problem is the social mistrust which such situations of rapid change generate, which is natural when we see the State as the only guarantor of social justice. The citizen thus understands that it is legitimate to pursue individual interests without thinking about others' rights or the common good, which are a matter for the law to protect. In such a situation, the whining culture flourishes – people claim their own rights – which puts paid to any solidarity which is not channeled through the State (Naval, 2001).

It is clear that this panorama requires us to take action along the lines of preparing people to realize and take on the civic responsibility which is ours, in the awareness that all personal decisions have social and political implications. We need to discover what each of us can do to contribute to the common good, and we need to generate new attitudes that counteract the culture of whining and suspicion – attitudes based on trust, a sense of responsibility, constructive dialogue, the spirit of cooperation, and the capacity for initiative. This is a special kind of "social literacy". In this way, *social participation* becomes more than a political right, a civic duty, which triggers no fear or rejection, but which calls on us to participate because it is people who need it, people whom it affects.

One key point, educationally speaking, in the formation of the character and social relations, is a healthy understanding of the dichotomy autonomy-dependence, which is truly disfigured by modernity.

In general terms, what is lacking is a sense of human sociability: which also includes recognition of the need for independence or autonomy, and the natural dependency of oneself and others. This point has a radical impor-

18

tance, since admitting one's dependency is in some way related to reaching the independence towards which our education is directing us (MacIntyre, 1999: 85). The idea is that, as independent people, we should be able to live together, accepting and cultivating our common bonds. If we do not do so, how shall we be able to achieve a common good? The reality is that the history of each of us is also the history of the people who were present or absent, helping us, intervening, or failing to do so (MacIntyre, 1999: 73).

On the sociological level, there is also a certain dispiriting skepticism which may lead to cynicism, in reaction to what we might call the imperfections of democracy. Thus the State, the market and the mass media seem today to be, as Llano indicates (1999) in *Humanismo cívico* (Civic Humanism), the real mediating powers which paralyze the liberating energies of the liberal democracies.

Freedom, as is obvious, requires support and encouragement on the social plane (Naval, 2000). Participation and responsibility are probably the two key concepts for understanding what we are talking about when we talk of citizens. A theoretical and practical concept of society must be pursued which values and promotes three characteristics that mutually require and reinforce each other, which are (Naval, 2000):

- 1. the active role of real, concrete human people;
- 2. the consideration of human communities as essential, decisive settings where the women and men who form them can develop to their full potential;
- 3. the high value of the public sphere, as the arena for the unfolding of social freedoms, and as the guarantee that the lives of these communities should not suffer any interference or pressure from external powers.

One route that must be tried is that of "giving public importance to citizens" virtues" (Llano, 1999: 22). This is a truly important point, since what is meant is a call to participation and social initiative. It is true, as Ash says, that there are still many people who see in the State the main core of identity and its project of democratic self-government. But it is also clear that the state model is not unique or perfect, and in fact, the greater the economic ease and cultural level of the citizens, the less they depend on one single identity. It would seem relevant to point here to the public dimension and meaning of those areas generally known as *private*, such as the family sphere. Feminist ethics here has played a leading role. The citizen's virtues are first learnt in the family, in the small communities in which the child first lives. If

the child learns to trust and care for others in the atmosphere of the home, he or she will find it easier to do the same in the social or professional sphere. The other people in the home are a step towards the other people he or she will meet outside, in society. Conversely, family conflicts are often the origin of violence, not only in the home, but also outside it.

In this way, the pronoun "we", which some feel to be dangerous, needs to be explored in a more positive light: as a shared destiny. "What kind of personal relations sustained over time can be contained in the use of we?" (Sennett, 2000: 146). Today it seems that the mere distant possibility of being dependent on someone provokes feelings of shame and rebelliousness. Dependence is repudiated as something shameful. But this rejection of dependency does not produce bonds which enable sharing; rather, it erodes mutual trust and commitment.

"The social bond basically arises out of a sensation of mutual dependence. All the dogmas of the new social order hold dependence to be a shameful condition: the attack on the rigid bureaucratic hierarchy tends to free people structurally from dependence; and it is supposed that risk-taking means stimulating self-assertion rather than submission to what is given. In modern corporations, there is no honorable place for service (...). John Kotter celebrates consultancy as the *summum bonum* of flexible business behavior, which means that the consultant is not indebted to anyone" (Sennett, 2000).

Yet this opposition between dependence and independence is a cliché which needs rethinking, as it is too much of a stereotype to equate strong and independent, in opposition to weak and dependent. As the psychologist J. Bowlby comments, a healthily independent person is capable of depending on others when "the occasion requires it, and also of knowing whom (...) to trust" (Bowlby, 1973: 359).

The fear of becoming dependent on someone causes true flights, and in the last instance, people run away from themselves. Instead of forging human relationships in trust, we often seem to base them on defensiveness or mistrust.

The problems which surround trust can have two basic forms: 1) a lack of trust, and 2) active suspicion of others. The bonds of trust are, logically, put to the test in situations of danger, when things go badly and we need help. Who do we trust now? Who is worthy of our trust? To whom can we make this confidence which will lighten our heart? It could be that the very person who shows the greatest distrust of others is like that because he or she is ashamed of being in need. This means that recovering our trust in others is

a reflexive act: we must overcome our fear of our own vulnerability, and accept help. Giving and accepting are the very core of the concept of community. Receiving and giving are a bridge that extends from person to person. But this bridge needs both pillars: if one collapses, the bridge will fall in (Guardini, 2000: 41 ff).

This does not by any means mean that no conflicts will arise in our day-to-day life together. Of course they will – but that is not a reason to opt for a culture of distrust. Some authors have even gone so far as to maintain that inner conflicts also create bonds. Strong bonds between people imply commitment over and above their differences over the course of time (Coser, 1976).

In education, this point is of key importance, since when the other person fails us, the consequences are tough: we are disconnected. Perhaps someone might add: but what if the other person makes us distrustful? The immediate result could be that we would fall silent. If, for example, the system in some way irradiates indifference (Sennett, 2000: 29), when, for example, everything is measured in terms of human effort, then a lack of trust is generated, because one has the sensation that one does not matter as a person, one is not necessary to others, one is dispensable; and this creates insecurity on the one hand, and a lack of response, mute behavior, on the other.

Sennett maintains that the increasing insecurity experienced by workers makes it impossible for them to achieve a moral identity. The relationship between risk and character is not coordinated in intelligible terms, for fear of what is new, or for fear that past experience does not count. Perhaps the most confusing thing about flexibility is its impact on character (Sennett, 2000: 10).

Globalization, on the other hand, requires this flexibility in the work-place, but we ought to ask whether flexibility, with all the risks and uncertainties it entails, will solve the human problem it addresses. How can a sense of commitment be kept alive in the midst of all this uncertainty? Flexibility is thus presented as a challenge for character building, if we take into account the ingredients that are deemed necessary for flexible specialization: high technology, speed of communications, swift decision-making, and the willingness to let the changing demands of the outside world determine the inner structure of institutions (Sennett, 2000: 47 and 53).

Risk, in this panorama, is something quite everyday and unremarkable in a globalized society. But to take on this risk we need spirit, character. Sometimes, when we take a risk in our careers, or in life in general, we are more worried about losses than gains. As Tversky says: "people are much

more sensitive to negative stimuli than to positive ones (...). There are few things which can make one feel better, but the number of things which can make one feel worse is infinite" (Tversky, 1990: 75).

In this way, the action of running a risk takes on the attributes of a narrative. But it is a dangerous story, because what we feel is missing is a plot that can organize behavior. "Stories are more than simple chronicles of what happens; they give shape to the passing of time, suggest reasons that explain why things happen, and show their consequences" (Sennett, 2000: 29).

The dilemma of how to organize one's life story today is partly resolved by seeing how to confront the future, how we accept failure, which is more or less inevitable, and what fate we have in mind. In life, on many occasions, risk advances because of the fear of doing nothing, in the same way that when someone does not believe that something can be done to solve a problem, in the long term he or she stops thinking and a feeling of uselessness arises.⁵

In a different order of things, as a replacement for a true sense of community, in order to generate this lost trust, we often talk of encouraging team work – the need to foment cooperative work is certainly a real one. But we also need to note that team work is not a panacea. The bonds formed in team work are usually weak, since the team goes from one task to another very quickly and the people who form the team also change during the process. Solid bonds, loyalty and trust, require a longer association, and are therefore less easily manipulated. "The fictions of team work, because of the superficial nature of its content, its focus on the immediate, and its way of preventing opposition and confrontation, are useful in the exercise of domination" (Sennett, 2000: 121). Firm bonds in human communities require an acceptance of differences that can come up between individuals over the course of time. Moreover, team work does not generally have a place for differences in rank and power, and so the kind of community it promotes is a strange one.

IV

For the negative effects of globalization to be alleviated, it is important for the media to be seen and used for what they are: media, tools, but never ends in themselves. This is a crucial point for education.

The media, which could have served to bring us closer to each other, seem not fully to have achieved this goal as yet. Furthermore, the atomization of the social body which globalization threatens us with is exacerbated by the influence of the media, which seem to constitute the main arena for

universal exchange and relationships. These media penetrate our intimate sphere and make it spectacularly easy for us to connect up with the rest of the world. In addition to this, they work imperceptibly to spread lifestyles, ways of living, that gradually become shared knowing and living, without so much as provoking a critical response.

But as well as having inherent dangers, communication technologies are excellent instruments in the service of education: they have the capacity to be the driving force of change. We have one paradigmatic case: internet, the shape which organizes activity, the infrastructure of the knowledge society. But the infrastructure does not form a society by itself. It is a necessary, but not a sufficient condition. "Increasingly, the Internet Society, the organization which brings web designers together, is realizing that the problem is no longer in internet so much as in society. The weight is shifting from computer technology to social, economic and cultural technology" (Serra, 1999). We can thus observe a change in name: from ICT (Information and Communications Technology) to SIT (Social Information Technology), which marks the transition from the knowledge society to the new knowledge culture (culture of the new knowledge society): the generation of new fields of knowledge and new institutions of creation and reproduction of the new knowledge. "This entails the design of the most delicate area of the knowledge society, that of its institutions and research networks, and of higher education, that is, the design of the digital culture, the culture of the new knowledge society" (Serra, 1999).

In short, "the cultural battles," Castells tells us "are the power struggles in the information age. They are waged first and foremost in the media and through the media, but the media are not the actors who have the power. Power, the ability to impose behavior, lies in the information exchange networks, in the manipulation of symbols, which relate the social actors, institutions and cultural movements together through icons, spokespeople, and cultural amplifiers" (Castells, 1998a, 1998b). At the base of all social change, in the last analysis, we find people. People who are capable of inner growth, of knowledge, of boosting their operative capacity; this is something different from mere information (Llano, 2000).

In this way, the innovation of knowledge calls out for us to heed education, learning, training and research. The knowledge society is a society in which education is really given the place and role that it deserves, without a need for concessions, because what is really important is learning, and this is

a process that never ends.

It is true that modern communication technology has speeded up the process of collaboration, but in the media industry (Sennett, 2000: 112), the face-to-face seems still to be the best way of broadcasting. "In team work on something that is not material, in which people work together to create an image, the act of communication is more important than the facts that are communicated; to communicate, the conversation must be allowed free play, it must be open and accessible" (Sennett, 2000: 113). We can easily see the importance of this point for the world of education.

\boldsymbol{V}

By way of conclusion to this reflection on community, character and trust, in other words, on moral and civic education, in a globalized world, let me make a proposal which is inspired by Guardini's book Virtú (1997), which made me see in a new light the need to arouse, in our educational activity, some character traits – virtues – related to trust, in order to promote a sense of community. After all, trust plays a leading role in the human being's ability to be sociable. This trust could be viewed from two points of view, which are both of utmost interest for education: trusting and being trustworthy. Guardini offers a stimulating way of seeing and approaching human sociability. These are moral virtues with a social or political dimension, in the classic sense.

These virtues include acceptance, truthfulness, patience, respect, lack of ulterior motives, understanding, politeness, silence and the capacity to welcome others. Whatever the outcome of this, talking about trust means, in the last analysis, genuine dialogue, authentic inter-subjective communication, and intense, fluent participation (Naval and Altarejos, 2000; Naval, 1995): this is the key to approaching education in a global society.

NOTES

¹ Curiously, one point on which both poles implicitly meet is that of the value of and need for solidarity. J. Petras writes, with a certain cynicism, that solidarity is the alibi which serves some to pacify the victims, and other to cooperate in this task consciously or unconsciously, and also obtain some benefit from the situation (see Aguirre, 1998).

² The book by R. Sennett (2000) is of great interest in this context.

³ In a thought-provoking article entitled "El reverdecimiento del yo: el movimiento ecologista," Castells (1998) shows how ecologists have, among other things,

found a way out of this dilemma, by proposing that "in what is only an apparent contradiction, ecologists are at once localists and globalists: globalists in their management of time, and localists in their defense of space." Available: http://www.lafactoriaweb.com.

⁴ See El Cultural 20.II.00.

⁵ "Apprehension is anxiety about what may hapen; apprehension is created by a climate in which constant risk is emphasized, and it intensifies when past experience seems not to serve as a guide for the present" (Sennett, R., 2000: 101).

⁶ For a more developed description, see Naval (2001).

REFENENCES

Aguirre, M. (1998). La globalización y la solidaridad (Globalization and solidarity). Disponible: http://www.lafactoriaweb.com]

Altarejos, F. y Naval, C. (1998). Virtualidad formativa de los Derechos Humanos: la educación cívica (Educational Dimension of Human Rigths: Civic Education). Revista Española de Pedagogía, 211, 523-524.

An-Na im, A.A. (Ed.). (1992). Human rights in cross-cultural perspectives: A quest for consensus. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Beck, U. (1998). La sociedad del riesgo (The society of Risk), Barcelona: Paidós Ibérica.

Borja, J. y Castells, M. (2000) Local y global: la gestión de las ciudades en la era de la información (Local and Global: the cities in the information age). Disponible: http://www.lafactoriaweb.com.

Boulding, E. (1988). Building a global civic culture: Education for an interdependent world. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bowlby, J. (1973). Separation. New York: Basic Books, 359.

Burbules, N. y Alberto Torres, C. (Eds). (2000). Globalization and education. Critical Perspectives. Routledge: New York-London.

Case, R. (1993). Key elements of a global perspective. Social Education, 57 (6), 318-325.

Castells, M (1998a). La era de la información: Economía, sociedad y cultura (The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture) (Vol. 1. La sociedad real). Madrid: Alianza.

Castells, M. (1998b) La era de la información: Economía, sociedad y cultura (Vol. 2. El poder de la identidad). Madrid: Alianza.

Castells, M. (2000). La ciudad de la nueva economía (The Citie of the New Economy), Conferencia del 21.II.2000, Salón de Cent del Ayuntamiento de Barcelona. Disponible: http://www.fbg.ub.es.

Castells, M. y Borja, J. (1998). Local y global. La gestión de las ciudades en la era de la información (Local and Global: the cities in the information age). (2ª ed). Madrid: Taurus.

Coser, L. (1976). The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: Free Press.

Crick, B. (2000). Essays on Citizenship. London: Continuum.

De Pablo, A (1998). Los nuevos retos del urbanismo (The new challenges of town planning). Disponible: http://www.lafactoriaweb.com.

Dietrich, H. (1997). La globalización desde una perspectiva social (Globalization from a social perspective). Contacto, VII, (79), 28-29.

Fukuyama, Garton Ash, Cooper, Hobsbawm, Hassner, Luttwark (2000). El orden global en el siglo XXI (The Global Order at the XXI Century). El Cultural, 20. February. 2000.

Giddens, A. (2000). Citizenship Education in the Global Era. En Pearce, N. & Hallgarten, J. (Eds.), Tomorrow's Citizens. Critical Debates in Citizenship and Education, 19-25. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Guardini, R. (1997). Virtú (Virtue). Brescia: Morcelliana.

Guardini, R. (2000) Cartas sobre la formación de sí mismo (Letters on self-formation). Madrid: Palabra.

Hall, S. (2000). Multicultural citizens, monocultural citizenship. En Pearce, N. y Hallgarten, J. (Eds.), Tomorrow's Citizens. Critical Debates in Citizenship and Education. London: Institute for Public Policy Research, 43-51.

Kymlicka, W. (1996). Ciudadanía multicultural. Barcelona: Paidós. (Multicultural Citizenship, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995).

Llano, A (2000) Humanismo y tecnología en la sociedad del conocimiento (Humanism and Technology at the Knowledge Society). Revista de Antiguos alumnos IESE, 11-18.

Llano, A. (1999). Humanismo cívico (Civic Humanism). Barcelona: Ariel.

Lynch, J. (1989). Multicultural education in a global society. London: Falmer Press.

Maalouf, A. (1999). Identidades asesinas. Madrid: Alianza Editorial (Les identités meurtrières, Ed. Grasset-Fasquelle, Paris, 1998).

Macedo, S. (2000). Diversity and Distrust. Civic Education in a Multicultural Democracy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

MacIntyre, A. (1999). Dependent Rational Animals. Why human beings need the virtues. Chicago: Open Court.

Marti, M.A. (1999). La convivencia (Living together). (3^a ed). Madrid: Ediciones Internacionales Universitarias.

Naval, C. (1995). Enseñanza y comunicación (Teaching and Communication). Pamplona: Eunsa.

Naval, C. (2000) Ampliar el margen de libertad social Growing Social Freedom). En Educación, Etica y Ciudadanía, IV Congreso Internacional de Filosofía de la Educación, UNED, Madrid.

Naval, C. (2001) Confiar: cuna de la sociabilidad humana (Trust: cradle of human sociability). Costa Rica: Promesa.

Naval, C. y Altarejos, F. (2000). Filosofía de la Educación (Philosophy of Education). Pamplona: Eunsa.

Naval, C. y Laspalas, J. (2000). La educación cívica hoy. Una aproximación interdisciplinar (Civic Education Today. An Interdisciplinary Approach). Pamplona: Eunsa.

Naval, C. y Urpi, C. (2001). Una voz diferente en la educación moral (Moral Education in a Different Voice). Pamplona: Eunsa.

Nussbaum, M. (1997). Educar ciudadanos del mundo (Educating World Citizens). En VVAA, Cosmopolitas o patriotas. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Parker, W., Ninoniya, A. y Cogan, J. (1999). Educating World Citizens: Toward Multinational Curriculum Development. American Educational Research Journal, 36, (2), 117–145.

Ricoeur, P. (1992). Oneself as Another. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 165-168.

Sennet, R. (2000). La corrosión del carácter. Las consecuencias personales del trabajo en el nuevo capitalismo. Barcelona: Anagrama. (The corrosion of Character. The personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism, W.W. Norton&Company, New York, 1998).

Serra, A. (1999). Tres claves para entender el fenómeno Internet (Keys to understand Internet). Disponible: http://www.lafactoriaweb.com/articulos/serra.htm.

Turkle, S. (1998). La vida en pantalla Barcelona: Paidós Ibérica (Life on the Screen. Identuty in the age of the Internet, Simon&Schuster, New York, 1995).

Tversky, A. (1990). The psychology of Risk. En Sharpe, W. (Ed.), Quantifying the Market Risk Phenomenon for Investment Decision Making. Charlottesville: Institute of Chartered Financial Analysts.

Young, I. M. (1996) Communication and the other: Beyond deliberative democracy. En Benhabib, S. (Ed.), Democracy and difference. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

В ПОИСКАХ ПОСРЕДНИКА

Дмитрий ИВАШИНЦОВ

Протянет ветер шлейф росы вдоль той тропы, где серой цапли немота, где слов пустырь.

Где даже встретив чей-то взгляд спешишь пройти.
А сердце гулко бьет в висок:
Пусти! Пусти!!!

Практически каждый человек периодически испытывает чувство одиночества. При этом, само это чувство многослойно и многомерно: человек и вселенная, человек и общество, человек и его душа. В каждой из этих суперпозиций присутствует проблема притяжения и отталкивания, проблема поиска идентичности, проблема сохранения своего Я. В каждой из них присутствует бинарность, как фундаментальное свойство мироздания.

Когда оцениваешь происходящее с позиций внешнего наблюдателя, создается впечатление о все большей совмещенности людей в пространстве коммуникаций. Все чаще происходит непосредственное общение ранее изолированных членов общества — инвалидов, пожилых пюдей, людей с нарушениями тех или иных функций. При этом преодолеваются не только границы жилища, но государств и материков.

Виртуальное пространство вообще снимает понятие границы, как предела перемещения смыслов. Виртуальная коммуникация игнорирует не только географические и государственные границы, но также границы конфессиональные, гендерные и возрастные.

Все это должно было бы снять проблему одиночества. Одиночества экзистенциального.

Но прав был Бердяев, говорящий, что «объективированный мир никогда не выводит меня из одиночества. И когда Бог становится объектом, то и Бог не выводит меня из одиночества».