

Pleading for Culture

Ștefan GROSU, PHD Student
Bucharest University, Romania,
Fellow, POSDRU/ 159/1.5/S/13/6077 Project, Romanian Academy¹
stefangrosu@gmail.com

Abstract

Culture designates “the tools through which the human polishes himself and develops his multiple spiritual and physical gifts.”² The humans interact and change opinions and become conscious that they belong to a global cultural space and are also “authors of the culture of their own community.”³ Through these tools human “exerts to disobey the world, humanizes social, family and physical life, through progress of mores and institutions, in the end human, expresses, communicates and keeps in its operas, during the times, its great major experiences, because them to serve the progress... of whole human people.”⁴ The human valorizes itself but also contributes to the progress of society. Today we talk about the plurality of culture through which is opened the path to the cultural dissemination and perfection. In this way, the humans get a responsibility towards the cultural progress of their community which is anchored in global community, and then appears the question: “what must be done so that all the humans of the world to participate to cultural gods?”⁵ It is observed here a “spiritual and moral maturity of humans,”⁶ defined as “new humanism”.⁷ This new type of humanism is not a simple talk, but it represents a new “type of responsibility towards human and towards history.”⁸ In this way, it appears the need of a new type of education because the nowadays human must be prepared to become creator and responsible to integrate in a global culture based on values as “intelligence, will, conscience and human fraternity.”⁹

Keywords: culture, diversity, humanism, responsibility, education.

¹ This paper is supported by the Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources Development (SOP HRD), financed from the European Social Fund and the Romanian Government under the contract number SOP HRD /159/1.5/136077.

² “Gaudim et Spes” (Joy and Hope), in *Conciliul Vatican II* (Vatican II Council) (Bucharest: Arhiepiscopia Romano-Catolică Publishing House, 1999), 53.

³ “Gaudim et Spes,” 55.

⁴ *Ibidem.*

⁵ “Gaudim et Spes,” 56.

⁶ Vladimir Petercă, *Calea spre oameni* (Iași: Sapienția, 2011), 734.

⁷ “Gaudim et Spes,” 55.

⁸ Petercă, *loc. cit.*, 734.

⁹ *Ibidem.*

The Definition of Culture

The human who is taken out of the cultural society where he is anchored loses his significance, and then it becomes necessary the study of the concrete and alive human reported to “personality and culture”¹⁰ beginning from “all the sufferings, all the strivings and all the limits”¹¹ which are capable to offer “the measure of human.”¹² Thence the human belongs to a cultural space,¹³ he is anchored in a cultural history and then he is “in a way a human of his time.”¹⁴ The human cannot live without the culture of his time, from which he “takes his sap from his actual existence”¹⁵ and pleads for the culture of his time.

Nowadays the humanity passes through deep changes as consequence of the intensification of creative human activity. As consequence the conditions of life have improved and it can be talked about technological explosion but also of a culture specific to this time. The type writer was replaced by computers which became more and more advanced and it is put the problem if the human will be overdraw by computer. The actual time is characterized by an acceleration of different (economical, social, political) aspects of human life, and human does not have time to adapt to this global culture that suffocates him.¹⁶ Under these circumstances it is reached to the difficult definition of actual culture because the word is in this context about “distinctive notes: the so called exact sciences develop... the critic sense; recent psychology researches explain... the human activity; the historical disciplines contributes... to the approach of things under their changing and evolutionary aspect; the life styles and customs become

¹⁰ Gheorghită Geană, *Antropologie Culturală*, ed. G. Stănescu (Bucharest: Criterion, 2005), 67.

¹¹ *Ibidem*.

¹² *Ibidem*.

¹³ The cultural space is described in the acceptance of C. Mesaroş. To be seen Claudiu Mesaroş, “Prefață,” in *Filosofia Sfântului Gerard în context cultural și biografic*, coord. Claudiu Mesaroş (Szeged: Jate Press, 2014), 7.

¹⁴ Wilhelm Dancă, *Și cred și gândesc* (Bucharest: Arhiepiscopia Romano-Catolică Publishing House, 2013), 153.

¹⁵ M. A. Raschini, “Premessa”, in A. Rosmini, *L'introduzione del Vangelo secondo Giovanni comentata* (Roma: a cura di Annalisa Capuzzi, Città Nuova Editrice, 2002), 2.

¹⁶ Adriana M. Macsut, “Consumism și anticonsumism, Platon și Prozac,” in *Virtual Philo Café 2013*, Ștefan Grosu, Adriana M. Macsut, Stănculescu Daniela, Ana Maria Gajdo, Lesenciuc Ioan (Bačau: Rovimed, 2013), 226. “The modernism brought industrialization, and then came the postmodernism with automatization, robotisation and of two decades the computational explosion. There is not now as example the typing, but a pompousness term called desktop publishing. The old typewriter stays sad in a drawer, because its place was taken by the more and more performance computer. The actual characteristic of lived time is the acceleration of social, political and economical culture, and thus human becomes more alone if front of avalanche of information”.

uniform.”¹⁷ The technological progress determines the industrialization and urbanization and leads to new forms of culture from which result “new ways of feeling, of acting.”¹⁸ In this way it is reached the cultural diversity, but this diversity needs also a pleading for universal human culture which “promotes and expresses the unity of the nation”¹⁹ and “respects the particularities of different cultures.”²⁰ It is reached to formative cultural idea such a fixed idea ”so it is told by Berlioz until the end in the Fantastic Symphony.”²¹

Overall, the culture designates “the tools through which the human polishes and develops his multiples spiritual and physical gifts.”²² The culture follows the obeying of the world “through knowledge and work”²³ and has in view the humanization of life in “social, family... and civic acceptance through the progress of customs and institutions.”²⁴ It represents “a social and historical aspect,”²⁵ but it does not lose the view of “sociological and even ethnological sense.”²⁶ Then it is reached to the debate about plurality and diversity of cultures, specifically to a historical and social environment and also to each human in part. From this diversity results different styles of life and a classification of values. From this diversity of values and styles it must result a cultural formative idea (previously mentioned). It must be vast because it contains close and far approaches so to be “a distinguished sign... a style that keeps together the most different themes of the world.”²⁷ Also it must prove to have a deep sense which overdraws the restricted frame marked by a passed fashion. Culture succeeds, in this way, to bring apologetics into attention in an actual form: “it right who sees more, who is capable to contain more, even contradictory things which in other part appears as isolated.”²⁸ The word here is about a unity and also about a cultural polyphony which results from the modern cultural life and which “in Christian conscience... is translated as dichotomy between pneuma and institution.”²⁹ To be specified that

¹⁷ “Gaudim et Spes,” 54.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*.

²⁰ *Ibidem*.

²¹ Hans Urs Von Balthasar, *Despre opera sa*, trans. W. Tauwinkl, ed. S. Hodiş (Târgu Lăpuş: Galaxia Gutenberg, 2005), 80.

²² “Gaudim et Spes,” 53.

²³ *Ibidem*.

²⁴ *Ibidem*.

²⁵ *Ibidem*.

²⁶ *Ibidem*.

²⁷ Von Balthasar, *loc. cit.*, 80.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, 86.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, 87.

this paper “starts from the power to unite that to humans could appear as hopeless or fragmentary.”³⁰ The word is about an art of integration through catholicity which is different of integralism. It results a catholic culture throw which it is in view the whole humanity, but also divine immensity which is “bigger than our power of expression, given that scarcely this Bigger, animates our entire Christian life.”³¹

About Diversity, Anthropology and Humanism in Cultural Approach

1. CULTURAL DIVERSITY

We can talk about cultural diversity in the sense of “the ways of using things, of working, of expressing, of practicing religion, of constituting customs, of legislating, of creating juridical institutions, of developing sciences and handicrafts and cultivating the beauty.”³²

In the Occidental sense, based on Greek-Roman culture, this cultural diversity is represented through “the intension of enrolling the *alteration* of Nature which, outside and prior surprises, the direct identity that the Identical represents from the human self.”³³ The human identity must take into account the opinion of the partner of dialogue in the sense that it is teathed “the alteration of the partner of dialogue, what he affirms.”³⁴ It is imposed a qualitative thinking but also quantitative. It results that there is a cultural formative idea based on the global spiritual culture, and also approach based on “the relation with what unites us and what separates us.”³⁵ It is not anyway exaggerate, in this context, the reporting to a cultural ecumenism, and Catholic Church being anchored in actuality becomes conscious about the launched challenge of the modern frame and “enters in dialogue with the world, with other Churches, and *ecclesial* communities”³⁶ reaching to an interrogation on the principle “rather challengers than irrelevant.”³⁷ The word is not in any case about relativism, but of a religious and spiritual cultural global level. The invocation of Church must not be seen as “a group of

³⁰ *Ibidem*, 86.

³¹ *Ibidem*.

³² “Gaudim et Spes,” 53.

³³ Emmanuel Levinas, *Între noi. Încercare de a-l gândi pe celălalt*, trans. Ioan Petru Deac (Bucharest: Bic All, 2000), 180.

³⁴ Dancă, *Și cred și gândesc*, 41.

³⁵ *Ibidem*.

³⁶ *Ibidem*, 33.

³⁷ Camillo Ruini, *Chiesa contestata. 10 tesi a sostegno del cattolicesimo* (Edizioni Piemme, Casale Monferrato, 2007), 6.

power”³⁸ that follows to build a reality. Through the invocation of relativism it is forgotten that the religion has as goal the humanization of the human culture. The humans come to be afraid to talk in public about religious culture because they are afraid that such discussion attacks the freedom of another. The actual world is characterized by the quickly challenges and it is imposed the condition that the human doesn’t fail into “an individualistic ethics”³⁹ and goes to a culture of autonomy which is “a profound atheist culture”⁴⁰ and selfish. The human history and implicitly this atheist culture, and in this acceptance, “God who transcends creation itself, He is voided.”⁴¹

2. ABOUT CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY

The social and historical environment is inserted in the human “of every kind and epoch... who wins his values”⁴² through which he promotes the civilization and the culture where he is anchored. It goes then to the cultural anthropology which is a “study of human – in some fundamental hypostasis... – such as could be... community – through his behavior in standardized forms, even these have some cultural patterns, customs and institutions.”⁴³

Anthropology does not refer to study of the societies being in the primitive stage, but focuses on the research of human condition. Referring to the sense of the term, we use “the etymological cleavage – *anthropos* = *human*, *logos* = *science*, tells everything.”⁴⁴ This science appeared later because human his object of study was difficult to be analyzed. In this difficult context the report is to “individual (as personality) and anthroposphere (as a planetary projection of the species).”⁴⁵ These constitute “human-existential unities, hypostasis of human gender”⁴⁶ which are inserted in human culture and are not anyway “static, inert... empty forms.”⁴⁷ The human, anchored in a global culture, is integrated as individual in “family, community, nation, anthroposphere.”⁴⁸ In this point it becomes necessary the approach of the concept of *corporate personality*, an illustrated objective reality in

³⁸ Dancă, *Și cred și gândesc*, 33.

³⁹ “Gaudim et Spes,” 30.

⁴⁰ Levinas, *Între noi*, 182.

⁴¹ *Idem*, *Dificila libertate. Eseuri despre iudaism*, trans., notes and postface of T. Goldstein (Bucharest: Hasefer, 2000), 180.

⁴² “Gaudim et Spes,” 53

⁴³ Geană, *Antropologie Culturală*, 39.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, 66.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, 71.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*.

the human that composes it.⁴⁹ The human generations reported to *corporate personality* from a global culture “are inherited in a perfect unity, those far gone are found in the present ones, due to an alive relation between them, that is the past and the future are superimposed in an organic way.”⁵⁰ Cultural anthropology about human takes into account the human corporate personality. Culture has in this acceptance a significance that is related to human existence. Under these circumstances, the cultural anthropology is defined as “human behavior based on norms, on the scale of existential-human unities where human incarnates concrete.”⁵¹ The norms refer to pleading for culture and their role is to show that a human cultural behavior becomes normative. In this sense, an individual who is part of a group is not allowed to disobey the culture arisen from custom. Certainly not any manifestation or gesture has a cultural significance, but only “the entities... in which are incarnated the hypostasis of the human reality.”⁵² In the cultural acceptance it is reached, in this way, to the forming of a “pattern, that is a configuration, a system.”⁵³ The modification of life condition led to intellectual and anthropological transformations which, at their turn, moderate culture. But, at its turn, the human culture cannot exist without a culture of life. The humans of the whole world who are anchored in global culture have the mission to plead for culture in general, but this at its turn cannot exist without a culture of life. So pleading for this culture of life is the charge of the whole humans and also of every human. The word is about a proclamation and celebration of *The Gospel of Life*.⁵⁴

Celebrating of *The Gospel of Life*, the human is called to look contemplatively at the fullness of life that gives life. In this way are appreciated and valued the gestures and customs of different traditions of different people, but is also built a community culture which pleads for unity in diversity. The human nation is today attracted into a global culture that brings accelerated challenges. The anthropologic frame, marked of expectations, strivings caused by the creative

⁴⁹ H. Wheeler Robinson, “The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality,” in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, ed. Johannes Hempel, *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. 66 (Berlin: Töpelmann Verlag, 1936), 46-62.

⁵⁰ Vladimir Petercă, *Regele Solomon în Biblia ebraică și cea grecească*, preface of F. Băltăceanu (Iași: Polirom, 1999), 16.

⁵¹ Geană, *Antropologie culturală*, 74.

⁵² *Ibidem*, 74.

⁵³ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁴ *Evangelium vitae*, 110. “Sent to life as a people for life, our annunciation must become also a celebration of The Gospel of Life. Scarcely this celebration, through the evocated power of its gestures, symbols and rite, must become a precious and significance place of transmission the beauty and greatness of this Gospel.”

human activity, leads to “a true social and cultural transformation, which is reflected also in the religious life.”⁵⁵

3. THE HUMAN BECOMING

It was previously mentioned that the human is related to historical environment. Thence the human is not alone, but has a history of his becoming through which he obtains the cultural values which define him. So it is reached to “the explanations of nature in the becoming of human.”⁵⁶ The culture cannot exist without reporting to the becoming of human because only human has a history of his becoming: “human is not human, but becomes human.”⁵⁷ In this human becoming can intercede a dramatic moment of suicide when human cut, in a voluntary manner, the way of his becoming. It is observed that humans tend to put too much accent only on material goods and appreciates “only meant objects to procure material goods which put us into evidence, most of the times, not for meritorious facts.”⁵⁸ It could be told that there is a philosophical confrontation between “the philosophy of life”⁵⁹ and “the philosophy of muscles.”⁶⁰ The quotation of consumerist society is: *live a full life*. Thus everything must be lived and experienced because “over life cannot be anything, life can only be understood only through life.”⁶¹ The philosophy dedicated to life appears in this case of consumerist society and could be characterized by a formalist character, and “the philosophy of muscles” is subordinated to practical interest and gives birth to a philosophy that pretends to have the “phobia of intelligence,”⁶² but in reality is “sceptical, dilettante, emotional, in a word a genuine philosophical *dandyism*.”⁶³ The word is about a pragmatic thought through which it is intended to set criteria for human to feel comfortable in life. But can happiness be really ordered? Under these circumstances, the philosopher must create “only such concepts that satisfy our inward, they tickle our little interests of life.”⁶⁴ It is intended to reach to a kind of objective conscience through which are established comfortable life criteria but in reality it is suppressed the sensibility of human self. Certainly the philosophy

⁵⁵ “Gaudim et Spes,” 4.

⁵⁶ Mircea Florian, *Introducere în filosofia istoriei* (Bucharest: Garamond, 1997), 33.

⁵⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁸ Emil I.V. Socec, “Forewords,” in Mircea Florian, *Rostul și utilitatea filosofiei* (Bucharest: Fundațiunea I.V. Socec Publishing House, 1935), 5.

⁵⁹ Florian, *Rostul și utilitatea filosofiei*, 105.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*.

⁶² *Ibidem*.

⁶³ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, 116.

cannot take the place of human life, it must “only light it, guide it in the chaos of the heart.”⁶⁵ On the other hand nor “the philosophy of muscles”⁶⁶ or precisely pragmatic must not believe that it could transform the world “into a society insuring and satisfying all earthly needs.”⁶⁷ The philosophy must not turn its back to life, because a historical analysis shows that decadent philosophy finds itself in relation with “the partition of human interests, too human.”⁶⁸ The philosophical sense must not be tempted by “the blinding chaff of facts,”⁶⁹ but to search for an ideal, “a peak of thought... from where human can look right and left, forth and back, up and down.”⁷⁰

Usually in life it is talked in a pragmatic way about “the elevating with the lift and the airplane,”⁷¹ but in a spiritual way is only a temporary elevation because the spirit needs “a psychic elevation... seen spiritually.”⁷² Under these circumstances, the philosophy has the vocation to plead for the culture of life. The philosophical research cannot limit to “the reflection on itself and on existence.”⁷³ The simple reflection on personal self is “the story of a personal adventure, of a private soul, coming incessantly back to itself.”⁷⁴ It is inexcusable the indifference related to suffering, because the mission of a civilization anchored in a culture of life is “to feed humans and to relieve their sufferings.”⁷⁵

The human becoming and the culture of life report to the fact of being and taking care of being. It’s about of being human without hurting other human being because even “nature teaches you what to do... because it accompanies you in ministry.”⁷⁶ The dialogue, the collaboration, the charity and the solidarity must not be simple words from the global cultural inheritance because “only a harmonious collaboration can avoid the defeat of the civilization.”⁷⁷

⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, 119.

⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, 105.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*, 109.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, 114.

⁷¹ *Ibidem*.

⁷² *Ibidem*, 116.

⁷³ Levinas, *Între noi*, 19. To be seen also Ștefan Grosu, “Despre scopul vieții în sens filosofic,” *Cronica de Fălticeni*, October 2, 2014.

⁷⁴ Levinas, *Între noi*, 19.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, 100.

⁷⁶ Anselm de Canterbury, *De ce s-a făcut Dumnezeu om*, translations, introductory study and notes of E. Grosu (Iași: Polirom, 1997), 153. To be seen also moral aspects in human life, presented by M. Sinaci, *Normativitate și bioetică. Aspecte filosofice contemporane* (Cluj Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2014), 38.

⁷⁷ *Evangelium vitae*, 121.

4. THE HUMAN AND ITS CULTURE

Through the act of becoming, human comes to understanding, knowing and promoting the cultural values of the historic environment where he is inserted. Nowadays we talk about the plurality of cultures through which is opened the path to cultural spreading and perfection. The humans interact, change opinions and become aware that they belong to a global cultural space, but are also “the authors of the culture of their own community.”⁷⁸

Every human is developing in a cultural space, so it can be talked about a human and his formative culture. It's about the culture transmitted through “the language of... the social interactions”⁷⁹ which are reflected in the human personality. In social interaction, cultural human affirms only through a non-violence ethics. The humans who do not have enough cultural formation tend to appeal to custom based only on “particular examples transmitted through myths, habits, traditions,”⁸⁰ and in this way they motivate their “aggressive manifestations in every context and level of social organizations.”⁸¹ So, the reflection shows that it's about infiltration of the selfish poison of subjectivity.

The recessivity of Mircea Florian points out that the life which is reported to “the ethical recessive dualisms, has proper characters, irreducible, brings into the world something new, but not a novelty created out of nothing, but a novelty with prevital prefigurations through which is facilitated the recessive passing to conscience, an original essence, irreducible, «an eternal possibility» of the existence.”⁸² The idea of recessivity is new in the philosophical field, being introduced by Mircea Florian and the goal of the exegesis is to show “now it can think... with the idea of recessivity.”⁸³ The research establishes, in this sense, that the recessivity constitutes an ethical approach is established “the report between life and moral, from instinct and reason.”⁸⁴ The ethics becomes a recessive

⁷⁸ “Gaudim et Spes,” 55.

⁷⁹ Oana Lența, “Dezirabilul reafirmării eticii non-violenței. Rolul poveștilor identitare în descoperirea de sine,” in *Paradigme Umaniste. Explorări în tradiție și actualitate*, coord. Marius Cucu (Suceava: Universitatea Ștefan cel Mare Publishing House, 2013), 166.

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, 168.

⁸¹ *Ibidem*.

⁸² Mircea Florian, *Recesivitatea ca structură a lumii*, vol. II (Bucharest: Eminescu, 1987), 202, 204. To be seen also Ștefan Grosu, “De la acțiunea morală la etica prospectivă - rolul eticianului,” in *Repere ale gândirii în filosofia lui Mircea Florian*, Marius Eși, A. M. Gajdo, Ștefan Grosu, Adriana M. Macsut, Narcisa Posteuță (Bacău: Rovimed, 2014), 53-101; Ștefan Grosu, *etică și recesivitate în concepția lui Mircea Florian*, PHD Thesis, *manuscript*.

⁸³ Gheorghe Vlăduțescu, *Neconvențional, despre filosofia românească* (Bucharest: Paideia, 2003), 83.

⁸⁴ *Ibidem*, 9.

counterweight to violence, and the human life is a demarche through which love puts brakes to violence. This violence is related with disequilibrium which is “embedded in the human heart,”⁸⁵ in the sense that inside the human being is a fight. The human is tempted to surpass his limits and to feel unlimited through his wishes. Along his life human is forced to give up to his unlimited wishes. Inside the human being feels torn apart, and then “appear... great disruptions in society.”⁸⁶ Scarcely the human must be aware that he is the one who orders the cultural reality where he lives and depends of him “the good orientation of the forces that he himself has put in motion and can crunch him or serve him.”⁸⁷

5. THE NEW HUMANISM

The humans, men and women, have the conscience that they are the founders of their own culture. They have to discover that through culture is understood the totality of spiritual goods of a nation and of the whole world. Then, “in the whole world grows... the sense... of responsibility, thing... of great... importance for the spiritual maturity of humankind.”⁸⁸

The human is reported to humanism, a term that designates “at day break of Middle Age, the great perspective of renewal the vision about human, starting from the discovery of the antic human model through the Italian Renaissance.”⁸⁹ Anyway here is not about the break of the divine model, but about the highlight of the divine in the human.⁹⁰ But nowadays it is needed “the new humanism through which the human is defined through... the responsibility toward his brothers in history.”⁹¹

The Need of Responsibility and Education in Cultural Domain

1. THE CULTURAL RESPONSIBILITY

The human has a responsibility towards the cultural progress of their community which is anchored in the global community, and then appears the question: “what must be done so the whole human of the world to participate to cultural goods?”⁹² They must be educated “in the view of an integral culture and

⁸⁵ “Gaudim et Spes,” 9.

⁸⁶ *Ibidem.*

⁸⁷ *Ibidem.*

⁸⁸ “Gaudim et Spes,” 55.

⁸⁹ Cucu, “Cuvânt înainte,” in *Paradigme Umaniste*, 1.

⁹⁰ *Ibidem.*

⁹¹ “Gaudim et Spes,” 55.

⁹² “Gaudim et Spes,” 56.

get “the capacity and responsibility to assimilate in a creator and responsibility way”⁹³ the cultural values.

2. THE RESPONSIBILITY TOWARDS HUMANS AND HISTORY

Mircea Florian is an optimistic ethicist who concludes that the happy future “of the humanity is ensured through the flourish of an authentic moral of love”⁹⁴ which is not *a utopia*, but a main “condition of a «progress».”⁹⁵ So, the recessive ethics of Mircea Florian promotes the victory of good and it is reached to “*the prospective ethics* which... foreshadows the ideal world of «what that might be»”.⁹⁶ The *recessive ethics* and *prospective ethics* become paths through which human brakes the violent impetus in the world through reason and love, and so, the *future* becomes responsible through claiming responsibility because human being “moral *being*... cannot abdicate from the claiming of the responsibility.”⁹⁷

Every human has a history and he is anchored in the historical environment of his epoch.

It appears the question what has human to do in this moment when he is confronting with complicate problems of modern world. There is “industrialization, urbanization and other causes that... create new forms of culture.”⁹⁸ It is imposed “a fruitful and an authentic dialogue”⁹⁹ but also responsible for the whole human family.¹⁰⁰ It is not a simple word, but it represents a new type “responsibility face to human and history.”¹⁰¹

3. THE NEED OF EDUCATION

It appears the need of a new kind of education because the human from nowadays must be prepared to become creator and responsible toward to integrate in a global culture based on values as “able-minded, will, conscience and human fraternity.”¹⁰²

⁹³ *Ibidem*.

⁹⁴ Florian, *Recesivitatea*, vol. II, 202, 204.

⁹⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁹⁶ Sorin T. Maxim, *Peripathetice* (Iași: Pim, 2010), 23. To specify that prospective ethics an original concept introduced by Sorin T. Maxim.

⁹⁷ *Ibidem*, 179.

⁹⁸ “Gaudim et Spes,” 54.

⁹⁹ “Gaudim et Spes,” 54.

¹⁰⁰ “Gaudim et Spes,” 56.

¹⁰¹ Petercă, *Calea spre oameni*, 734.

¹⁰² *Ibidem*. Spiritual aspects of teaching can be seen in Adriana M. Macsut, “Aspecte ale teologiei spirituale în concepția Sfântului Gerard de Cenad,” in Mesaroș, *Filosofia Sfântului Gerard*, 107.

Bibliography:

1. Anselm de Canterbury. *De ce s-a făcut Dumnezeu om* (Why God Became Human). Translation, introductory study and notes of E. Grosu. Iași: Polirom, 1997.
2. Balthasar, Urs Hans Von. *Despre opera sa* (About his Work). Translated by W. Tauwinkl, edited by S. Hodiș. Târgu Lăpuș: Galaxia Gutenberg, 2005.
3. Cucu, Marius. "Cuvânt înainte" (Foreword). In *Paradigme Umaniste. Explorări în tradiție și actualitate* (Human Paradigms. Explorations in Tradition and Actuality). Coordinator Marius Cucu. Suceava: Ștefan cel Mare University Publishing House, 2013.
4. Dancă, Wilhelm. *Și cred și gândesc* (Also I Believe and Think). Bucharest: Arhiepiscopia Romano-Catolică Publishing House, 2013.
5. Florian, Mircea. *Rostul și utilitatea filosofiei* (The Aim and the Utility of Philosophy). Bucharest: Fundațiunea I. V. Socec Publishing House, 1935.
6. Florian, Mircea. *Recesivitatea ca structură a lumii* (Recesivity as Structure of the World), vol. II. Attended edition, note and postface by N. Gogoneață and I. C. Ivanciu. Bucharest: Eminescu, 1987.
7. Florian, Mircea. *Introducere în filosofia istoriei* (Introduction in the History of Philosophy). Bucharest: Garamond, 1997.
8. "Gaudim et Spes" (Joy and Hope). In *Conciliul Vatican II* (Vatican II Council). Bucharest: Arhiepiscopia Romano-Catolică Publishing House, 1999.
9. Geană, Gheorghică. *Antropologie Culturală* (Cultural Anthropology). Editor G. Stănescu. Bucharest: Criterion, 2005.
10. Grosu, Ștefan. "De la acțiunea morală la etica prospectivă - rolul eticianului" (From Moral Action to Prospective Ethics). In *Repere ale gândirii în filosofia lui Mircea Florian* (Markers of the Thought in the Philosophy of Mircea Florian). Marius Eși, Ana Maria Gajdo, Ștefan Grosu, Adriana M. Macsut, Narcisa Posteuca. Bacău: Rovimed, 2014.
11. Grosu, Ștefan. "Despre scopul vieții în sens filosofic" (About the Scope in the Philosophical Sense). *Cronica de Fălticeni* (Cronicle of Falticeni), October 2, 2014.
12. Grosu, Ștefan. *etică și recesivitate în concepția lui Mircea Florian* (Ethics and Recesivity in the Conception of Mircea Florian). Phd Thesis, *manuscript*.
13. Lența, Oana. "Dezirabilul reafirmării eticii non-violenței. Rolul poveștilor identitate în descoperirea de sine" (The Desirable on Reaffirmation of Non-Violence Ethics. The Role of Stories in the Self Discovering). In *Paradigme Umaniste. Explorări în tradiție și actualitate* (Human Paradigms. Explorations

- in Tradition and Actuality). Coordinator Marius Cucu. Suceava: Universitatea Ștefan cel Mare Publishing House, 2013.
14. Levinas, Emmanuel. *Dificila libertate. Eseuri despre iudaism* (The Hard Freedom. Essays About Judaism). Bucharest: Hasefer, 2000.
15. Levinas, Emmanuel. *Între noi. Încercare de a-l gândi pe celălalt* (Between Us. The Attempt of Rethinking the Other). Translated by I. P. Deac. Bucharest: Bic All, 2000.
16. Ioan Paul al II-lea. *Evangelium vitae* (The Gospel of Life). Bucharest: Arhiepiscopia Romano-Catolice Publishing House, 1995.
17. Macsut, Adriana M. “Aspecte ale teologiei spirituale în concepția Sfântului Gerard de Cenad” (Aspects of Spiritual Theology in the Conception of Saint Gerard of Csanad). In *Filosofia Sfântului Gerard în context cultural și biografic* (The Philosophy of Saint Gerard in Cultural and Biographical Context). Coordinator Claudiu Mesaroș. Szeged: Jate Press, 2013.
18. Macsut, Adriana M. “Consumism și anticonsumism, Platon și Prozac” (Consumerism and Anticonsumerism, Plato and Prozac). In *Virtual Philo Café 2013* (Virtual Philosophy Coffee 2013). Grosu Ștefan, Macsut Adriana M., Stănciulescu Daniela, Gajdo Ana Maria, Lesenciuc Ioan. Bacău: Rovimed, 2013.
19. Maxim, Sorin T. *Peripathetice* (Peripatetics). Iași: Pim, 2010.
20. Mesaroș, Claudiu. “Cuvânt înainte (Foreword).” In *Filosofia Sfântului Gerard în context cultural și biografic* (The Philosophy of Saint Gerard in Cultural and Biographical Context), coordinator Claudiu Mesaroș. Szeged: Jate Press, 2013.
21. Petercă, Vladimir. *Regele Solomon în Biblia ebraică și cea grecească* (King Solomon in Hebrew Bible and the Greek One). Iași: Polirom, 1999.
22. Petercă, Vladimir. *Calea spre oameni* (The Path to Humans). Iași: Sapienția, 2011.
23. Raschini, M. A. “Premessa” (Premise). In *L'introduzione del Vangelo secondo Giovanni comentata* (Introduction of the Gospel Commented of Paul II). A. Rosmini. Roma: a cura di Annalisa Capuzzi, Città Nuova Editrice, 2002.
24. Ruini, C. *Chiesa contestata. 10 tesi a sostegno del cattolicesimo* (The Contested Church. 10 Thesis of Sustaining Catholicism). Edizioni Piemme, Casale Monferrato, 2007.
25. Robinson, Wheeler H. “The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality.” In *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, edited by Johannes Hempel,

- Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. 66. Berlin: Töpelmann Verlag, 1936.
26. Vlăduțescu, Gheorghe. *Neconvențional, despre filosofia românească* (Unconventional, About Romanian Philosophy). Bucharest: Paideia, 2003.
27. Socec, Emil I. V. “Cuvânt înainte” (Foreword). In *Rostul și utilitatea filosofiei* (The Aim and the Utility of Philosophy). Mircea Florian. Bucharest: Fundațiunea I. V. Socec Publishing House, 1935.
28. Sinaci, Maria. *Normativitate și bioetică. Aspecte filosofice contemporane* (Normativity and Bioethics. The Contemporain Philosophical Aspects). Cluj Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2014.