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Q1，Do you think the democracy of individual state is a hindrance to the World Republic? For example, German’s Refugee Police.

A, This is a complicated and actual question, there’re different answers to give, first, if Merkel opens the frontiers of Germany, it was a nation-state decision, a world republic should have, actually there is no world republic, discussions with its neighbors. It says, we should have to have this shared- destiny, we have to look for solution to decide what sort of solution and how can we share the birth of solutions. As you know, she expected that other states especially Poland, Czech Republic and so on, would help the situation, it’s a very special reaction, wonder Poland is one of those states which gets the most money of Europe Union, 45 billions, on the other hand, they’re not able of willing to help this to share the duty to assistance, so it’s a question of unsolidarity. And Nikos and Germans, it proves to be solidarity with these problems of refugees. They could hope and expect that the other Europe countries would do their tasks to about they had been disappointed. Now the more philosophical question, the world republic would have seen this problem, and the world republic next to operate both sides, one side of the states, which, press people ,this states which make it necessary to free all of it, to this states, which are sometimes very rich in natural resources but also rich in corruption. So the walls goes on a little very small, but you lead the rest of people suffers famine. There’s one side. We should change the situation in serious, and Africa says it’s not their defenders to have this first states. On the other hand, as long as they are this first state which states, and the liberty democracies, say has certain duty to have. But this is a reciprocal question, you should take Germany as about 80 millions in evidence, the people who on the way as refugees all over the world. Something like 80 million people, you can’t bring them all to Germany. That would be neither interested of refugees, for what come into Germany country not vag country, and on the other hand, it would be merciless work from the side of the Germans, so in any cases, that would be task of the world republic. They have to say that they are no longer such dictatorial to runic first state. On the other hand, the very small part which is then open to have its interests of refugees, to bring these refugees all over the world even those countries are rather rich. And once more, Poland, as country which is not really rich, but not very poor, can’t get 35 billion from Europe Union, and does nothing to help this situation.

Q2, what is the relation between globalization and modernization?

A, Globalization starts just before the time of modernization, take the several roads of other things. And this is a limited globalization on the mention of times of modernity. But in times of modernity in the age of discovery ,one hand talks of Columbia less or more, other hand, the relations became much broader and much more encompassing, and then we have these three dimensions, that we want to trisome, the global society of violence, international terrorism international morphia abuses and so on, but the much broader global society of cooperation, and this is not only economic, but also cultural, scientific, religious in sports, in music, architecture, and it’s on. Then the shared destiny, that we are in the same boat that we have this limited globe, and mankind is in the same boat, you can see in question of ecology and of environment protection. Now the process of modernization, they has the relation as one of factors which promote the globalization, but the enlightment is the second one, and discovery is the third one. So a lot of factors which constitute modernization are also factors which promote the globalization.

Q3, is prof. Hoffe more approval of EU than UN?

A, I would say that for we have these three levels, the first is nation states, in the situation of Germany, they’re closed connected, because of certain common culture, the same history of wars and conflicts. So they’re at least demanded, don’t force, but demanded to bring about union of peace and full cooperation, but that was designed on the and could at the introduction intervention establishment of Europe union seems for me one upper the most innovative political factor after the second world war. But I said with certainly invitation for the united nations is another inventive factor, it’s not comparament sense, it’s not the safe power, not the same system of commonalities, of common convictions, but it’s not sufficient to have this regional union of Europe, and then to have nothing. And that could be competitions in wars so-called economic wars, even between united-states and European community, and the rest of the world shouldn’t be forgotten. So I have certain criticism against European Union, it’s not all going well, but it’s much better than the time before, very much better, and I hope they will approve it, and it’s a question about British people was risible to make this, and from the side of responsible people like Jones, it was really unreasonable, he favored, the breaksit, but there’s no ideas what to do afterwards, you know Scotland that this is not a part of Great Britain ,and try to become single state. In preparation of that, they brought about book about of 250 pages and which all the advantages and disadvantages had been listed. And the questions of breaks which are much more important they did nothing comparable, so that authority mistake but it was a sense of endeavor, neither the Cameron as a prime minister nor Jones as one of the leaders of breaksit did a good job. I want to say that they are not allowed to go out of the Europe, but not on the base of such a bad preparation, not on the base of the deceed population, they didn’t see the real economic problems, and the other problem of immigrant, immigration of polish, vox Francis, they are more helpful than some other immigrant people, and a lot of immigration to great Britain became controlled that way for they come parts of the British empire. Then not allowed to send back all these problems had been separated out and had been prepared, so it was foolish. But apart of that, I think there’re some other problems of Europe, because basic idea to have a cooperative endeavor to stop wars , to have a peace treating, and to cooperate in different levels, it’s more or less going very well. But we need the next step, the cooperation between take china with 1.3 billion, is more than European Union. You can’t expect that china reform to sort of Asian union with Korea, Japan, Vietnam, Thailand, if North Korea, then put it in possible but take 1.3 billion in evidence, they should be on the third level at the same weight, as for France in Europe union. Once more, I approve the Europe union, but in each detail, approve United Nations, too. But there’s one problem at least: on one hand, each state has the same right, in the general assembly, and then we have the security group in which, five states have more rights than others , and five states are elected first in some yields to become part of this group. So this is not defendable in the long run. In the moment that might be helpful, but in the long run, you can’t defend that.

Seminar: question from prof. Hoffe

Q1, let’s start with what I called approval globalization, what did you understand globalization before you get the idea present you?

A, it’s an economical concept we change and share the same world. It’s the usually mean.

Q2, Can you understand and approve the first dimension, the multi-facet global society of violence?

A, Terrorism, drug abuse, wars, pollution in environment, new weapons.

Q3, What are the examples came your mind long before having heard of my critique, what sense are we global persons taking part in global cooperation?

A, we share the same environment, when we face the weather question; each nation should take some steps to resolve it. You can’t release too much co into air. They are belonging to the society of shared destiny. It’s a part we all use it and a very unfixable way, without reflecting that is a part of all globalization. It’s a very important part of globalization. We take part in this we can take on machine look around the world, we get the information from the politics, we get scientific information, we use YouTube and we can see what is done in other part of the world and so on. Perform information on the internet. Commodities we use in daily life.

Q4, the world memory we can name it but go further on, what about the global society of shared destiny?

A, The Africa students get help from Chinese government ----- The under developed countries get help from better developed countries. More important, natural catastrophe, tsunami, hurricanes, destroyed a lot of things in Japan. Once more, we should take it into conscious that three dimensions and each dimensions is multifaceted.

Q5, can you explain the word, subsidiarity, in your own words?

A, A subsidiary world republic has three levels, the first is individual states, the higher is regional cooperations, and the highest maybe the UN. In a word, elements in three levels consist the subsidiarity. In each level every state can make decisions by itself. Subsidiarity means the higher level the European Union don’t helpful in primary level, and the third level isn’t helpful in the second level, they are only justified as helping the other levels. They don’t have justification legitimation in themselves; world republic is not ending in itself. But only when helping, when giving assistance to the other levels, the subsidiary principles mean that in general. Each level of organization only have the rights as long as it helps to the smaller groups or institutions and in the rank which is necessary that the basic tasks of the smaller institution can be fulfilled. Only under this, the principle of higher level is justified.

Q6, what does it mean in this context of federal world republic?

A, In what sense they are states, in what sense they are united, like united states of America-----they have a federal government, and each state has their right. The higher rank of the federal institution to get more and more tasks and duties than the lower ones. They are different, of course for that we should not discuss, it is enough to say a world republic cannot be understood, but as a federal world republic that means for the nation states and even the second level, the Europe union and other regional organizations, are the primary or secondary politic entities, the world republic cannot be, but a community nation and unification of these different states without or pressing their own rights. And this idea , first the nation states then individual level and finally world government, gets the third qualification , subsidiary federal and then what I called complimentary world republic.

Q7, we cannot have a world legal system if there is not the common sense of justice, what are the objections against that before we speak in favor of it?

A, there are lots of Kant’s example, the common sense of justice is lacking already, for example in America , people can make a law sue for a huge money, so they don’t talk about the justice, just want to have more money. There are some elements in America law tradition which are unfamiliar for us Europeans, which are, in all opinion, striking Kant’s examples to understand by justice. Principle: You can’t be judged in your own case, take Kleist as example. You need a third person to treat your case. The special rules can be different.

Q8, what elements in ideal law giver, ideal parliament, should be defined? What are the elements of ideality?

A, he should know all thing, or sort of it could be. He should know the inter relations between social situations and what could be happened in the world. That needs perfect justice, which suits for everyone. There is an under-determination, even if you have all the knowledge about crime, like robbery, deceit, killing someone and so on, you can’t give the states answer about legislation. Even for the ideal law giver, the ideal parliament, there is no full determination what a legal culture save. If we have this under-determination, then we need the concretization which depends on cultural historical social elements, that beyond that some question of determination of dezisionismus.