

Eva SVITAČOVÁ, Danka MORAVČÍKOVÁ
Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra, Slovakia.
e-mail: eva.svitacova@uniag.sk, danka.moravcikova@uniag.sk

ENVIRONMENTAL RESPONSIBILITY OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALIZING CULTURE AND ECONOMY

Abstract. The development of global economy goes hand in hand with the cultural change gaining a new place and value in the society. Thus, the globalizing culture develops which is connected with the changes of the world and culture into the market. It acquires an anti-natural as well as antihuman character and it is not compatible with the idea of sustainable life. One of the sub-systems of the culture – global economy – plays there the major role. It is also anti-natural, helps spreading global culture damaging the cultural system, nature and eventually also Man. Young people have become the hope because they are able to realize that the nature is the system with its function and values superordinated to the culture and economy. They will take over the responsibility for not only the global culture but also for the nature.

Keywords: globalizing culture, global economy, global culture, nature, young people

ODPOWIEDZIALNOŚĆ EKOLOGICZNA MŁODYCH LUDZI W KONTEKŚCIE ZGLOBALIZOWANEJ KULTURY I GOSPODARKI

Streszczenie. Rozwój globalnej gospodarki rzutuje również na zmiany w kulturze, która zyskuje w społeczeństwie nowe miejsce oraz nową wartość. Powstaje zglobalizowana kultura, tak zwana kultura światowa, która łączy się z komercjalizacją świata i kultury. Nabiera ona charakteru sprzecznego z naturą oraz człowiekiem i jest nie do połączenia z ideą zrównoważonego rozwoju. Znaczny udział w tym ma jeden z podsystemów kultury – globalna gospodarka. Jest ona również sprzeczna z przyrodą, pomaga w szerzeniu kultury światowej, przez co szkodzi systemowi kultury, przyrodzie oraz samemu człowiekowi. Nadzieją stają się młodzi ludzie, którzy są w stanie uświadomić sobie, że przyroda stanowi system funkcjonalnie i wartościowo nadrzędny w stosunku do kultury i gospodarki. Są oni w stanie wziąć odpowiedzialność nie tylko za globalną kulturę, ale również za przyrodę.

Słowa kluczowe: zglobalizowana kultura, globalna gospodarka, globalna kultura, przyroda, młodzi ludzie

1. Introduction

Globalization takes part in development of the global economy causing the change of culture which gains a new place and value in the society. The culture goes to the same way of 'feeding', and that is the globalizing market economy (Dubnička, 2007). The current globalizing culture is connected with the changes in the world and culture into market, and thus it has anti-natural as well as anti-human character. That happens despite the fact that Man is the creator. Man is not only the creator of the culture but also the "depredator", takes his part in a gradual degradation of environment, destruction of the living conditions on the planet, he is responsible for the deteriorating state and life quality on the Earth. That is not only from the point of view of Man but also from other living forms on the Earth (apart from human being). This phenomenon mainly points at the conflict of the culture and nature representing the system of all the systems, value from all the values and the only home of man and human culture. Mainly Man and young people, who actively and courageously interfere into the original natural conditions and transform them in terms of specific human objectives, are expected to do the following. They should realize the fact that the nature is a system with its functions and values super-ordinated to the culture and economy. It enables them develop the culture without nature suffering – as the super-ordinated host system towards the culture.

2. Culture and anti-nature of a globalized culture

From the point of evolution ontology the nature is the base of all the values, the only home for Man and human culture. The nature cannot be ontologically characterized without the fact that we would consider ontical opposition of the culture towards it (Šmajš, Binka, Rolný, 2012).

The culture on its highest level of abstraction is considered to be universally human phenomenon which enabled the man to get away from nature as the primarily environment (Slušná, 2010). It represents the instrument for survival of "a human animal" "that is not equipped enough by the nature but at the same time it represents the instruments for leading the nature mainly through cultural artefacts and technology. Regarding the fact that the culture was formed in a host environment of biosphere, it has non-natural dimension, it is not in an equal relation with the nature and we label it as the anti-natural. It is an anti-natural system, wildly expanding in a wider natural environment of the Earth on which Man depends. The roots of anti-nature go not only in the structure of human organism but also in the structure of cultural organism (Šmajš, 2003). It has come with human activity, purposeful activity of Man which is nowadays called the "selfish activity of species" "with dangerous

effects for the Earth and Man (Šmajš, Binka, Rolný, 2012). It is called the “overall product of a human attacking an adaptive strategy, as an anti-natural system with its own information and fate depended on Man (Šmajš, 2006).

As it is stated: “The nature appears as a cradle of culture which should focus on a material relation which is in harmony most of the times.” (Dubnička, 2007, p. 38) However, current global culture does not confirm this and the problem arises due to the fact that Man looks down on nature and overlooks its constitutive task in the problems of human ontogenesis. It is worrying that today the humankind realizes only slightly its dependence on natural, mainly unrenewable organic sources.

As A. Giddens points out, a category of an artificial environment or a socializing nature, refers to a changed relationship between human beings and physical environment. „Variety of ecological dangers are in this category developed from the change of the nature by the systems of human cognition.“ (Giddens, 1998, p.115). The fact that mainly in the era of globalization, culture is turning against nature and it is proved by environmental crises, understood by Dubnička as the reaction towards the cultural expansion of Man (Dubnička, 2007).

Even if culture has anti-natural orientation, it should not be seen as the threat. In every season and every part of the world it is important to maintain culture in a dynamic balance with conditions in environment of the Earth. However, due to the fact that anti-natural strategy has not been applied only in a local dimension but in the dimension of the whole planet, the conflict of culture with nature is being bigger. Global changes of the environment happening in the last decades with high intensity and dynamics are connected mainly with exponential growth of human population, with attempts to reach unlimited economic growth as well as with the growth of material consumption, etc.

For U. Beck, an invisible side effect of socialized nature is socializing of damaging damages to the nature and their change into economic, social and political conflicts. Global threats with the new challenges for social and political institutions of highly industrialized global society are caused by disrupting natural conditions (Beck, 2011). It is essential to strengthen their environmental responsibility and regarding the fact that economic institutions take the main part in development of a globalizing culture and they cannot be managed only by economic logic but realize the definitiveness of the ecosystem and responsibly consider the limits of source withdrawals.

3. Globalizing culture and economy as culture's subsystems

Globalizing culture has been currently considered in connection with development of global economy. Thanks to globalization, culture is connected with economic fields to the

amount that it has changed into “the sector with the key function to generate economic benefits.” (Slušná, 2015, p. 6) Z. Bauman in this issue points at the consumption society which is the society of choice and it is culturally conditioned. In the time of so-called “liquid modernism”¹, the culture is bound with the market society or more generally – with consumption society (Petrušek 2010). Similarly, other thinkers (J.Šmajš, G.Lipovetsky, etc.), consider economy not only for culture’s subsystem but also for its significant determinant.

Globalizing culture is limited as a base for creativity in the terms of so-called „new economy“, “cultural and creative industry“ (Kreuzzieger, 2012). It is globalizing culture with developed abiotic technologies which is “burdened and pushed by two similar, for Earth damaging principles: firstly, it is biological setting of Man for attacking adaptive strategy in the sphere of entrepreneurship and secondly, overgrown consumption instinct in the way of people’s lives“ (Šmajš, 2008, p.57). In such culture the anti-naturality grows. Globalizing culture supports consumption way of life and thus also the growth of massive consumption which becomes an essential condition of economic prosperity and economic growth. Economy which accepts from the host natural systems sources, energetic nutrition, should be a subordinated subsystem of culture creating cultural products. It seems to be relatively independent and determined regarding the culture.

Economy is a sub-system of culture and currently it takes a leading place regarding the fact that it creates conditions for meeting various needs of people, enables increasing quality of their life. A serious problem happens due to economic subjects as they place themselves to the role of conquerors and they do not realize the dependence on a natural environment (Dubnička, 2007). The nature is a super-ordinated host system towards culture in a way that it provides energetic nutrition with the help of which it creates cultural products. On the other hand, economy directly harms natural structures, helps damaging (by spreading products on a market, supporting consumption) and produces also production and consumption waste which is not able to be decomposed.

Economy which plays a dominant role in a globalizing culture, has significantly taken part in increasing anti-naturality of culture. As it is stated: “The result of abnormal economic activity in predator’s spiritual paradigm of culture is thus not only dangerous in lowering natural system of the Earth, diminishing the area of natural eco-systems and also damaging Man and nature by artificial technical metabolism. The result is damaged health of living systems, loss of natural information (orderliness), plaguing the Earth by productive and consumption wastes.“ (Šmajš, Binka, Rolný, 2012, p.54)

An increasing interest and attempts of Man to produce and overproduce, there comes encouragement and increase of consumption, supporting the mass consumption which are essential conditions of economic prosperity and growth. Due to this fact, a big social and cultural burden of nature happens. The problem is also that the current Man mainly in

¹ Z. Bauman talks about liquid modernity, liquid modern life and its dangers in the book: *Liquid modernity, times, life in an age of uncertainty*. 2008.

developed countries has not consumed under the pressure of biological necessity but his needs are mainly influenced by offer and marketing activities with the attempt to support consumption. We can agree that: “Nobody or almost nobody in our society does not live with the aim to gain only the most necessary things. With growing consumption, entertainment and bliss, the surplus has been democratically approved and it has become the legitimate desire of masses.” (Lipovetsky, 2013, p.84) Lifestyles and needs of current Man has been more and more adjusted to economic criteria and interests. In connection with economic globalization and global economy, so-called global culture has been considered which can be assigned for one of the main causes of ecological crises². It is stated that ecological crises is not only “socio-cultural phenomenon or “cultural feeling“ of the 20th century. However, it represents the situation of the earthly nature, the state of real being in a global ecosystem and its parts and a cultural situation, the state of values and principles at the same time. It is connected with realizing the limits of ecosystems and sources for growing “giant urbanizing and industrializing expansion“ (Kolářský, Sůša, 1998). It is also connected with realizing anti-natural and anti-human global culture without borders, as well as anti-natural economy focusing on consumption.

4. Anti-naturality and anti-humanity of global culture

Development of global culture is connected with the development of global market and economy. The market is expanding into all cultural fields and thus economic and cultural spheres get closer together. Economy has changed into culture and culture is closely connected with commerce. It is made of combination of mainly organizational principles, such as – market, consumption lifestyle, science and technology, individualism and cultural and communication industry. As Lipovetsky says: “global culture – culture of image, body and consumption is given by the market which has become an universal language in the wild hypercapitalism³. It can be labelled with economic totalitarianism because symbols, cultural meanings, myths and principles create the market which forces the laws of adaptation, flexibility, modernization, etc. (Juvin, Lipovetsky, 2012). It is lead only by economic logic and it deletes all the time spatial limits of consumption. Due to this fact, it behaves irresponsibly towards nature.

² The term „ecological crises“ was discussed in the 70-ties of the 20th century in connection with the risk reflection which were not produced by the natural evolution but human reproduction and socio-economic production. In this time the warning whether the Earth is able to maintain economic growth, population growth and consumption as well as the fastened destruction and devastation of ecosphere by pollution and agricultural methods (Meadows et al. 1972).

³ The current phase of capitalism is called hypercapitalism by G. Lipovetsky.

The socio-cultural burden of natural system is connected with ecological easiness causing damage and falling the natural and it aims towards deepening the global ecological crises. Current economy, which does not attempt to fulfil real needs of people but it evokes new consumption lifestyle, is called anti-natural. This means that it is not compatible with environment. Furthermore, anti-natural also means the global culture supported by the market. Not only the super-ordination of the global culture over the nature but also the loss of respect and acknowledgment of fellowship of Man with surrounding biotic whole, threatens nature and culture as well. Global culture threatens us with the fact that it does not respect the need to maintain sources and original natural condition of urban cultures. Due to the fact that global culture supports aimless consumption, it gradually damages its base. We can agree with Dubnička that „Culture is not anti-natural but paradoxically antihuman character, at least nowadays.“ (Dubnička, 2007, p.41) The author probably meant inappropriate sociocultural burden and development of anti-natural technosphere, in the attempt to increase the bliss of current Man. He points out that Man is the creator of culture which has antihuman character and the Man behaves self-destructively. He has an exclusive place in biodiversity only due to the fact that it „ it threatens the existence of other species and paradoxically also him“. (Dubnička, 2007, p.66) Regarding the growing sociocultural burden of nature connected mainly with the development of consumption economy seriously threatens lives of future generations. Global culture thus can be considered for antihuman culture. It is not sustainable due to the fact that it has been developed on the expense of biosphere.

Development of economy in a new global environment has damaging effects on ecosystem of the Earth and mainly on its biosphere and that is the reason why the globalizing economy is labelled as anti-natural. It means that economy aims towards the mostly organized ontic layer of the planet, against natural ecosystems. Due to the fact that culture has anti-natural character, economy is also anti-natural and helps spreading global culture and damages cultural system, nature and also Man. Currently, economy has a dominant place in the culture, the need to correct its task is growing with the aim not to allow the culture to grow in a new global environment at the expense of nature with the dominant assistance of economy. Lipovetsky indirectly points at this fact by focusing on the changes happening in the eighties and nineties years of the 20th century in connection with so-called “turbocapitalism“. In this times people started to feel threatened and uncertain, indulgence retreated to the fear and existential uncertainty has been replaced by the “postmodern“ levity. It seems that the presence accompanied by anxieties and thus limits of culture focused on the presence. At the same time, it is pleasant that there are more expressions of everything that has permanent value and a hypermodern individual focuses more on future rather than present even if it is the future in the first person singular (Lipovetsky, 2013). We can hope that in such connection the principal dependence of globalizing culture – global culture on nature will contribute to the fact that Man will become environmentally responsible individual. As it is stated, the hypothesis under which environmental responsibility should be understood more

as a political and legal rather than moral category supports also the concept of human rights (Šťáhel, 2015). We assume that it is mainly the ethical category which deserves attention in every educational system.

5. Strengthening environmental responsibilities of young people in the context of globalizing culture and economy

An attempt and aim of several governments in the world is to create such environmental politics which would prevent main causes of damaging environment. One of the possibilities how to follow this aim is to implement current issues into the educational systems, topics or subjects which acknowledge young people about actual questions regarding nature and culture. They should be aware of the situation in which the environment is.

“The part of modern development of social subjects increase their culture and ethics“ (Fobel, 2004, p.51) Thus the young people who receive quality education in these fields are able to realize that nature is a system super-ordinated to the culture and economy. They become the hope that they will take over responsibility for global culture and also the nature. Hans Jonas who conceived environmental responsibility as an ethical category, points out the fact that the nature of human dealing has changed and the subject of completely new order – biosphere of the whole planet is something which we should be responsible for (Jonas, 1997). Similarly as J. Šmajš talks about threatened culture, H. Jonas deals with threatened future and in such connection he calls for responsibility. He also warns about new dimensions of responsibilities connected with development of modern technologies. He thinks that thanks to environmental responsibility of people living on the Earth, the ecological catastrophe can be prevented and he adds a new responsibility – the responsibility for maintaining the life of humankind on the Earth. It is the ethics of maintaining, protection and prevention (Jonas 1997). It represents a considerate relation of culture and the Earth and we agree with J. Šmajš that in opposed to the traditional education the leading idea in education should be “an economical renting relation of the culture to the Earth“ (Šmajš, 2008). This presumes such education for young people which enables them getting to know an absolute priority of life, compatibility of culture and nature. It should lean on a bio philia education, strengthening environmental awareness and clarification of a possible rate of civilization interference into environment without the fact that the stability of ecosystem would be harmed (ibid). Secondly, the real assumption is that thanks to this, they would reach ecological literacy which covers ecological awareness and an ecological world view towards harmony of Man and Earth, i.e. competence to process information, implement them and use by acting in different activities of everyday life (Klimková, 2015).

Ecological literacy covers environmental responsibility which should respect a new imperative by H. Jonas: “Act in a way that the effects of your action should be compatible with the duration of real human life on the Earth.” (Jonas, 1997, p.35) It means that young people should realize the fact that natural sources are more and more burdened by productive and non-productive activities and the social and cultural burden of nature happens and these cause negative changes in the environment. Then, they should prevent changing economy into culture.

6. Conclusion

Current understanding of culture touches the wide field of economy, fairness as well as cultural differentiation of human rights. Culture in the society does not represent symbolic extension but actively takes part in changing the touchable world, production and business. This is how we go down from the noble sphere of culture to cultural capitalism, in which the cultural and communication industry becomes an instrument of economic growth and in so-called “cultural economy“. The real world of production presents itself as the world of culture and the culture brings economic demands (Juvin, Lipovetsky, 2012).

A deepening battle between nature and culture is a fatal effect of development of globalizing culture in which the man builds his own world – the human world. The essential part takes global economy on this counter-productive effect of globalization, or planetary culture which is not compatible with an idea of sustainable life.

This reality should be clear to every citizen of the Earth and extremely important is to teach young people about it. This is one of the ways of how to strengthen their environmental responsibility.

Bibliography

1. Beck U.: Riziková společnost. Na cestě k jiné moderně. 2. vyd. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství. 2011.
2. Bauman Z.: Tekuté časy, život ve věku nejistoty. Praha: Academia, 2008.
3. Dubnička I.: Kultúra a environmentálna kríza. Nitra: UKF v Nitre, 2007.
4. Fobel P.: Aplikovaná etika v dialógu kultúr, [in:] Etika, kultúra a multikultúrny dialóg. Banská Bystrica: UMB, 2004, s. 51-57.
5. Giddens A.: Důsledky modernity. 1. vyd. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství, 1998. 195s.

6. Jonas H.: Princip odpovědnosti. Pokus o etiku pro technologickou civilizaci. Praha: Oikoymenh, 1997.
7. Juvín H., Lipovetsky G.: Globalizovaný Západ. Polemika o planetární kultúře. 1.vyd.Praha: PROSTOR, 2012.
8. Klimková A.: Prípadosť - komunikácia - ekologická etika. 1.vyd.Košice: FF UPJŠ v Košiciach, 2015.
9. Kolářský R., Sůša O.: Filosofie a současná ekologická krize. 1.vyd.Praha FÚ AV, 1998.
10. Kreuzzieger M.: Kultura v době zrychlené globalizace. 1.vyd.Praha: Filozofia. 2012.
11. Lipovetsky G.: Hypermoderní doba. Od požitku k úzkosti. 1.vyd.Praha: PROSTOR, 2013.
12. Meadows et al.: The limits to growth. A Report for the club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind. New York: Universe Books, 1972.
13. Pertusek M. :,Zygmunt Bauman: ‚tropika diskursu‘, slovo o pop- kultúře a spotřební společnosti epochy ‚tekuté modernity‘.“ Sociologický časopis.: Praha. 2010. vol. 46 (5) s. 801-820.
14. Slušná Z.: Ľudský a spoločenský rozmer kultúry. Témy a trendy súčasného myslenia o kultúre. Národná osveta, 2010, 3-4, s. 23-28.
15. Slušná Z.: Súčasná kultúrna situácia z pohľadu teórie a praxe. 1.vyd.Bratislava: UK v Bratislave. 2015.
16. Sťahel R.: Environmentálna zodpovednosť a environmentálna bezpečnosť. Filozofia, 2015, roč. 70, č. 1, s. 1-12.
17. Šmajš J.: Civilization (Culture) – a Theme for Contemplation. Životné prostredie, 2003, Vol. 37, No. 5, s. 229 – 232.
18. Šmajš J.: Ohrozená kultúra. Od evolučnej ontológie k ekologickej politike. 1.slovenské vydanie. Banská Bystrica: PRO Banská Bystrica. 2006.
19. Šmajš J.: Potřebujeme filosofii přežití? 1.vyd. Brno: Doplněk, 2008.
20. Šmajš J., Binka B., Rolný I.: Etika, ekonomika, příroda. Praha: Grada Publishing a.s., 2012.