

Time	Detail
Session 1 chair : KIM Seon-Wook(Provost, Soongsil Univ.)	
10:00-11:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Polarization in the Post-Truth World from the evolutionary perspective CHOI Jongduck(Independent Scholar) - Moral and Political Dilemmas at the Time of the Coronavirus Pandemic: The Role of Philosophical Thinking Stelios Virvidakis(Univ. of Athens, Greece)
11:00-11:30	Coffee break
Session 2 chair : PARK So-Jeong(Sungkyunkwan Univ.)	
11:30-12:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Autonomous AI and how will we regulate it? SHIN Sangkyu(Ewha Univ.) - Philosophical Messages from COVID-19: Human Survival, Coexistence with Nature, and Transformation KIM Yang-Hyun(CNU) / PARK Ey-Yeon(CNU)
12:30-13:30	Lunch at KU
Session 3 chair : Anat Biletzki(Quinnipiac Univ., USA)	
13:30-15:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Opportunities and Boundaries of Intercultural Encounters: Confronting Charles Taylor's views with those of Paul Ricoeur Peter Jonkers(Tilburg Univ., Netherlands) - What Role for the Reflective Society? Riccardo Pozzo(Tor Vergata Univ. of Rome, Italy) - The Ukraine War and Philosophy LEE Sang-Hoon (President, The Korean Federation of Humanities and Social Science)
15:00-15:30	Coffee break
Session 4 chair : JEONG Se-Geun(President-elect, KPA)	
15:30-17:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Philosophizing in Korean: <i>Uri</i> as Extended Self PARK So-Jeong(Sungkyunkwan Univ.) - Calling a Spade a Spade: Reflections on Political Language in time of Covid Gerhard Seel(Univ. of Bern, Switzerland) - Ethics and Africa in international relations: An ubu-ntu perspective Mogobe Ramose(Univ. of South Africa, South Africa)
Meeting with KPA philosophers moderator : LEE Sang-Hoon(President, The Korean Federation of Humanities and Social Science) _at KU conference hall JANG Dong-Ik(Gongju Nat'l Univ. of Education)	
18:00-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcome : Presidents of KU, KPA, FISP - Presentation of KPA SUH Yu-Suk(Howon Univ.) - Presentation of FISP & WCP(Rome 2024) Luca Maria Scarantino(President of FISP)

Polarization in the Post-Truth World from the evolutionary perspective

CHOI Jongduck

Independent Scholar; philonatu.com/english

Premise: Dual track of selfish and cooperative behavioral characteristics and balance of conflict

Traditional normative ethicists attribute the human desire to the realm of nature and morality to the realm of heaven(or culture). Evolutionary ethics has another view that even human morality results from the adaptation by natural selection. There is no debate about thinking of desire as human nature. It could be allowed to see moral behavior as a continual extension of human nature of desire from the evolutionary biological view.

My thesis starts from the premise that desires directed human nature and morality directed human nature are the products of the two-track process of human evolution. If one considers my basic premise unsatisfactory, one might regard human desires as a selfish behavioral trait and morality as a kind of cooperative behavioral trait. I suppose human nature has evolved a dual track of selfish and cooperative behavioral characteristics.

The nature of the double track is the cause of psychological-social conflicts. We cannot eliminate the conflicts in our society. Paradoxically speaking, it is crucial to control the conflict balance. The concept of conflict balance can be described as a metaphor for magnets. One cannot make a magnet with only one side pole by cutting a bar magnet with positive and negative poles in half. Because the bar magnet automatically creates another pole when we cut it in half. Attempts to make social polarization into a single polarity also lead to social chaos. Just as the balance of two sides of polarity is the nature of a magnet, we might not avoid social conflicts of selfish and cooperative behavioral tendencies.

If someone asks me, “Are you a selfish **or** cooperative style person?” I could ignore their asking. Or I might answer confidently, “I am selfish **and** cooperative.”

Inference 1: Two-track of human nature and its dynamism

Being dynamic that is being exposed as a constant push and pull between selfish behavior-trait and cooperative behavior-trait is a feature of human nature. Human nature is not immutable and fixed but changes and fluctuates according to circumstances because dynamism itself is nature. In other words, Which way of two-track one will ride on might differ depending on the circumstances.

A human being is not a two-track as a noun subject but a conflict itself that pushes and pulls as a verb due to my evolutionary premise. That means human nature is a verb-type 'becoming' escaped from a fixed 'being.' From the view of Deleuze, the verb-type becoming corresponds to the 'multiplicity' from which 'oneness' is eliminated.

Inference 2: Psychological homeostasis and social durability

The dynamic structure between individual behavioral traits supports society's collective behavior-pattern dynamic structure and vice versa. An individual's moral dynamism appears as psychological homeostasis in a human being. Psychological homeostasis means that although conflicts between selfishness and cooperation exist in us, we maintain an exquisite balance of conflicts.

In a society, the dynamism of a group (or state) appears as social durability. In this sustainable community, conflict dynamics become an internal driving force that maintains the equilibrium in conflict as a whole while experiencing individual conflicts.

Inference 3: The psycho-social inflection point: post-truth world

Unfortunately, we, especially Koreans and Americans, are facing a moment when the equilibrium of conflict is gradually breaking down. The immunity of our community is bound to drop when a geographic division, racial discrimination, wealth gap, chauvinism, and macho hegemony(power) spread.

The psycho-social inflection point is when the community immunity of psychological homeostasis and social conflict equilibrium begins to break through. The biased society, which comes after the psycho-social inflection point, is called "the post-truth world."

The term 'post-truth,' which derives from the ex-president of US Donald Trump's shock, was named Word of the Year in 2016 by the Oxford Dictionary. It is defined as "social circumstances in which emotion and personal belief instead of objective facts are dominant at shaping public opinion." (Mackey 2019)

Inference 4: Psycho-social symptoms of the post-truth era

As features of the post-truth world, immune-deficient social diseases induce psycho-social symptoms such as exclusion, disgust, and bullying. In other words, as the social conflict balance is disrupted, the individual's psychological homeostasis is reduced. Conversely, atrophy of psychological homeostasis (i) lowers each individual's shame or self-esteem, (ii) makes them act confidently in lies and further spreads self-deception, (iii) divides sides and extremes of bias. It reveals the nature of selfish behavior. Eventually, a vicious cycle arises in which the social conflict equilibrium is more threatened than before.

Inference 5: From post-truth to pernicious polarization

We could not avoid political polarization in party politics. However, if the pathology of post-truth leads to polarization, then the polarization appears as 'the pernicious polarization' that I take issue with. In this polarization, instead of compromise, agreement, and tolerance, the psychological pathology of exclusion, disgust, hatred, and greed begin to restructure our society. It is called "pernicious polarization."

The pernicious polarization heads to society which exposed an explosion of severe mistrust, intolerance, and discrimination that spread beyond the two political parties' sphere into societal relations. (McCoy et al. 2018) It is a psycho-social state blocked by the dichotomy of "us" and "them." (Somer and McCoy 2019) Even though the characteristics of the political group holding hegemony are unfair, the dishonest and disguised behaviors of the hegemony group overwhelm the other polar group, which is the relatively moral group. It is the general phenomenon of pernicious polarization.

The pernicious polarization can easily move to the form of monopoly or totalitarian politics since social conflict balance was disrupted. In this regard, I quote Hannah Arendt's famous saying.: "The ideal subject of totalitarian rule is not the convinced Nazi or the convinced Communist, but people for whom the distinction between fact and fiction (i.e., the reality of experience) and the distinction between true and false (i.e., the standards of thought) no longer exist." (Arendt 1973/1951, 474)

Inference 6: Bias of information polarization

Anyone can become a producer, consumer, and distributor of information through social media such as personal broadcasts via youtube or personal blogs. Through the social media platform, bits of knowledge and pieces of information are being distributed at an exponential rate. Distributed

information is stained with confirmation bias, and social media-based information consumers converge from dispersed individuals to synchronized bipolar groups. Social media-based information consumers, producers, and distributors synchronize with each other, thereby forming antagonism of merged biased information. Afterward, only two opposing clusters of information remain. It is what we call biased information polarization.

Inference 7: Lower cost of deception

The deception and bias of information polarization are products of behavioral tendencies of exclusion and disgust, hate and greed. Anyone can expose their inherent selfish behavioral tendencies without reflective filtering with just a laptop or smartphone equipped with the Internet. Therefore, the cost of deception has become very cheap through the convenient sharing of biased information. The destructive post-truth symptoms of lies and conspiracies spread too easily and quickly. There are various personal broadcasts on the Internet that hate groups run. The bridge between political polarization would be destroyed by indiscreetly attacking the opposing camp by the Trump-like group armed with conspiracy and witchcraft in the Korean political landscape. The German weekend newspaper <der Freitag> represented the Trump-like phenomena in Korean as “K-Trump.”(Ausgabe 11/2022) Eventually, pernicious political polarization gradually began to dominate our society.

This risk of pernicious political polarization is not only present in Korea but all over the world. Not only developing countries but also countries such as Italy, France, the UK, and the United States are no exception, so I think we need to discuss this issue practically.

Can the pernicious polarization phenomenon be resolved?

I am embarrassed that I cannot show a concrete and practical strategy for the justification to dissolve this problem. My suggestions are only philosophical ideas. Even my suggestions are things that many political philosophers have already discussed. They are as below:

- ① It is a transition to a culturally center-less society that disperses the power centers of skin color, gender, ideology, and religion.
- ② Since the pernicious polarization is the first step toward a monopoly of political power, global solidarity that can break down the monopoly phenomenon in the international community is essential.
- ③ International or regional civic solidarity is needed to realize concrete (scientific) action to control

the balance of conflict, not the ideal (metaphysical) pursuit of completely eliminating conflict.

- ④ Besides political and social criticism, it is essential to popularize philosophical discourse on social and cultural polarization.

References

Arendt, Hannah 1973/1951, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harcourt.

Mackey, Thomas P. 2019, *Metaliterate Learning for the Post-Truth World*. Neal-Schuman Publishers.

McCoy, Rahman, Tahmina, and Somer 2018, “Polarization and the Global Crisis of Democracy: Common Patterns, Dynamics, and Pernicious Consequences for Democratic Polities”. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 62 (1): 16-42.

Somer and McCoy 2019, “Transformations through Polarizations and Global Threats to Democracy”. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 681 (1): 8-22

Trivers, Robert 2002, *Natural Selection and Social Theory*. Oxford University Press.

최종덕 2014, 생물철학. *생각의힘*https://philonatu.com/english/english_view.php?id=50