



# Journal of Intercultural Management and Ethics

## JIME

ISSN 2601 - 5749, ISSN-L 2601 - 5749

published by

Center for Socio-Economic Studies and Multiculturalism  
Iasi, Romania  
[www.csesm.warter.ro](http://www.csesm.warter.ro)

## TABLE OF CONTENT

Editorial .....	3
Iulian Warter	
Counting on Creativity (Cultural Contexts of Knowledge) .....	7
Slawomir Magala	
Leading Through Language: What Do You Speak (And Hear)? .....	13
Thomas Zweifel	
In Life as on Paper? The Influence of Emotions on Personality Perceptions in an Interactive Setting .....	21
Ursula Hess, Michel Cossette, Shlomo David, Shlomo Hareli	
Ethical Aspects of NATO-EU Cooperation.....	31
Florin Şuhan, Vasile Cocris	
Three Theses on Recognition Culture and Human Security .....	39
Anton Carpinschi	
Universality and Culturalism in the Management of European Projects in Pre-University Education .....	43
Vasile Cocris, Diana Vicol	
Psychological Dimensions of the Political Behavior. Cognition, Emotions and Vote in Romanian Presidential Elections .....	49
Silviu-Petru Grecu	
The Culture of Royalty Political Reintegration. The Case of Romania and Other Eastern- European Experiences in Post-Communism and Before and After EU Accession .....	61
Alexandru Muraru	
Multinational Companies - Between Hope and Disillusion .....	73
Ioana Buhac, Vasile Cocris	
Book Review .....	79
Aurelian Virgil Băluţă	

## THREE THESES ON RECOGNITION CULTURE AND HUMAN SECURITY

Anton Carpinski Ph.D.  
Professor, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University, Iași, Romania  
E-mail: anton.carpinski@gmail.com

### Summary

Inspired by an autoreflexive-therapeutic approach, this study proposes the idea of *culture of recognition as an axiological principle of human securitization*. In this context, the culture of recognition might become a therapy of human securitization, by cultivating the comprehensive attitude with the help of the philosophical conscience and political reasonableness. Three general theses determine this study. The first thesis, an ontological-anthropological one, states that *the-human-mode-of-being predisposed to recognitive and securing behavior is that of assumed fallibility*. The second thesis maintains, for cultural and epistemological reasons, that *the trans-modern spirit favors the culture of recognition because of its comprehensive and recognitive potential*. The third thesis, a praxeological corollary of the previous ones, states that *securitizing the human through the culture of recognition becomes socially possible in a climate of political reasonableness*. The three theses can be operationalized by three hypotheses, as follows: the first hypothesis identifies the hypostasis of *comprehensive being* as a state of wakefulness through which the human capacity of understanding becomes more embracing, more profound, and more participative. The second hypothesis sets out to elaborate *an epistemological model* of the comprehensive being capable of the culture of recognition, by valorizing acquisitions in the philosophy of conscience and cognitive sciences. The third hypothesis advances the *model of the politics with the human face* as an *expression of the comprehensive being in action*.

**Keywords:** the culture of recognition, human security, comprehensive being, philosophical conscience, political reasonableness

Inconvenient and hard to grasp, recognition is difficult to encompass in an inner dialogue and not easily approachable through a systematic research. And yet, the double stake - theoretical and therapeutic – of this present attempt might be stated as follows: *the culture of recognition, a human securitization therapy*. Deriving from this statement is the importance of a theoretical model and of practicing the culture of recognition. This is the objective, significant in my opinion, which I will pursue within an *autoreflexive-therapeutic discourse* on the culture of recognition and human security. Of course, the concepts and options regarding *recognition* as a personal and communitarian act, *the culture of recognition* as a moral phenomenon on both an individual and a collective scale, *human securitization* as a self-referential practice and synthesis, may be different. However, I believe it is important to identify the theme of inquiry and the agenda, as such. Under these circumstances, my option is the following: *the culture of recognition might become a therapy of human securitization, by cultivating the comprehensive attitude with the help of the philosophical conscience and political reasonableness*. The path I will follow suggests now, at the beginning of the road, the guiding theoretical and disciplinary „landmarks”, thus emphasizing the profound connections between the culture of recognition and human security. And so we are already able to see on the path of encounter between the culture of recognition and human security a series of disciplines, from philosophy, theology, the sciences of cognition, theories

of language and discursiveness to studies on security, international relations and political sciences.

Three general theses, true power lines of the discourse, determine this entire essay. The first thesis, an ontological-anthropological one, states that *the-human-mode-of-being predisposed to recognitive and securing behavior is that of assumed fallibility*. A thesis that stipulates the acknowledgement of fallibility and, at the same time, its conversion to innovative-creative actions opposes and, at the same time, correlates *the discontinuity* of personal existences and *the continuity* of the universal Being, the finitude of individual lives and the infinite of the undetermined Being. By acknowledging fallibility as an *existential given* one guesses the natural limit of the human in relation to *the infallibility of Being* as a pure-undetermined-and-universal-act-of-Being. However, at the same time, by assuming fallibility, and thus by converting it into innovative-creative actions, the human being becomes more profoundly aware of the unity and continuity of the Being unto whose background it projects its fragile individual and collective existence. After all, recognizing fallibility is recognizing the discontinuity of human existence, finite and determined in relation to the infallible, infinite and undetermined Being. Converting fallibility into innovation and creation expresses in turn the participation of the human being to the continuity of Being or, at the very least, its undeniable aspiration towards it. Assuming fallibility involves, at the same time, acknowledging a guiding resort, be it the inner voice of conscience, public opinion, the competition of paradigms, the judgment of history or the Holy Grace.

The second thesis maintains, for cultural and epistemological reasons, that *the trans-modern spirit favors the culture of recognition because of its comprehensive and recognitive potential*. If post-modernism is, as it has been stated, a modernism freed from illusions, the trans-modern spirit might validate the idea that the release from illusions must not mean the loss of trust and release from faith. Without illusions, but not without faith! This leads to a certain potential of recognition and trust which would favor the culture of recognition. A necessary distance from the historicist illusion of modernity, as well as from the dissolving relativity of post-modernity might allow the trans-modern spirit to assume the position of a reasonable synthesis. Beyond the deterministic rationalism of modernity and the relativistic deconstructivism of post-modernity, the trans-modern spirit might attempt to reunite reason and belief, physics and metaphysics, existential immanence and transcendence of Being, diversity of phenomena and the systemic unity of essence, nonfoundationalism and necessary founding. “The mistrust of meta-narratives” and the prophetic historicisms of modernity cannot be permanently opposed solely by the irony and estheticism of post-modernity’s semantic games. After having consumed the post-modern intellectual exercises, reasoned up to a point and spectacular to some extent, I believe that a trans-modern reconstruction is called for. Transposing the lights of natural reason in the enlightened horizon of transcendence, this reconstruction would wisely place the fallibility of human existence in front of the infallibility of the universal Being and the dramaticism of anthropocentric humanism closer to the all-embracing theocentric humanism.

The third thesis, a praxeological corollary of the previous ones, states that *securitizing the human through the culture of recognition becomes socially possible in a climate of political reasonableness*. In other words, the social implementation of the culture of recognition through a *policy of assumed reasonableness* provides the social and political frame for human security. A socially implemented culture of recognition is the culture of citizens’ mutual recognition, acquired through the understanding and assuming of cleavages, no matter if they pertain to gender, race, age, or if they are socio-economical, ethnic-cultural, confessional-religious and so on. The long road towards an understanding and acknowledgment of the cleavages - by accommodating and treating equally the different and

possibly divergent positions and interest - cannot be taken without modeling and operationalizing a politics of acknowledged reasonableness. Such an aim would entail: a humanization of power relationships, civic and democratic inclusion, patterning the relations between the public and private realms, an equitably management of resources and distribution of costs, respect for the right to cultural difference and preservation of identity. Consolidating democracy, ordering the relations between the constitutional state and civil society, and educating of the civic spirit are corroborated within the politics of assumed reasonableness which involves denying discrimination, acknowledging the multiple cultural codes and converting opposite ways of life into alternative ways of life.

The general and normative theses that advance would become much more interesting and useful of them on problematized as working hypotheses, usable in empirical-analytical researches and able to be tested in *praxis*. In this context, I employ a hermeneutical research strategy, of conceptual analysis and philosophical problematization within a systemic-interdisciplinary horizon. From this perspective, I propose a set of frame-hypotheses, correlated with the three general theses. Starting out from the thesis of assumed fallibility and from the question “Who might be able to create from the culture of recognition a therapy of human securitization?”, the first hypothesis identifies the hypostasis of *comprehensive being*. As for as we exist < in > and < through > the act of understanding, we become comprehensive beings, aware of the importance of assuming and converting fallibility. As the comprehensive being is a state of wakefulness through which the human capacity of understanding becomes more embracing, more profound, and more participative, it favors acknowledgement of one’s own fallibility and the value of the other, thus making its own the culture of recognition. This hypostasis of human being founds, from an onto-anthropological perspective, the project of the culture of recognition. By answering the question “How does the comprehensive being think and feel?” the second hypothesis sets out to elaborate an *epistemological model* of the comprehensive being capable of the culture of recognition, by valorizing acquisitions in the philosophy of conscience and cognitive sciences. In my opinion, such a model, inspired by trans-modernity, should cognitively evaluate the mental representations of the intellect; explore the comprehensive-rational mechanisms; valorize the speculative intentionality of the transcendental conscience. Finally, the third hypothesis attempts to answer the question “How does the comprehensive being act?”. To what extent are human security and the management of social cleavages possible against the background of the competition for the power to assign resources and distribute costs? The hypothesis of the *politics with a human face as an expression of the comprehensive being in action* is meant to contribute to a reasonable approach to social cleavages and the implementation of the culture of recognition, from the perspective of a *policy of assumed reasonableness*, understood as necessity of a common life and of an increase in the degree of personal and communitarian security. In other words, I intend to: 1) onto-anthropologically establish the culture of recognition by capacitating the fallible man as *comprehensive being*; 2) identify the mental models of the comprehensive being, emphasizing the role of *transcendental conscience*; 3) draft of the strategies of human security policies as expressions of *political reasonableness*. With the discursive practice of articulating concepts and entities, respectively – comprehensive being, transcendental conscience, political reasonableness – I propose a multiply-conditioned concept of the culture of recognition. This has been defined defined *ontologically*, *epistemologically* and *praxeologically* in my book, *Recognition Culture and Human Security* (2012). Such a conceptual model of the culture of recognition might be operational in a therapy of securitizing the person and community.

Down this road we are guided by a series of analytical questions: how is the need for recognition experienced in a world of globalization and multiculturalism? What do we mean by recognition? How about by comprehension? What meanings and purports lay behind these

words, as promising as they are ambiguous? Which are the psycho-cognitive mechanisms that set recognition and comprehension in motion? What is the culture of recognition and which are its constitutive values? Is the culture of recognition possible in the absence of a culture of gratitude? What sort of a man, of society and politics would a culture of recognition inspire? How may one conceive and apply the policy of assumed reasonableness? In seeking the answers, we are left to meditate on the topic and context, operationalization of concepts, and, most of all, verification of the proposed hypotheses and demonstrations.

### **Some bibliographical references**

1. Beck, U. (1999). *What is Globalization?*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
2. Buzan, B., Waever, O., & de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security. A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder Colorado, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
3. Buzan, B., & Hansen, L.(2009). *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Gutmann, A. (1994). *Multiculturalism. Examining the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
5. Kaldor, M. (2007). *Human Security. Reflections on Globalization and Intervention*. London: Polity Press.
6. Kintsch, W. (2007). *Comprehension. A Paradigm for Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Scholte, J. A. (2000). *Globalization. A Critical Introduction*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.