

USC 141.32

A CONCEPT OF RESPONSIBILITY AS A PHENOMENON OF CIVIL SOCIETY

Oksana Sarabun

*Ivan Franko National University of Lviv,
Universytetska str, 1, Lviv, 79000, Ukraine,
e-mail: oksana.sarabun@gmail.com*

A concept of responsibility as an inalienable feature of free self-execution of a person is discovered in the given article. The main attention is paid to the existential nature of responsibility which is a specific source of its social dimension. Creative potential of responsible human-creator is analysed in contrast to spiritual emptiness, losing of a reason for own existence. Demarcation between the concept of responsibility and notion of duty is proposed by the author. A specific nature of anthropocentric ethics of dominance is determined in contrast to ecological ethics of responsibility. Horizon of future development of the society is foreseen on the basis of its virtual image correlation with recognition of dignity of another person and responsibility of the person for his/her self-execution that is determined by civil cultural environment.

Keywords: person, responsibility, social responsibility, reason for existence, self-execution, duty, anthropocentrism, naturologism (ecologism), horizon of future.

Rhythms of modern paradoxical reality characterized by instability and social, cultural and political embarrassment. The level of spiritual and moral climate shows that life is a multidimensional, complex and ambiguous. Face and inner mood of the era is evident in the fact that “in difficult circumstances to find your way to the mature decision, which is able to take responsibility” [3, p. 18]. Article is an attempt to understand the challenges of our age. Purport interpret the concept of responsibility, based on the tradition of existential philosophizing.

Existential position in the interpretation of human life guides to turn to his individual measurement. According to this source of our behavior is not an abstract nature, and in every person: “existence overcomes external alienation between thought and life. It shapes them into the unity of life and thinking life filled with thoughts” [1, p. 37]. As a result of this approach, man confronts himself, as a problem of its own existence. She begins to mark the uncertainty in relation to their own objectives, interests and ways to achieve happiness. This difficulty can not be resolved objectively or theoretically. It encourages people accountable for their own decisions, even if it is controversial and imperfect. Existentialism is not distinguished themselves on anything human. It takes everyone in the fullness of its ambiguous immediate, dramatic life. Next we will focus on the personal dimension of responsibility. It can not be reduced to the limits of the general concept, and is one of the existential human free self-realization and self-determination. It is characterized through the interpretation of the content and purpose of human life. This is in a difficult situation specific choice of their daily goals and priorities. It is important to refer to the

personal dimension of responsibility in a situation where abuses era slogans about the need for global responsibility. As a result, we forget about the actual responsibility that each of us has – not according to the Globe, but for what only he was entrusted to care for. We have a responsibility for what did not you, not someone else. For example, the Hasid, Rabbi Meir used to say: “God does not judge you for what you have been as Abraham, Moses or Samson... God will judge you by how you were Mayer”. Fundamental existential responsibility is to be yourself. This problem one can not delegate to anyone else.

Reflections on existential source of responsibility is an integral component of development of Ukrainian civil society. Together with this philosophy we are faced with a conscious and free individual. His creativity, he constructs a reality. Outside it is chaotic and alienated reality, devoid of meaning. Human existence is not a tool in the hands of ultimate reality – the mind, humanity, high spirit or absolute. It is not limited or conditioned out of their own will and ability to take risks and initiatives. Cast in a world that tends to destroy any of its initiatives, the man is not determined by anything other than itself. Therefore, there is no guarantee the feasibility of its choice, and only non-stop action at its own risk, under their own responsibility. Responsibility is always immanent to human creativity, so to avoid responsibility – a direct route to the acquisition of slave consciousness. In this sense the function responsible deployment of a new reality, which is a consequence of the disclosure of the unique potential of the individual. Obviously, that is not always deploy unique person through mode liability. But in this case, the neglect of responsibility revolves escape from freedom when the burden of action weigh on the shoulders of someone else. That world is so, what is the man who builds it as active, unique, irreplaceable and unique existence. For example, Sartre said that “all intellectuals dream act” [11, p. 281], but only units dare, because they remember the inevitable burden of responsibility for the consequences of their actions.

Appeal to the issue of responsibility is not limited to theoretical interest. Its relevance is in the modern Ukrainian attempt to answer the global question: why do I live in that social space? Here be erected to a common denominator numerous problems, ranging from social inequality and ending internal disunity people. Some clearance in addressing this question see in adopting the opinion according to which “the responsibility for their lives, and therefore its success, prosperity and happiness nobody can be transmitted, we are responsible for ourselves” [12]. With the awareness of self sole cause of its national and state failures and disasters, while not shifting responsibility beyond our circumstances, we can begin to build the desired social space. The circumstances of the formation of the Ukrainian nation is not favorable, but the danger is that we used sympathy to his thahichnoyi history. The result is an acute lack of principle in national issues. Her we call humane tolerance. In fact, Ukraine does not need sympathy, but respect. The latter grows out of the fact that we can take on their shoulders the burden of responsibility for their own history and stop blaming our troubles just beyond our circumstances. This position was advocated, for example, Larissa Crushelnytska. Recalling the history of repression and deprivation of his family in the crucible of the totalitarian system, it says that nevertheless, “the cause of all our national and state failures and disasters are ourselves” [7, p. 39].

Need philosophical understanding of the complex issues of social responsibility due to the current state of development of the Ukrainian state. In the early twenty-first century, it is characterized by large domestic disappointment in former ideals. It stands on the brink of spiritual emptiness. Often the leading spirits of the era found in the notes of meaninglessness and absurdity.

In the words of Ivan Karamazov: “how many people over the past two centuries tempted to turn to God card in the senseless and cruel world ... but the fact that a person such a world seems absurd, proving that man is a being who seeks meaning” [3, p. 58]. Meaning occurs when people can courageously decide and take responsibility for it. The question of the meaning of human existence sounded very serious situation in the twentieth century. The issue of meaning can be formulated as follows: What should be do something rather than nothing? Position, according to which some still takes precedence over nothing, can justify relying just on the principle of responsibility. It is a way of bringing lyudynovymirnoho meaning in an absurd world beyond human participation, as “the greatest masterpiece becomes a simple piece of matter in a world where there are no people” [6, p. 156]. Using the terminology of S. Kierkegaard, we live in a “spiritual confusion”, when the most general and most important goal of human life is to achieve the idea of “man” [4, p. 20].

In contemporary philosophy of social responsibility issues has direct access to social practice, because the understanding of responsibility in its philosophical and theoretical aspect can more efficiently explore issues of legal liability and in particular criminal liability. At the level of social certainty the person responsible manifested as behavior regulation according to generally accepted social norms, as agreed to fulfill their social role, as a conscientious attitude to societal demands. Responsibility in a social context indicates moral, legal and social maturity of the person, its capability and capacity. This responsibility is a system of accountability, as a sanction for actions that are not consistent with the public interest. Limit of responsibility depends on the social significance of his behavior. That person is responsible for what in the circumstances or arrangements depends on it, in that it extends its competence. Thus, responsibility is a way of organizing diverse and multi-social relations. With its help, a person has to learn to behave, given the interests of others. That is, social responsibility is the guarantor of social security in general and personal security rights in particular.

Responsibility is an important element in the mechanism of social control. It provides a measure of the efficiency of the social organism and indicates the level of moral, legal, and social maturity of the individual. The subject of our interest are existential factors shaping responsibility. They are in the depths of the spiritual life of the individual. They are not imposed from the outside through the rules and regulations, and is a natural and desirable condition for authentic self-realization in line with the civil construction space. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that how a person can be responsible accomplice life events, so it is free. The reality is the guarantor liable true freedom, their mutually conditioned and mutually determined. And as expressed, for example, M. Riedel, “man is condemned, doomed to freedom, as it believed the postwar existentialism, rather – to have to take responsibility” [10, p. 82]. Thus, freedom without responsibility is impossible, then it is only fiction. Responsibility – a self-conscious volitional freedom as a condition of its possibility. Responsibility is an integral feature of human beings, it emphasizes and strengthens its freedom. It is not a mechanism of external control and regulation of social behavior. Returning to the reflection on existential nature of liability dwell on the fact that an auxiliary to understand its content, will last from the concept of separation of duty. Content duty clearly embodied in the categorical imperative of Kant, whose meaning boils down to “you must” act with dignity, because your actions rise to the level of universal norms. The concept of responsibility is not based on external demand and domestic demand on the other. The duty is mutual, it appears, when present two sides, that have reciprocal rights, prescribed by the contract, the violation of which impose a single claim. Responsibility, in contrast, is not mutual, because its object is the one who needs

help now. That is, to be responsible – this show's own “optional” initiative on the person with whom I do not associate any mutual obligations. Responsibility – an activity “number one” and not because someone respects my rights and I shall answer him in return. Consequently, authentic sole responsibility, that goes beyond the immediate responsibilities, is to maintain relationships of trust, on which the common people's lives. If the duty – self-evident logical consequence of mutual agreement, the responsibility is given axiomatically. It is accompanied by the deployment of such linguistic practice, which is the recognition of the dignity of the Other. Existentialism shows that accountability is a prerequisite for the emergence of a free and deliberate person, not perfectly rationally justified objective duty. Responsibility includes the moral basis duty that proves why you should do so, and not otherwise, but it is not enough to implement this provision in action. Therefore, another aspect of responsibility is the psychological ability to motivate will to work. That is, existentialism treats responsibility as inherent characteristics of the individual. According to this I answer, that I wish for this process is an integral part of my nature, and not because I am forced to. Responsibility is part of me, not just a natural consequence of my actions. Because of this, I do not have to learn responsibility, or take it as an external norm of social behavior. I want to open it through self-discovery. Manifestation of responsibility must be communication, which recognizes unique and creative nature of man as a social value. The basis so determined responsibility lies first with respect to dignity the person, not the institutions. Therefore, we can affirm that “liability due status, is recognized by man as a vocation, but due to an agreement – a duty” [5, p. 41].

One should pay attention to the fact that in the present situation the principle of responsibility leads us to rethink the value of anthropocentrism. It was founded in traditional ethics since the time of F. Bacon identity of knowledge and power. F. Bacon ideal gradually led to the failure of a person to protect themselves and their environment from the destructive power. Man is a slave to its power, and its wit and ingenuity began to border on arbitrariness and insolence. Inherent in modern technology risk, demonstrate that today selfish person should be removed from the pedestal of superiority over nature and the world. It should take what it needs is not the final authority morally good. Adjusting absolute anthropocentrism, we reject the hierarchical structure of the world and place human needs alongside the requirements of other living beings. Today, we are “scared of that huge power is combined with a huge void, a huge opportunity – with the least knowledge about why it all” [6, p. 45]. There are two interrelated dimensions of responsibility – to save the image degradation of human existence and availability of physical environment. Requirements for the twenty-first century demonstrates the need for pryrododentrychniy or environmental ethics with orientation to a future that is necessary for nature and for the individual. “Nature as a matter of human responsibility is nothing new for ethical theory” [6, p. 21]. This is due to the fact that modern technology intervention aggressive nature makes people vulnerable and unprotected. Therefore, cumulative and technological activities are not ethically neutral. Nature in her infinite capacity for self-renewal leveled first fluid and ephemeral human endeavor. But the XX and especially the XXI century shows an upward trend, according to which the human relationship to nature becomes ethical oznachenosti, as is a threat to the natural world. Indifferent attitude of man to human nature itself, must change to realize her self-worth and acceptance of what is without us, as space may exist, but we are without it – no. So authentically human attitude is to recognize the nature of its own dignity, opposed tyranny of our power. Nature is not just a physical condition of human existence in the future, and part of the human existential perfection. How paradoxical

it may sound, but the realities of life are proof that a person should learn humanity in the animal world that will never fall below its natural image, as opposed to the person who can do in certain situations as a “beast”. In the situation of a common threat to nature and destiny of man, we have to realize the nature of dignity and self-sufficient, breaking utilitarian motives, to defend its integrity.

Form the basis of language and speech communication and philosophical discourse principle of accountability is a means of constructing discourse and ethical horizon of the human future. His axiological determination confirms the need not just to limit their actions according to deontological moral principles, but encourages them to correlate the effects of human activity in general. Only the position of responsibility to the individual and all the environment can enable our mutual survival. Updating virtual future, as part of self-awareness – is not so impaired. It is a condition of consideration of the consequences of current actions on their own sense of self-fulfillment and life. The future is quite important symbolic factor in the deployment of civil communication space and cultural spheres of life and regulatory principle of the constitution of modern social reality. Responsibility as a way of defining the horizons of the future, does not apply to the construction of its utopian benefit of projects. It is a constructive way to avoid the dangers caused, by the negative aspects of technology and globalization axiological rejected. The point is that the dangers and threats that a person has for nature and civilization, should be given more attention than anticipating good. Otherwise, we return to the communist practice of forced humanity to bring “a happy future”. It is not that we have to sacrifice the present for the future, and that the desirability of the benefit can not be expected in the future, because today consist of preconditions for its implementation. The hypothesis concerning the desire to protect themselves from unwanted, they do not want to create a future based on certain goods. That is, you can live without the so-called imaginary or virtual “greatest good”, but not allow to accept the obvious evil. Without the participation of future responsibility is unworthy human being. Our task is to not worry about a perfect future, but only to ensure its perspective and practical social virtual presence. Taking for granted the idea that humanity should continue to be, *a priori*, it faces the problem of responsibility for the idea man, the possibility of evolutionary implementation.

Thus, we can conclude that responsibility issues as philosophical reflection brings to life the realities of a globalized world and gives it a practical communication, civil, social and ethical dimension. In search multifaceted ways in the future, responsibility is an important ideological and moral guidance. He rejects the passive or nihilistic response to the effects of modernism or escape from the world. It offers an active civic engagement and democratic rights to the complex social, scientific, technological and civilizational processes. Escape from the world, whether in the form of intellectual nihilism, or middle-class comfort and indifference, is a manifestation of moral irresponsibility. It is rooted in moral narcissism traditional worldview. They can also manifest itself in such ideological forms of fatalism as the belief doom, or rejection of relativism basic moral principles of human society, or as a utopianism, that is devaluing modernity and appealing to the ethics of the perfect man, is a threat to fanaticism.

Existential basis as a way to self-realization of the person, lets not reduce the responsibility to report on their actions only to himself and to the assumption of guilt for their possible consequences. Indeed, in this case alive and suffering natural man is to frame the socio-political function, that performs certain tasks on certain social and expected results. The responsibility is not simply an external requirement to do properly. It appears domestic needs and condition of existence, without which the latter is unable to fully implement. Therefore, the responsibility – it is an internal

conscious choice in favor of freedom of self-determination. She is a schematic pressure reduction of individual freedom to set its external common to all men deontological norms. Responsibility – a recognition face itself sole cause of what it seeks freedom and freedom of choice. It's taking all the consequences of our "authorship" on life. Responsibility is not the only mechanism of external control and regulation of social behavior, which agrees personal and public interests. It is an essential feature of human existence, in which the axiology of ethical guidelines and defined a measure of freedom. The reality of responsibility is the guarantor the reality of freedom.

Author's translation of the article

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Аббаньяно Н. Структура экзистенции. Введение в экзистенциализм. Позитивный экзистенциализм и другие работы. СПб.: Алетейя, 1998.
2. Апелъ К.-О. Дискурс і відповідальність: проблема переходу до постконвенціональної моралі. К.: Дух і Літера, 2009.
3. Галік Т. Ніч сповідника. Парадокси малої віри у постоптимістичну епоху. Жовква: Місіонер, 2010.
4. Гессен Й. Сенс життя. Унів: Вид-во ПУЛЬСАРИ, 2009.
5. Гришук В. Соціальна відповідальність: навчальний посібник. Львів: Львівський державний університет внутрішніх справ, 2012.
6. Йонас Г. Принцип відповідальності. У пошуках етики для технологічної цивілізації. К.: Лібра, 2001.
7. Крушельницька Л. Рубали ліс...(спогади галичанки). Львів: Астролябія, 2008.
8. Маср-Абіх К. Повстання на захист природи. Від довкілля до спільносвіту. Київ: Лібра, 2004.
9. Нанси Ж.-Л. В ответе за существование // Интенциональность и текстуальность. Философская мысль Франции XX века. Томск: Водолей, 1998. С. 306–317 // <<http://www.philosophy.ru/library/intent/index.html>>.
10. Рідель М. Свобода і відповідальність. Два засадничих поняття комунікативної етики // Ситниченко Л. Першоджерела комунікативної філософії. К.: Либідь, 1996. С. 68–83.
11. Сартр Ж.-П. Брудними руками // Сартр Ж.-П. Нудота: Роман, п'єси. Х.: Фоліо, 2006. С. 241–341.
12. Українська хартія вільної людини // <<http://1-12.org.ua/2012/12/08/1421>>.

An article received by the Editorial Board 30.05.2013

Accepted for publication 24.06.2013