
UDC 130.2N. M. VOLOVCHUK^{1*}

^{1*}V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, Ukrainian Engineering Pedagogics Academy (Kharkiv, Ukraine), e-mail inet2010adres@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0003-3975-7337

Balancing Universality and Cultural Diversity in the Search for Inclusive Moral Frameworks

Purpose. The article aims to draw the attention of researchers to the creation of an ethical framework that harmoniously incorporates universal principles and cultural diversity taking into account the rights and dignity of every individual as a key actor in ethical discussions. It argues that an effective ethical framework gives the opportunity to each person to take part in moral deliberations and ethical decision-making. **Theoretical basis.** The article, based on the approach of Kant, Rolls, Singer and others, insists on the need to define and agree on the universal principles. They should form the basis of all subsequent ethical discussions. The protection of personal identity is emphasized through intercultural sensitivity (Herskovits, Benedict). People with diverse cultural contexts should be included in ethical debates. The importance in research of the flexibility of ethical concepts in accordance with the cosmopolitanism of Appiah and the approach to the capabilities of Nussbaum is also emphasized. Ethical theories need to balance between cultural pluralism and universality. Cultural sensitivity in ethical theories must recognize, respect, and give space to other moralities, paving the way for the formulation of open ethical theories. Anthropological and philosophical insights contribute to achieving the necessary balance between core principles and flexibility to create avenues for dialogue and consensus. Finally, while attempting to achieve universality, cultural sensitivity, and adaptability, ethical frameworks in an interconnected world should apply the principles across various societies, respect diversity in values, and take into account changes in those societies. **Originality.** The article outlines the contours of a possible balanced approach emphasizing universality as the central core of ethical theory and cross-cultural sensitivity, flexibility, and adaptability. That allows each person to preserve identity and feel to be involved in ethics. **Conclusions.** The article demonstrated that it is necessary to promote such qualities as understanding cultural specificity, empathy for other cultures and cooperation in solving moral dilemmas on the path towards ethical excellence. Only a balanced approach that combines universal principles and takes into account cultural diversity recognizes the rights and dignity of each person and transcends cultural differences.

Keywords: human being; freedom; universal principles; cultural diversity; moral dilemmas

Introduction

The debate about balancing universal principles with cultural diversity continues in philosophical and anthropological literature (for example, Çamur (2023), Singer (2011), Sutrop and Lõuk (2022)). Cultural diversity within an ethical framework can be incorporated by adopting a multidimensional approach that recognizes both the common basis of human dignity and rights and the diversification of cultural values. "The moral justification for universal human rights lies in the shared values across diverse societies" (Çamur, 2023, p. 1). This diversification allows each person to feel valued in the society to which he or she belongs. The intercultural approach allows reconciling at least some of these contrasting principles and traditions in a common ethical framework. In the long term, this approach lead towards a more inclusive and ethical approach respecting the rights of every person, their cultural uniqueness in a globalized world.

Purpose

The article aims to draw the attention of researchers to the creation of an ethical framework that harmoniously incorporates universal principles and cultural diversity taking into account the

rights and dignity of every individual as a key actor in ethical discussions. It argues that an effective ethical framework gives the opportunity to each person to take part in moral deliberations and ethical decision-making.

Statement of basic materials

Universal Principles and Cultural Diversity in Ethical Frameworks

It is critical to achieve a balance between universal principles and the diversifications of culture in the development of ethical frameworks that take into account the rights and interests of each person. Universality refers to the common moral foundations while cultural diversity acknowledges the value of all manifestations of human existence. There is a need to bring them together to create a common ethical framework. As noted, "Culturally responsive practices are those that take the client's cultural perspectives, beliefs, and values into consideration in all aspects of education or providing a service" (Riquelme, 2022).

Singer, a philosopher of applied ethics, emphasizes the need for ethical frameworks in response to the moral challenge facing humanity. The ethical judgment has to be practical because "an ethical judgment that is no good in practice must suffer from a theoretical defect as well" (Singer, 2011, p. 2). His utilitarianism focuses on maximizing well-being and minimizing pain for the greatest number of people, which puts a person at the center of ethical reasoning (Singer, 2011, p. 5). Singer is a supporter of global ethical theories stretching across countries and cultures. His universal principle of human equality is stated on the basis of the position that man has an inner value and therefore everyone should be treated equally (Singer & Myers, 2002). He also focuses also on empathy and compassion as the guide to decisions that are morally oriented on the interests of others and their welfare which is inclusive of non-human animals and the coming generations (Friedrich, 2018). However, Singer controversially questions the inherent value of human life, especially in unborn and newborn children, which created debates in the philosophical literature (Androne, 2017; Friedrich, 2018). To summarize, the ethical framework of Singer pertains to altruism, justice, and sustainability which would guide a person toward a more compassionate and ethically responsible world (Engel, 2011, p. 73).

The cultural context, however, matters. The anthropologist Herskovits was one of the first to emphasize the importance of respect for cultural characteristics. Based on the difficulties of developing a global declaration of human rights that both respects human rights and demonstrates sensitivity to cultural differences, he is attracted to a declaration for all people, rather than a declaration of human rights as a declaration of Western values (Herskovits, 2018). Herskovits' (1937) position, which protects cultural diversity, allows a person to maintain his vision of the world, feel the support of society, and be involved in solving moral dilemmas.

In summary, when developing an ethical framework, one must take into account both universal principles and try to be culturally sensitive so that a person of each culture feels respect for himself and his vision of the world. Singer and Herskovits, though from opposing positions, both ponder the creation of a more compassionate world.

Universality in Ethical Principles: The Human Aspect

Universal principles include such fundamental concepts as justice and respect for human dignity; they transcend the boundaries of culture and provide a framework that usually forms the basis of moral reasoning. They help understanding and cooperation between different societies to

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

make them more harmonious and just global community. Rooted in the experience of human existence, these principles are not abstract norms but are vital guidelines for each person.

The common aspects of human nature are reflected in the universality of ethical principles. Examples of such imperatives are the ban on murder or robbing, which are found in every society. This is evidence of the deep structures of human existence that connect nature and culture. Anthropological works, for example by Brown (1991), argue that there are certain behaviors or norms common to all cultures, serving as a sign of implicit universal humanity governing induced ethical principles (pp. 40-41). Humans are the central figures of the natural process, and through them, universal norms are opened. In "Universals, Human Nature and Anthropology", Brown (1991) argues that cultural, social, linguistic, and individual universals trace back to human nature (pp. 142-156). He accentuates the significance of universals for the understanding of the human mind and their importance in anthropology in which culture had been severed from nature (Brown, 1991, p. 144). Brown (1991) stands for a comparative perspective of all people at all times, as one way of understanding human nature (p. 146). The recognition of universals requires interdisciplinary research and applying insights across several social sciences and humanities disciplines (Brown, 1991, p. 149). Anthropologists can examine the conditions producing the universals, drawing their strengths, in the areas of human evolution and ethnographic studies (Brown, 1991, p. 151). An interaction framework calls for an interdisciplinary approach to capture the full drama of human behavior (Brown, 1991, p. 153).

In philosophy, Kant formulated the Formula of Universal Law (FUL) in *The Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785). He underscores the role of universal principles in moral judgment (Kant, 2017, p. 19, p. 24). FUL states that moral actions should follow maxims that one could wish to be universal laws. Kleingeld explores various interpretations of FUL in the critical literature. Guyer emphasizes the demand for moral action to pass the idea of universal acceptability, Korsgaard stresses the necessity of willing a maxim as a universal law, and O'Neill focuses on a test on whether everyone could will a maxim (Kleingeld, 2017, pp. 91-92). These interpretations agree that FUL requires all maxims to be universal and transcendent over cultural boundaries (Kleingeld, 2017, pp. 91-92). Universal moral principles are not just rules; they reflect humanity's deep aspirations for justice and equality beyond cultural limits.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights maintains that the inalienable rights and freedoms of every human being are immutable, regardless of cultural or national context (United for Human Rights, n.d.). Human rights find their applicability worldwide, founded on individual dignity, and thus transcend cultural or national differences (Donnelly, 2007). This demonstrates the importance of the principles that the UDHR has to assert since most states in the world have adopted them. The UDHR preamble is a symbol that human dignity is gradually becoming a universal value. Although core human rights principles are universal, their implementation must balance cultural diversity and universal standards (Donnelly, 2007). International human rights treaties provide international norms for local implementation. The UNESCO Cultural Diversity Declaration states that human rights and cultural diversity are interrelated and interdependent (Donders, 2012, pp. 7-9). Human rights, therefore, are a matter of formal acceptance of states through international treaties, representing a global obligation (Brems, 2001, pp. 6-7).

In conclusion, the considered philosophical and anthropological studies, considered here, based on a deep understanding of human nature, argue that universal principles are rooted in the transcendent aspects of being and are aimed at realizing the ultimate goal of humanity. Humans appear as beings capable of recognizing their place in the world and working to improve it.

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Cross-cultural dialogue opens the door to mutual understanding and cooperation based on common values across cultural divides. Fricke (2020) supports this point by invoking Adam Smith's ideas on moral sentiments, along with David Lewis's "Theory of Conventions", to show how social norms, though conventional, can nevertheless come to enjoy universal authority (pp. 1-2). Fricke (2020) highlights the distinction between moral and conventional norms as substantial for cross-cultural dialogue and underlines becoming aware of the variation of rules and moral perceptions from one society to another (p. 2). The concept of the impartial spectator helps to diffuse conflicts and resolve differing vantage points in cross-cultural situations by adopting a neutral stance (Fricke, 2020, p. 3, pp. 5-7). Fricke (2020) investigates the balance between universal and relativistic cultural norms and the prospects for cross-cultural dialogue (pp. 3-5). This dialogue has a deeply human aspect, as it could help find common ground along with respecting differences in the principles of interaction and respect across different cultures.

Universal principles, especially in bioethics clearly outline a framework for judging acts and policies while reaching beyond the cultural boundaries (Petryna, 2012). These principles – autonomy, justice, and charity – ensure that ethical decisions are ultimately based on some fundamental values shared by all human beings and, through this, answer the questions – the moral dilemmas – posed by medicine. Petryna (2012) stresses that different systems of health care should align with these principles (p. 376). Despite different practices and values, universal ethical principles are valuable guides in dealing with issues related to access to care and the rights of patients around the world (Petryna, 2012, pp. 379-388). Petryna (2012) discusses the need for a "science of survival" based on "moral rights to health", giving primacy to universal principles for fair and consistent moral reasoning across contexts (p. 392). In bioethics, such principles provide a framework to address diverse cultural and medical settings (Petryna, 2012). Universal moral principles help solve complex moral dilemmas, balancing generally significant ethical concerns with cultural differences.

Goodale starts from the idea that the individual is a fundamental element of human rights practice. Universal principles create a platform for moral reasoning in the anthropology of human rights. Human rights practice is initially not socio-political processes, but deeply moral, creative, self-reflective processes of creating identity. In fact, they are dynamic and often a source of conflict (Goodale, 2012, pp. 473-474). At the same time, some challenges arise when attempting to realize human rights in intercultural and political spaces; Goodale calls it "tragedy" and "unpredictability". Universal principles, as part of management, require translation in any context, a process associated with "ingenuity", "creativity" and "flexibility" (Goodale, 2012, pp. 473-478). Goodale sees human as a being who possess certain moral values that cannot be relativized, and the practice of human rights filled with meaning derived from universal principles embedded in global moral reasoning and ethical behavior.

Sutrop and Lõuk raise the question of what norms of research should be in a globalized world. On the one hand, there are universal norms in Europe and North America, on the other hand, the question arises of how to apply them in different cultural contexts.

The challenge to the globalization of research ethics is how to solve the tension between universal values and principles on the one hand and their contextual applications on the other. Focusing too much on universal val-

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

ues and principles without sensitivity to different cultural contexts, research fields and specific contexts of application may run the risk of trying to hit too many birds with the same stone. (Sutrop & Lõuk, 2022, p. 16)

The authors argue that in the context of the growth of international research projects, cultural diversity and consistency of ethical norms to local realities should be taken into account.

Human beings are actors of moral reasoning; they seek consistency in moral reasoning. Otherwise, it becomes relative and fragmented, denying justice and equality. Rawls, in *A Theory of Justice* (1971), theorizes that principles of justice must be derived from a position known as the position "under a veil of ignorance". For Davies, Rawls's veil of ignorance is probably the most dominant philosophical idea of the 20th century, emphasizing universal moral principles that ensure the ultimate goal of humanity – a just society. In the hypothetical situation of the veil of ignorance, individuals design society without knowing specific details about themselves, ensuring justice and fairness without bias (Davies, 2019).

Geertz adheres to the concept of cultural relativism but agrees that universal standards must be for cross-cultural ethical issues, addressing the fundamental aspects of human existence. He states that even though each culture defines its norms in its own way, there are universal evaluative standards that allow for critiques of cultural practices as well as enabling cross-cultural moral judgments (Geertz, 1973, p. 53). Shweder (2012) supports balancing cultural relativism and universal ethical principles, advocating for moral understanding through a dialogical approach (pp. 86-89, p. 98). In other words, universal principles represent a depth human yearning for justice, equality, and respect ensuring that every person is treated with dignity, thus realizing an inclusive and just global community. Whether through Rawls' or Geertz's moral theories or the balanced approach by Schweder, there remains a need for universal standards to guide fair and rational moral judgments, despite the existing various cultural premises, to achieve transcendent standards of ethics.

To conclude, universal ethics provide a basis for just moral considerations, despite the differences that define diverse societies. These principles, which ensure rational, just, and consistent moral reasoning, allow for intercultural dialogue as well as guide ethical decision-making. They are supposed to form the basis of international legal standards and serve as the backbone of ethical discussions, offering deep insight into the essence of humanity.

Cultural Sensitivity within an Ethical Framework: The Importance of the Human Aspect

Creating an ethical framework requires a deep understanding, respect for human experience, and cultural diversity. As noted, "When seeking to practice in an ethically appropriate manner, it is important to first explore one's own perspectives. It is important to understand that our perspectives are shaped by our experiences, what we were taught while growing up, and our ongoing knowledge about the world around us" (Riquelme, 2022). Humans are at the center of these debates, as their worldview influences the content of moral decisions. This section aims to suggest ethical frameworks representing cultural variations while avoiding the pressure of universal norms. The combination of both aspects emphasizes the value of culturally sensitive ethical frameworks, which take into account each person's unique experience.

As Geertz and Benedict have demonstrated, there are many different moral values among various cultures, and each culture should be treated with respect. As Geertz claimed using the example

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

of a wink, it is possible with the implementation of "thick description". One must immerse oneself in a cultural context to fully understand its specific moral system (Geertz, 1973, pp. 3-32). Geertz's "Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight" illustrates that shallow practices may be filled with deep moral meaning. They reveal the themes of death, masculinity, and pride in the context of Balinese society (Geertz, 1973, pp. 443-448). Benedict argues that every culture has its norms and values, which should be understood and respected within its context. She gives examples from the Zuni, Dobu, and Kwakiutl cultures to explain different moral systems and calls for an acknowledgment of this diversity, rather than the imposition of external standards (Benedict, 1934, p. 206). Customs are culturally chosen rather than biologically transmitted, and they require the diffusion and adaptation of traits in a local setting to be fully appreciated (Benedict, 1934, p. 216). To summarize, both Geertz and Benedict offer a sensitive perception of the diversity of moral values and practices, calling for their respect as an integral part of human life.

Appiah's *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* and Nussbaum's *The Cosmopolitan Tradition A Noble but Flawed Ideal*, hold that, for ethics to thrive amid cultural diversity, universal norms cannot be imposed. It is important to respect human dignity (Appiah, 2006; Nussbaum, 2019). Appiah's cosmopolitanism is based on the hybridity of cultures, openness, and acceptance of different cultures towards co-existence (McCluskey, 2007, pp. 540-543). He advocates for ethical discourse where the diversity of values forms the foundation of consensus, without cultural assimilation. Instead, Appiah calls for maximum flexibility and adaptability in ethics (McCluskey, 2007, pp. 542-543). Nussbaum's (2019) Capability Approach (CA) is based on individual entitlements and economic and social justice. It promotes political liberalism and systems that uphold freedom and democratic principles in both national and international spheres (Nussbaum, 2019, p. 247).

In summary, ethical theories must be culturally sensitive and provide space for each individual's moral and cultural beliefs. Only in this way can truly inclusive ethical systems be created.

Adaptability in Ethical Frameworks

Human nature is very complex and diverse, and the ethical framework must be adaptive, taking into account not only abstract principles but also human experiences. Ethics that do not take into account cultural contexts may become detached from life. Rigid principles of ethics can sometimes be inadequate or even counterproductive. Embedding adaptability into an ethical framework helps make principles relevant and effective in addressing contextual problems and needs that exist in different communities and reflect the individual's experience. In this context, Geertz's (1973) concept of "thick description" is very important, as it encourages scholars to go deeper into the world's cultural practices as well as moral beliefs, contributing to the creation of a flexible and human-oriented ethical approach (pp. 3-4). Geertz's (1973) essay presents a convincing argument for the role of "thick description" in ethnography, as a science that decodes the meanings embedded in complex cultural actions (pp. 9-10). This approach emphasizes that scientists must delve into the cultural experience in order to better understand the needs of people and how these are reflected in each particular culture.

In philosophy, the Nussbaum Capability Approach (CA) supports human flourishing and well-being by placing the human being at the center of ethical considerations. There are necessary opportunities each person should be able to develop within a culturally sensitive ethical framework. Introduced by A. Sen, CA is in opposition to GDP per capita by stressing substantial freedoms and different human values over economic metrics (Nussbaum, 2019, pp. 238-239).

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

Nussbaum (2019) lists the ten central human capabilities: life, bodily health, bodily integrity, senses/imagination/thought, emotions, practical reason, affiliation, concern for other species, play, and control over one's environment (pp. 241-243). These capabilities require flexible adaptive ethical principles that take into account specific contexts (Nussbaum, 2019, p. 243). Nussbaum wants to replace paternalism with moral argument and persuasion, creating a framework where dialogue and consensus take precedence. Her framework incorporates cases of justice and material aid within a morally rich international community, but only up to the realistic threshold of capability. In short, the CA adjusts ethical principles to local conditions, inviting revision, and exercising moral dialogue in light of global and individual diversity. This approach underscores the importance of adapting to the needs of specific individuals and cultures.

Adaptability in the context of norms and morality reflects the idea that ethical frameworks must meet people's deep needs. Universal norms are revealed through the interaction of a person with the world. By encouraging dialogue and consensus, adapted ethical frameworks can incorporate many perspectives and respond effectively to changing ethical environments. For instance, Benedict (1937), in "Anthropology and the Abnormal", illustrates how concepts of "normal" and "abnormal" are culturally relative. Using materials from Melanesian and North American societies, Benedict (1937) concludes that behaviors seen as abnormal in one society may occupy functional roles in another, forming an integral part of its social structure (p. 1). Every culture makes a selection of behaviors it standardizes, and individual who fits well within one culture's norms may be considered abnormal in another. Benedict (1937) calls for a comparative study of psychiatric material from various cultures to expand our understanding of abnormal behavior (p. 4). She argues for a deeper understanding of behavior, shaped as abnormal by cultural contexts while acknowledging the minimum universal concept of abnormality (Benedict, 1937). This reinforces the importance of taking into account cultural and human aspects when creating an ethical framework.

In a heterogeneous world, the ethical frameworks should be flexible yet firm on some basic principles of justice and equity. Rawls' theory of justice as fairness suggests universally fair and flexible enough principles. His concept of "reflective equilibrium" continuously updates the principles of ethics based on new knowledge, intuition, and experience. These principles evolve with changes taking place in society (Doorn & Taebi, 2018). The "wide reflective equilibrium" (WRE) approach has been adopted in applied ethics, where it has become popular as a method of justification (Doorn & Taebi, 2018). WRE aims to achieve coherence between abstract and concrete ideas through discussions that will render moral judgments coherent to the maximum extent possible until reflective equilibrium is reached (Doorn & Taebi, 2018). In light of the rising achievements in technology, ethics has become an interdisciplinary field, focusing on fairness and equality, particularly in science and technology studies. Debates now focus on the social representationalism of technology and good engineering practices (Doorn & Taebi, 2018). Ethical frameworks must be created through dialogue, and Rawls's theory of justice and reflexive equilibrium approach demonstrates the balance between universal principles and local context as an attempt to interact with transcendent realms of human nature.

In summary, the ethical framework should be adaptive and human-oriented, revealing the difficulties of his cultural existence in the modern world. Adaptability, on the one hand, takes into account real challenges, and, on the other hand, acknowledges fundamental principles of justice.

Balancing Universality, Cultural Sensitivity, and Adaptability

The philosophical understanding of humans as beings of absolute value, for whom the world has a theological component, requires a deep understanding of the structures of human existence. Moral action should see a convergence of universality, cultural sensitivity, and flexibility. Cultural sensitivity respects and accepts all specific cultural values and practices, while flexibility contemplates evolving and dynamic change in an ethical framework shaped by new perceptions, circumstances, and experiences. By weaving these three imperatives properly together, one can work toward ethical frameworks that are both robust and responsive; encouraging ethical behavior that is universally just, culturally respectful, and contextually relevant.

Researchers emphasize the deep need for ethical frameworks that honor human dignity and reveal the teleological meaning of the world through an understanding of the essence of man (Herskovits, 1937; Nussbaum, 2019; Singer, 2011). For Herskovits, cultural background should come first before making judgments about ethical norms, as his approach avoids ethnocentrism. Herskovits (1937) focuses on acculturation – the process of changing cultural patterns resulting from constant contact between different cultures – and applies this understanding (p. 259). The best way to study culture, according to him, is through its human carriers. Acculturation studies are essential in understanding the change in cultures caused by direct contact, hence representing the entire process of cultural interactions – changes too complex to be presented by any other means (Herskovits, 1937, p. 261). This study demonstrates the importance of taking into account various practices and values in order to fully reveal the essence of humanity and purpose in the world.

Philosopher Peter Singer, on the other hand, argues for a utilitarian calculus that seeks the greatest overall well-being while taking into account the cultural differences in moral beliefs and practices. He observes an evolution in views on morality, noting, for example, the change in moral attitude towards issues such as abortion, sexuality, euthanasia, suicide, and racial inequality after World War II (Singer, 2011, p. 16). Despite the persistence of traditional views, there has been progress towards universal values of equality and respect. Singer's approach considers universal norms as applicable in different cultures, at the same time, not ignoring the complex nature of human beings, which is shaped by both cultural and social evolution.

Abu-Lughod demonstrates that culturally sensitive and flexible ethical frameworks are a must for mutual comprehension and respect. She explores how cultural values percolate into ethical perceptions and actions, asserting that cultural diversity needs to be considered in ethical discussions (Abu-Lughod, 2016, p. 29). She explains the role of poetry in Bedouin society, both as a means for personal expression in poetry and as a guide for social interactions within specific cultural contexts (Abu-Lughod, 2016, p. 26). This understanding leads to the belief that flexible and culturally informed ethical frameworks are necessary for justice and fairness while respecting cultural differences. Abu-Lughod (2016) further illustrates how sentiments expressed in poetry do not mirror real-life experience, underlining the complexity of cultural contradiction and suggesting that unraveling them is key to developing ethical models (p. 27). As such, she argues the need to strengthen universal norms by interacting with cultural sensitivity and flexibility, thereby creating a more complex and adaptive ethical discourse.

On the other hand, philosophers like Nussbaum (2019) focus on universal human capabilities that are necessary for human flourishing. Based upon Aristotelian ethics, Nussbaum's theory seeks to build a normative framework for social justice, based on the fundamental human functions that societies should help people realize. Nussbaum's Capability Approach (CA) balances

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

neutrality and perfectionism, offering a meta-political perspective that accommodates cultural diversity. Cultural sensitivity, therefore, becomes an important consideration in Nussbaum's work, as she argues that cultural context should provide the backdrop for formulating universal opportunities that promote human dignity while respecting cultural diversity.

In conclusion, the search for a balance between universality, cultural sensitivity, and adaptability in creating an ethical framework emphasizes that human beings are a central value. Moral norms develop in the process of interaction with the world, rooted in universal principles derived from the essence of humanity.

Originality

The article outlines the contours of a possible balanced approach emphasizing universality as the central core of ethical theory and cross-cultural sensitivity, flexibility, and adaptability. That allows each person to preserve identity and feel to be involved in ethics.

Conclusions

The article demonstrated that it is necessary to promote such qualities as understanding cultural specificity, empathy for other cultures and cooperation in solving moral dilemmas on the path towards ethical excellence. Only a balanced approach that combines universal principles and takes into account cultural diversity recognizes the rights and dignity of each person and transcends cultural differences.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Lughod, L. (2016). *Veiled Sentiments: Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (in English)
- Androne, M. (2017). Some Considerations on Peter Singer's Practical Ethics. *Rethinking Social Action. Core Values in Practice, 1*, 34-43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.rsacvp2017.4> (in English)
- Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: W. W. Norton. (in English)
- Benedict, R. (1934). *Patterns of Culture*. Houghton Mifflin. (in English)
- Benedict, R. (1937). *Anthropology and the Abnormal*. Retrieved from <https://users.manchester.edu/Facstaff/SSNaragon/Online/texts/201/Benedict,%20Anthropology.pdf> (in English)
- Brems, E. (2001). *Human Rights: Universality and Diversity*. Martinus Nijhoff. (in English)
- Brown, D. (1991). *Human Universals*. McGraw-Hill. (in English)
- Çamur, A. (2023). Embracing Diversity, Upholding Universality: A Moral Discourse on Human Rights. In A. Şahin (Ed.), *Academic Research and Evaluations in Social Sciences – VI* (pp. 1-10). Özgür Publications. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58830/ozgur.pub402.c1770> (in English)
- Davies, B. (2019). John Rawls and the "Veil of Ignorance". In N. Levin (Ed.), *Introduction to Ethics: An Open Educational Resource* (pp. 92-97). N.G.E. Far Press. (in English)
- Donders, Y. M. (2012). *Human rights: eye for cultural diversity*. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/11245/1.373400> (in English)
- Donnelly, J. (2007). The Relative Universality of Human Rights. *Human Rights Quarterly, 29*(2), 281-306. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/hrq.2007.0016> (in English)
- Doorn, N., & Taebi, B. (2018). Rawls's Wide Reflective Equilibrium as a Method for Engaged Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Potentials and Limitations for the Context of Technological Risks. *Science, Technology, & Human Values, 43*(3), 487-517. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243917723153> (in English)
- Engel, M. (2011). Review of Practical Ethics, 3rd Edition by Peter Singer. *The American Journal of Bioethics, 11*(12), 73-75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2011.626728> (in English)
- Fricke, C. (2020). *Moral Norms: Conventions or Norms with Universal Authority?* Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/427249/_Moral_Norms_Conventions_or_Norms_with_Universal_Authority_ (in English)

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Friedrich, J. (2018). Peter Singer: Ethics in The Real World. 82 Brief Essays on Things That Matter. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 21(2), 453-455. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-018-9876-8> (in English)
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.(in English)
- Goodale, M. (2012). Human Rights. In D. Fassin (Ed.), *A Companion to Moral Anthropology* (pp. 468-481). John Wiley & Sons. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118290620.ch26> (in English)
- Herskovits, M. J. (1937). The significance of the study of acculturation for anthropology. *American Anthropologist*, 39(2), 259-264. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1937.39.2.02a00060> (in English)
- Herskovits, M. J. (2018). *Individual rights and respect for all cultures*. Retrieved from <https://courier.unesco.org/en/articles/individual-rights-and-respect-all-cultures> (in English)
- Kant, I. (2017). *Groundwork for the Metaphysic of Morals*. Retrieved from <https://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/kant1785.pdf> (in English)
- Kleingeld, P. (2017). Contradiction and Kant's Formula of Universal Law. *Kant-Studien*, 108(1), 89-115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/kant-2017-0006> (in English)
- McCluskey, M. (2007). Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers. *African and Asian Studies*, 6(4), 540-545. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/156921007X239140> (in English)
- Nussbaum, M. (2019). From Cosmopolitanism to the Capabilities Approach. In *The cosmopolitan tradition: a noble but flawed ideal* (pp. 236-252). Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. (in English)
- Petryna, A. (2012). Medicine. In D. Fassin (Ed.), *A Companion to Moral Anthropology* (pp. 376-394). John Wiley & Sons. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118290620.ch21> (in English)
- Riquelme, L. F. (2022). Ethics and Diversity: Doing the Right Thing? *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, 7(1), 27-34. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_persp-21-00261 (in English)
- Shweder, R. A. (2012). Relativism and Universalism. In D. Fassin (Ed.), *A Companion to Moral Anthropology* (pp. 85-102). John Wiley & Sons. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118290620.ch5> (in English)
- Singer, P. (2011). *Practical Ethics* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511975950> (in English)
- Singer, P., & Myers, J. J. (2002). *One World: The Ethics of Globalization*. Retrieved from https://cdn.carnegiecouncil.org/media/cceia/import/studio/One_World_The_Ethics_of_Globalization.pdf?v=1670907157 (in English)
- Sutrop, M., & Lõuk, K. (2022). Ethical research in a global context: a dynamic tension between universal values, principles and contextual applications. In R. Iphofen & D. O'Mathúna (Eds.), *Ethical Evidence and Policymaking: Interdisciplinary and International Research* (pp. 15-39). Policy Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56687/9781447363972-004> (in English)
- United for Human Rights. (n.d.). *Universal declaration of human rights: Official document: Preamble*. Retrieved from <https://www.humanrights.com/what-are-human-rights/universal-declaration-of-human-rights/preamble.html> (in English)

LIST OF REFERENCE LINKS

- Abu-Lughod L. *Veiled Sentiments: Honor and Poetry in a Bedouin Society*. Berkeley : University of California Press, 2016. 384 p.
- Androne M. Some Considerations on Peter Singer's Practical Ethics. *Rethinking Social Action. Core Values in Practice*. 2017. Vol. 1. P. 34–43. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18662/lumproc.rsacvp2017.4>
- Appiah K. A. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York : W. W. Norton, 2006. 256 p.
- Benedict R. *Patterns of Culture*. Houghton Mifflin, 1934. 290 p.
- Benedict R. *Anthropology and the Abnormal*. 1937. 4 p. URL: <https://users.manchester.edu/Facstaff/SSNaragon/Online/texts/201/Benedict,%20Anthropology.pdf>
- Brems E. *Human Rights: Universality and Diversity*. Martinus Nijhoff, 2001. 574 p.
- Brown D. *Human Universals*. McGraw-Hill, 1991. 220 p.
- Çamur A. Embracing Diversity, Upholding Universality: A Moral Discourse on Human Rights. *Academic Research and Evaluations in Social Sciences – VI* / ed. by A. Şahin. Özgür Publications, 2023. P. 1–10. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58830/ozgur.pub402.c1770>
- Davies B. John Rawls and the "Veil of Ignorance". *Introduction to Ethics: an Open Educational Resource* / ed. by N. Levin. N.G.E. Far Press, 2019. P. 92–97.
- Donders Y. M. *Human rights: eye for cultural diversity*. Amsterdam : Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2012. 37 p. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/11245/1.373400>

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

- Donnelly J. The Relative Universality of Human Rights. *Human Rights Quarterly*. 2007. Vol. 29, Iss. 2. P. 281–306. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/hrq.2007.0016>
- Doorn N., Taebi B. Rawls's Wide Reflective Equilibrium as a Method for Engaged Interdisciplinary Collaboration: Potentials and Limitations for the Context of Technological Risks. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*. 2018. Vol. 43, Iss. 3 P. 487–517. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243917723153>
- Engel M. Review of Practical Ethics, 3rd Edition by Peter Singer. *The American Journal of Bioethics*. 2011. Vol. 11, Iss. 12. P. 73–75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2011.626728>
- Fricke C. *Moral Norms: Conventions or Norms with Universal Authority?* 2020. 16 p. URL: https://www.academia.edu/427249/_Moral_Norms_Conventions_or_Norms_with_Universal_Authority_
- Friedrich J. Peter Singer: Ethics in The Real World. 82 Brief Essays on Things That Matter. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*. 2018. Vol. 21, Iss. 2. P. 453–455. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-018-9876-8>
- Geertz C. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York : Basic Books, 1973. 470 p.
- Goodale M. Human Rights. *A Companion to Moral Anthropology* / ed. by D. Fassin. John Wiley & Sons, 2012. P. 468–481. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118290620.ch26>
- Herskovits M. J. The Significance of the Study of Acculturation for Anthropology. *American Anthropologist*. 1937. Vol. 39, No. 2. P. 259–264. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1937.39.2.02a00060>
- Herskovits M. J. *Individual rights and respect for all cultures*. 2018. URL: <https://courier.unesco.org/en/articles/individual-rights-and-respect-all-cultures>
- Kant I. *Groundwork for the Metaphysic of Morals*. 2017. 53 p. URL: <https://www.earlymoderntexts.com/assets/pdfs/kant1785.pdf>
- Kleingeld P. Contradiction and Kant's Formula of Universal Law. *Kant-Studien*. 2017. Vol.108, Iss. 1. P. 89–115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/kant-2017-0006>
- McCluskey M. Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers. *African and Asian Studies*. 2007. Vol. 6, Iss. 4. P. 540–545. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1163/156921007X239140>
- Nussbaum M. From Cosmopolitanism to the Capabilities Approach. *The cosmopolitan tradition: a noble but flawed ideal*. Cambridge : The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2019. P. 236–252.
- Petryna A. Medicine. *A Companion to Moral Anthropology* / ed. by D. Fassin. John Wiley & Sons, 2012. P. 376–394. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118290620.ch21>
- Riquelme L. F. Ethics and Diversity: Doing the Right Thing? *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*. 2022. Vol. 7, Iss. 1. P. 27–34. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_PERSP-21-00261
- Shweder R. A. Relativism and Universalism. *A Companion to Moral Anthropology* / ed. by D. Fassin. John Wiley & Sons, 2012. P. 85–102. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118290620.ch5>
- Singer P. *Practical Ethics*. 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2011. 352 p. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511975950>
- Singer P., Myers J. J. *One World: The Ethics of Globalization*. 2002. URL: https://cdn.carnegiecouncil.org/media/ccea/import/studio/One_World_The_Ethics_of_Globalization.pdf?v=1670907157
- Sutrop M., Lõuk K. Ethical research in a global context: a dynamic tension between universal values, principles and contextual applications. *Ethical Evidence and Policymaking: Interdisciplinary and International Research* / ed. by R. Iphofen, D. O'Mathúna. Policy Press, 2022. P. 15–39. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56687/9781447363972-004>
- Universal declaration of human rights: Official document: Preamble. *United for Human Rights*. URL: <https://www.humanrights.com/what-are-human-rights/universal-declaration-of-human-rights/preamble.html>

Н. М. ВОЛОВЧУК^{1*}

^{1*}Харківський національний університет імені В. Н. Каразіна, ННІ "Українська інженерно-педагогічна академія" (Харків, Україна), ел. пошта inet2010adres@gmail.com, ORCID 0000-0003-3975-7337

Збалансування універсальності та культурного розмаїття в пошуках інклюзивних моральних рамок

Мета. Автор цієї статті має на меті привернути увагу дослідників до створення етичної системи, яка здатна гармонійно поєднувати універсальні принципи та культурне різноманіття, враховуючи права і гідність

SOCIAL ASPECT OF HUMAN BEING

кожної людини як ключового учасника етичних дискусій. Стверджується, що ефективна етична система дає можливість кожній людині брати участь у моральних обговореннях та прийнятті етичних рішень. **Теоретичний базис.** Ґрунтуючись на підходах Канта, Ролза, Сінгера та інших, автор наголошує на необхідності визначення та узгодження універсальних принципів. Вони мають стати основою всіх подальших етичних обговорень. Захист особистої ідентичності підкреслено через міжкультурну чутливість (Герсковіц, Бенедикт). Люди з різних культурних контекстів повинні бути включені в етичні дебати. Також наголошено на важливості дослідження гнучкості етичних концепцій відповідно до космополітизму Аппія та підходу до можливостей Нуссбаум. Етичні теорії мають балансувати між культурним плюралізмом та універсальністю. Культурна чутливість в етичних теоріях повинна визнавати, поважати та надавати простір для інших моральних систем, показуючи шлях для формування відкритих етичних теорій. Антропологічні та філософські погляди вкладають у досягнення необхідного балансу між основними принципами та гнучкістю, щоб створити можливість для діалогу й консенсусу. Нарешті, намагаючись досягти універсальності, культурної чутливості та адаптивності, етичні системи у взаємопов'язаному світі повинні застосовувати принципи в різних суспільствах, поважати різноманітність цінностей і враховувати зміни в цих суспільствах. **Наукова новизна.** Окреслено контури можливого збалансованого підходу, відзначено універсальність як центральний елемент етичної теорії, а також міжкультурну чутливість, гнучкість і адаптивність. Це дозволяє кожній людині зберегти ідентичність та відчувати свою участь в етиці. **Висновки.** Автор демонструє, що необхідно просувати такі якості, як розуміння культурної специфіки, емпатія до інших культур та співпраця у вирішенні моральних дилем на шляху до етичної досконалості. Лише збалансований підхід, який поєднує універсальні принципи та враховує культурне різноманіття, визнає права та гідність кожної людини і перевершує культурні відмінності.

Ключові слова: людина; свобода; універсальні принципи; культурне різноманіття; моральні дилеми

Received: 16.06.2024

Accepted: 21.11.2024