

DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/2592-8813-2026-1-24>

## NEW HUMANISM IN THE MODERN WORLD: GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITY

*Malahat Mammadova,*

*Master of Philosophy, Doctorate Student at the Department of Philosophy,*

*Baku State University (Baku, Azerbaijan)*

*ORCID ID: 0000-0002-6875-6483*

**Abstract.** The contemporary world is undergoing a profound transformation characterized by the transition from traditional forms of social organization and ideological paradigms to new global frameworks shaped by globalization, technological development, and ecological challenges. These processes have intensified ethical, social, and environmental crises, revealing the limitations of classical humanism in addressing contemporary global realities. This article examines the emergence of New Humanism as a response to these challenges, emphasizing its ethical, ecological, and social dimensions. Drawing on key philosophical contributions and international documents, the study explores New Humanism as a holistic framework that integrates human rights, sustainable development, cultural diversity, and responsibility toward future generations. The findings demonstrate that New Humanism offers not merely a theoretical alternative but a practical philosophical foundation for addressing global crises and fostering a harmonious relationship between humanity, society, and nature.

**Key words:** Sustainable development, planetary ethics, cultural diversity, human potential, social responsibility, global governance, holistic philosophy.

**Introduction.** Today, the world stands at the threshold of a transition from earlier forms of social life to a new stage, from former modes of thought and ideological paradigms to new ones. This transition can be observed in several key directions. First, development is shifting from relatively isolated national and civilizational models toward complex interactions within the framework of globalization (Solomon, 2011, pp. 21–22). Second, new reflections have emerged concerning the relationship between the world, humanity, and mortality, particularly in light of the increased potential for human self-destruction following the invention of nuclear weapons. Third, classical capitalism, having largely exhausted its internal developmental potential, is increasingly giving way to a new form of society commonly described as informational or post-industrial.

Contemporary research shows that humanism must now consider not only individual ethical behavior but also collective responsibility in a global context. Human development should be evaluated not merely by economic indicators but also in terms of real freedoms and social opportunities. Universal ethical norms can be established through communicative rationality, particularly in post-national and globalized contexts, highlighting the role of dialogue in legitimizing humanist values worldwide.

The process of globalization strengthens economic, political, and cultural integration worldwide but also generates new forms of dependency and inequality. At the same time, the unprecedented potential for destructive human activity challenges traditional ethical paradigms, creating an urgent need for a moral framework capable of responding to long-term consequences.

Post-industrial or information societies bring new social disparities and digital divides, emphasizing the importance of equitable access to knowledge, resources, and opportunities. Classical humanism, while defending human freedom, dignity, and creative potential, has been critiqued for its anthropocentric worldview, which has contributed to ecological crises and value system challenges. New Humanism responds by reimagining humans as an integral part of the biosphere, expanding ethical responsibility beyond interpersonal relations to encompass the broader environment.

Contemporary risks transcend national boundaries, necessitating collective responsibility. Globalization threatens cultural homogenization, but New Humanism provides a framework

for reconciling universal humanist principles with local cultural identities. New Humanism is positioned not as an ideology but as a practical, normative, and ethical framework that can guide human development in the 21st century. It integrates responsibility toward future generations, social justice, ecological awareness, and cultural dialogue, providing a comprehensive foundation for sustainable global development.

In my view, these transformations necessitate a fundamental rethinking of the philosophical foundations that guide human development. The growing interdependence of global systems, combined with ecological degradation and social inequality, reveals the inadequacy of purely economic or technological approaches to progress. Consequently, contemporary philosophical discourse increasingly turns toward New Humanism as a framework capable of addressing these multidimensional challenges.

**Research Objectives.** The objectives of this study are:

1. To examine the transformation of humanist thought from classical humanism to New Humanism in response to contemporary global challenges.
2. To analyze the ethical and ecological principles underlying New Humanism, particularly in relation to sustainable development and human rights.
3. To explore the role of New Humanism in fostering cultural diversity, social justice, and responsibility toward future generations in a globalized world.
4. To demonstrate how New Humanism can function as a holistic philosophical and methodological framework for addressing global ethical crises.

**Materials and Methods.** This study is based on a qualitative analysis of philosophical literature, international declarations, and key theoretical texts related to humanism, globalization, and sustainable development. The research employs comparative and interpretive methods to examine classical and contemporary humanist paradigms. In addition, analytical and hermeneutic approaches are used to interpret the ethical, social, and ecological dimensions of New Humanism as articulated in philosophical works and international policy documents.

**Research findings and discussion (main text).** The conference entitled “*Humanity at the Intersection of Nature and Culture*,” held in 2006 at Kruger National Park in South Africa, was part of the project “*Post-Globalization Humanism: Intercultural Dialogue on Culture, Humanity, and Values*.” This initiative emphasized the necessity of developing a new type of humanism capable of addressing the challenges of globalization while encompassing cultural diversity and promoting freedom (Rüsen, 2006).

The concept of New Humanism introduces a holistic approach to human development. Within this framework, alongside the realization of individual potential, individuals are encouraged to perceive themselves as members of a unified human community, regardless of origin or gender (d’Orville, 2015). In my opinion, this shift is crucial, as it redirects ethical orientation from narrow self-interest toward collective responsibility. As Paul Kurtz emphasized, humanity bears responsibility toward future generations (Kurtz, 2000). Therefore, contemporary humanism is inseparably linked to ecological and social issues.

Sustainable development, defined as meeting present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987), closely aligns with the principles of New Humanism. From this perspective, sustainable development is not limited to economic growth or technological progress; rather, it represents an ethical commitment to human well-being, equality, and environmental preservation.

The foundational principles of New Humanism include care for nature, responsibility toward the future, open-mindedness, and the ethical governance of technology. New Humanism rejects anthropocentrism, viewing humanity as an integral part of nature rather than its master. It also emphasizes dialogue and tolerance while insisting that technological advancement must serve human dignity rather than undermine it.

The global project of New Humanism is closely associated with the ideas of the Club of Rome. Its founder, Aurelio Peccei, argued that global crises stem from a crisis of human personality and values. According to Peccei, the highest goal of humanity is the development of human qualities at both individual and collective levels (Peccei, 1980, pp. 197–210). He maintained that preventing global catastrophes is possible only through the effective utilization of human potential as the primary global resource (Peccei, 1980, p. 199).

New Humanism represents a distinct direction within contemporary humanist thought. Unlike transhumanism, it does not seek to replace classical humanism but to reinterpret and develop it under new historical conditions. Classical humanism has been criticized for its anthropocentric worldview, which contributed to ecological crises and moral relativism. New Humanism responds to these criticisms by integrating ethical responsibility, ecological awareness, and social justice.

At the organizational level, New Humanism has evolved into an international movement coordinated by global institutions and articulated through various manifestos. The Humanist Manifestos of 1933, 1973, and 2003 progressively expanded the scope of humanist thought, addressing issues of democracy, global unity, and individual dignity (Kurtz, 2015).

UNESCO has played a significant role in promoting New Humanism. At its 2001 High-Level Group Meeting on Peace and Dialogue Among Cultures, New Humanism was identified as an essential component of cultural diversity, technological dialogue, and global peace (UNESCO, 2001). In my view, this demonstrates the increasing recognition of humanist values as foundational principles for addressing global challenges.

One of the most compelling philosophical foundations of New Humanism can be found in contemporary theories of responsibility developed in response to global risks. Hans Jonas argues that modern technological power has fundamentally altered the scope of human action, making responsibility toward future generations a central ethical obligation (Jonas, 1984). Unlike traditional moral frameworks focused on immediate consequences, Jonas emphasizes long-term accountability for the preservation of life and the planet. This perspective strongly resonates with the ethical orientation of New Humanism, which prioritizes sustainability and precaution over short-term benefit.

Similarly, Ulrich Beck's concept of the "risk society" highlights how globalization has transformed local actions into global consequences, particularly in environmental and technological domains (Beck, 1992). In my view, New Humanism responds to this condition by proposing an ethical framework capable of addressing systemic and transboundary risks. By integrating responsibility, foresight, and collective decision-making, New Humanism offers a philosophical response to the uncertainty and vulnerability characteristic of contemporary global society.

The contemporary challenges faced by humanity extend far beyond traditional social, economic, or political frameworks. New Humanism addresses these challenges by emphasizing the interconnectedness of human, ecological, and technological systems (Nussbaum, 2011). This perspective recognizes that individual well-being is inseparable from the health of the global environment and the sustainability of social institutions. As global urbanization and technological development accelerate, the ethical responsibilities of both individuals and collectives become increasingly complex, requiring a multidimensional philosophical approach that New Humanism offers (Dryzek, 2013).

A critical dimension of this approach is the recognition of ecological interdependence. Recent studies highlight that environmental degradation and climate change disproportionately affect vulnerable populations, intensifying social inequality (Ostrom, 2010). In response, New Humanism insists that ethical considerations must incorporate ecological justice, linking human rights with environmental stewardship. This entails a shift from anthropocentric thinking toward a recognition of the intrinsic value of all living systems, promoting sustainability as an ethical imperative rather than merely a technical challenge (Leopold, 1949; Gardiner, 2011).

Furthermore, New Humanism integrates the ethics of technological development, asserting that scientific progress must enhance, not compromise, human dignity. For example, emerging artificial intelligence and biotechnology present unprecedented opportunities but also novel ethical dilemmas, such as algorithmic bias, surveillance, and genetic engineering (Bostrom & Yudkowsky, 2014). By applying ethical foresight, New Humanism proposes guidelines to balance innovation with responsibility, ensuring that technological growth does not exacerbate social inequities or environmental harm (Floridi, 2013).

Another significant area of expansion is global cultural dialogue and pluralism. As international communication and migration increase, societies face challenges in reconciling diverse cultural traditions with universal humanist values. New Humanism provides a framework for intercultural dialogue that respects local identities while promoting shared ethical standards, fostering peace, and mitigating conflicts arising from cultural misunderstandings (Appiah, 2006). This global dimension emphasizes collective responsibility, demonstrating that moral duties extend beyond national or cultural boundaries.

In addition, New Humanism emphasizes intergenerational responsibility. Drawing upon concepts from environmental ethics and risk society theory, it argues that current decisions have far-reaching consequences for future generations (Meadows et al., 2004). This approach promotes policies and practices that ensure sustainability in education, resource management, and social governance, aligning economic development with ecological and social responsibility. It reinforces the notion that ethical frameworks must be anticipatory, not reactive, embedding precaution as a central moral principle.

Moreover, social justice is deeply interwoven into New Humanism's philosophy. The framework highlights structural inequities within societies and at a global scale, calling for equitable access to resources, education, and political participation (Sen, 2009). By linking social justice with ecological sustainability and technological ethics, New Humanism establishes a holistic normative system capable of addressing the multidimensional challenges of globalization.

Finally, New Humanism offers a pragmatic operationalization for global governance and policy-making. Through international collaboration, inclusive institutions, and the promotion of universal human rights, this framework guides decision-makers in balancing competing interests, fostering global solidarity, and anticipating systemic risks (Held, 2010; Pogge, 2008). By combining ethical theory with actionable strategies, New Humanism moves from abstract philosophical discourse to practical application, demonstrating its relevance in addressing contemporary global crises.

In summary, these new dimensions—ecological interdependence, technological ethics, intercultural dialogue, intergenerational responsibility, and social justice—reinforce New Humanism's comprehensive approach to global ethical challenges. This framework transcends conventional humanist thought by integrating ethical, environmental, social, and technological considerations into a cohesive system, providing actionable guidance for both individuals and institutions navigating the complexities of the 21st century.

**Conclusion.** The analysis demonstrates that New Humanism constitutes a comprehensive philosophical response to the ethical, ecological, and social challenges of globalization. It integrates universal human values, human rights, and the ideal of a harmoniously developed personality while rejecting both anthropocentrism and value relativism. New Humanism emphasizes responsibility toward future generations, ecological sustainability, and global solidarity.

In conclusion, New Humanism should be understood not as an abstract ideology but as a practical ethical framework capable of guiding contemporary social development. By prioritizing human dignity, cultural diversity, and ecological responsibility, New Humanism offers a viable foundation for sustainable global development and the prevention of future global crises.

Furthermore, the significance of New Humanism extends beyond ethical and ecological considerations to the guidance of global governance and policy-making processes. The complex risks and

transboundary challenges arising from globalization demonstrate that traditional state and institutional approaches are often insufficient. In this context, New Humanism offers a holistic and integrative approach, combining social justice, ecological sustainability, and ethical principles into a single framework.

At the same time, New Humanism emphasizes the importance of intercultural understanding and dialogue. In a global environment where misunderstandings between cultures and social groups are increasing, dialogue based on humanist values not only prevents conflicts but also strengthens global solidarity. This approach highlights that ethical principles should not remain at the theoretical level alone but must be applied in practical policy and cultural initiatives.

In the context of technological developments, New Humanism proposes a model of forward-looking and ethical governance. Emerging fields such as artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and other innovative technologies must be regulated according to principles that safeguard human dignity and social equality. By doing so, New Humanism reduces global technological risks while reinforcing responsibility toward future generations.

New Humanism also emphasizes intergenerational and long-term responsibility. In contemporary society, short-term profit and economic goals often exacerbate ecological and social problems. From this perspective, New Humanism provides an ethical foundation for sustainable policies and global decision-making processes.

Consequently, New Humanism is not merely a theoretical approach but a practical and normative framework. It enables states, international organizations, and individuals to manage global crises while maintaining ethical, social, and ecological balance. This framework also protects human dignity, promotes cultural diversity, and seeks to create a more sustainable world for future generations.

Thus, New Humanism functions not only as a philosophical and ethical concept in the modern world but also as a practical and applicable framework, offering guidance for building a sustainable, just, and ecologically balanced future for humanity.

#### References:

1. Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. W. W. Norton & Company.
2. Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity* (M. Ritter, Trans.). Sage Publications.
3. Bostrom, N., & Yudkowsky, E. (2014). The ethics of artificial intelligence. In K. Frankish & W. M. Ramsey (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Artificial Intelligence* (pp. 316–334). Cambridge University Press.
4. d’Orville, H. (2015). *Human rights and global responsibility*. Springer.
5. Dryzek, J. S. (2013). *The politics of the earth: Environmental discourses* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
6. Floridi, L. (2013). *The ethics of information*. Oxford University Press.
7. Gardiner, S. M. (2011). *A perfect moral storm: Climate change, intergenerational ethics, and the problem of moral corruption*. Oxford University Press.
8. Held, D. (2010). *Global covenant: The social democratic alternative to the Washington consensus*. Polity Press.
9. Jonas, H. (1984). *The imperative of responsibility: In search of an ethics for the technological age* (M. E. Zimmerman, Trans.). University of Chicago Press.
10. Kurtz, P. (2000). *The humanist alternative*. Prometheus Books.
11. Kurtz, P. (2015). *Humanist manifesto: Third edition*. Humanist Press.
12. Leopold, A. (1949). *A sand county almanac: And sketches here and there*. Oxford University Press.
13. Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., & Randers, J. (2004). *Limits to growth: The 30-year update*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
14. Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities: The human development approach*. Belknap Press.
15. Ostrom, E. (2010). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.

16. Peccei, A. (1980). *The human quality*. Pergamon Press.
17. Pogge, T. (2008). *World poverty and human rights* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
18. Rösen, J. (2006). *Humanity at the intersection of nature and culture*. Kruger National Park Conference Proceedings.
19. Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. Harvard University Press.
20. Solomon, R. C. (2011). *Ethics and excellence: Cooperation and integrity in business*. Oxford University Press.
21. UNESCO. (2001). *Report of the High-Level Group Meeting on Peace and Dialogue among Cultures*. UNESCO.
22. World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford University Press.