

The genesis of the «Homo responsibility»

Tatyana Kruzhkova^{1,*}, *Olga Rushitskaya*¹, *Ekaterina Kot*¹, and *Elena Szczepaniak*²

¹Ural state agrarian University, Institute of Economics, Finance and Management, 620075 ul. Karl Liebkecht, 42, Yekaterinburg, Russia

²Language school – Polish for foreigners in Legnica, 59220, Wjazdowa, 5/1, Legnica, Poland

Abstract. The article reveals the essence of the concept of "responsible person" and the problem of its genesis. Different theoretical and methodological approaches to its definition are shown. The phenomenon of social responsibility is considered as the basis of productive social creativity. The author analyzes the main trends and the nature of the process of formation of social responsibility of the individual in modern conditions. Particular attention is paid to increasing the role of personal responsibility in times of social instability and uncertainty. The accumulated experience of scientific understanding of the concept of «social responsibility» is revealed. Specific features of social responsibility and its interpretation in the works of F. Bastia, I. A. Ilyin, P. A. Kropotkin, I. I. Lapshin, N. O. Lossky, V. S. Solovyov, N. F. Fedorov, and others.

1 Introduction

In modern conditions, scientific ideas about the individual are changing significantly. The era of industrialism and post-industrialism contributed to the creation of the image of a «rational person» who maximizes his profit and minimizes costs. However, in the context of the formation of a new type of society – «risk society» (W. Beck), such a purely rationalized approach no longer provides answers to questions about the causes and consequences of many anthropological transformations. Therefore, the traditional view of the system-rationalized worldview is limited [1].

Each new stage in the development of society generates its own problems, contradictions and crisis situations, the resolution of which requires new approaches. The current situation in this regard is no exception. The global financial and economic crisis, trade wars, unfair competition in the global market, the policy of sanctions of some countries against others, the Covid-19 pandemic, political and military conflicts - all this indicates a high degree of global instability and turbulence.

The information society in the conditions of post-industrial development has undergone a certain evolution from «post-industrialism» (D. bell), to the «Technotronic» state (Z. Brzezinski) and, ultimately, has deformed into a «consumer society» (J. Baudrillard). Many of its features have now turned out to be simulacra, and the development itself is a simulation. A "one-dimensional universe" was formed [2], functioning on the basis of unfair (monopolistic) competition, affected by the cult of money and commodity fetishism

* Corresponding author: rustale@yandex.ru

[3]. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that in the context of the ongoing changes, cultural issues are coming to the fore in the anthropological dimension of the individual. One of the Central issues is increasing the social responsibility of the individual as a subject of economic practice, and more broadly - social creativity in General.

Probably, this circumstance is generally characteristic of critical epochs, one of which the modern world is experiencing. Even P. B. Struve at the beginning of the twentieth century, when Russia and the world were experiencing «great upheavals» (P. A. Stolypin's term), raised the question of «personal fitness» as a person's compliance with the challenges of the time [4]. In turn, V. S. Solovyov considered the individual as a «compressed society» [5], and I. A. Ilyin raised the question of "spiritual doing" as the basis for personal development [6].

2 Method

The research uses methods of structural-functional, program-target, comparative and hermeneutical analysis. The subject of the research is the phenomenon of social responsibility of the individual. The object of research is the individual as a subject of social creativity.

3 Study detail and result

A century later, the world is once again in a situation of instability, uncertainty and risk. The turbulent time that K. Jaspers once called «axial» [7] leads to the fact that a person's creative abilities, creativity and basic personal responsibility begin to play an increasingly important role in overcoming the externalities of digital reality and the existential crisis of the individual [8]. But on the way of such overcoming there are complex issues that a person has to solve independently. These are questions of personal self-determination, self-identification, formation of the ability to effectively self-government and self-realization. Unfortunately, the growth of dependency attitudes, when new generations Y and Z want «everything at once», «here and now» without any serious effort and labor costs on their part, introduce a significant element of instability and create a situation of social bifurcation. This can be seen in many countries around the world: Belarus, Venezuela, Moldova, and Ukraine. And even in the prosperous and industrially developed countries of Western Europe, where emigrants who entered from the «third world» countries demand «everything and now». They demand it, although they have not invested anything in solving this problem. Thus, we can talk about the formation of «global dependency», the crisis of multiculturalism policy, and a significant devaluation of people's personal social responsibility.

To actualize personal social responsibility, different researchers suggest different ways and stimulation of different abilities of the individual [9; 10; 11]. Especially popular today are asfatronics, Bricolage, synectics and some other technologies for the development of creative abilities of the individual, allowing them to achieve success and, accordingly, form their own personal responsibility and social security.

These abilities, however, must be actively formed independently through personal self-management, which precedes our actions [12, p. 11-12]. After all, the idea of Confucius is well known that you can just feed a hungry person, give him a «fish», or you can give him a fishing rod and teach him to catch this very «fish».

If we use the fundamental principle of mutual complementarity (N. Bohr), we can find that social (personal) responsibility is not limited only to the responsibility of a person to himself. The well-known principle of A. de Saint-Exupery about responsibility «for those

whom we have tamed», extrapolated to social reality, means responsibility for others. This idea was embodied in the well-known concept of P. A. Kropotkin about «human mutual assistance» [13], the theory of «human solidarity» by F. Bastiat [14] and other theories of a number of thinkers of the early twentieth century. An important stage in understanding the problem of responsibility, especially on the part of the Russian intelligentsia, was the publication of the famous collection «Milestones» (1909), the authors of which exposed the secession, nihilism and irresponsibility of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia, who called for «merciless revolt». One of these authors, P. B. Struve, explicitly stated that the Russian «intelligentsia needs to reconsider its entire worldview and, in particular, to radically revise its main Foundation - the denial of personal responsibility» [15, p.149].

Nevertheless, the formation of personal social responsibility of a modern person is very difficult. It is characteristic that this process of forming a responsible personality - homo responsibility - is inextricably linked with its self-affirmation. But such self-affirmation should not be based solely on the effective or affective tendencies, repulsive or attractive reactions of the individual. As I. I. Lapshin accurately noted at the time, responsibility as the most important subjective property should be aimed at making a person «a worthy member of the all-human brotherhood» [16, p. 199-201]. In the history of the Russian people, social responsibility was formed through such unique ideological and mental constructs of human existence as sacrifice, service, and truth-seeking. In the Orthodox mindset of the Russian people played a huge role such religious constructs as penance, obedience, collectivism, etc. Now, in the era of atheistic consciousness, the place previously occupied by the above-mentioned formats for the development of personal responsibility is increasingly being replaced by the attitudes of hedonism, rationalism, pragmatism, egoism and individualism. In such conditions, the very concept of «social responsibility» is aberrated. And the statement that «any act of a person is always initially responsible» does not stand the test of time [17, p. 53].

If previously being socially responsible meant being a worthy member of society (F. Aquinas, I. Kant, J. Monetti, P. Mirandola, J. G. Fichte, F. Schiller, etc.), today it means being successful (J. Vitale, R. Gage, R. Kiyosaki, M. Lozier, O. Mandio, D. Ron, J. Ray, B. Schaefer). Most of its developers associated the concept of dignity with the fulfillment of a person's duty and certain obligations to society (dignities hominis). While the concept of success is most often reduced to the possession of power by money, to the level of material well-being of the individual. This transformation of the understanding of the category of «dignity» manifests an existential crisis of the individual. Today, some Nouveau riches who have achieved their material well-being through the use of "gray", and sometimes just criminal schemes, cynically ask a question to conscientious workers: "If you're so smart, why are you so poor?" It's as if poverty, not theft, has become a Vice. There is no point in proving the difference between the concepts of «poverty» and «poverty», since it has long been established. But it is advisable to define the concept of "wealth" and its difference from the term «well-being». Wealth is considered to be the amount of goods that are excessive for personal rational and efficient consumption. Well-being, on the contrary, characterizes the correspondence of available goods to meet the immediate life needs of the individual. And although such needs can be very extensive, it is precisely about immediate needs, i.e. those that allow the individual to exist and develop, and not to satisfy their vices and ambitions. That is why money-grabbing, hoarding, as well as their modern manifestations (corruption, bribery, etc.) in any society are condemned and even prosecuted at the legislative level. Unfortunately, in modern Russian society, there is an aberration in the attitude to these social vices, when they are formally condemned, but in secret, «in the kitchen», in private they are perceived quite tolerantly. This is one of the manifestations of the existential crisis of the individual.

Once G. Simmel, one of the first researchers of the phenomenon of money, in his book «the philosophy of money» (1900) emphasized that the role of money is not so much to promote the development of a market economy, but to form a special type of personality - homo economics, for which it is money as a universal form of wealth that serves as a measure of success and a criterion of actions.

«The concrete historical relation of generations to wealth and the categories of success and money derived from it as the main values of modern economic reason is one of the fundamental problems of the theory and history of mentalities» [18, p. 107]. The modern transformation of mentality in Russian society has reached the point where enrichment itself is essentially purposeless, vicious at its core. We are not even talking about the multi-billion-dollar fortunes and incomes of Russian oligarchs and their inefficient use. But even civil servants, taking advantage of the fact that the upper limit of wages in the Russian Federation is practically unlimited, are gradually turning the state-owned enterprises, organizations and institutions entrusted to them into a source of personal enrichment, into a «cash cow». At the same time, the quality of management of such "managers" often does not correspond to the state of organizations and institutions themselves, their profitability and competitiveness.

The latest striking example is the breakdown of the deal between Rosneft and OPEC in 2020. As a result of ill-considered actions of the company's management, its revenue in the 1st quarter of 2020 fell by 20.6%.

This required a 25% reduction in the salary of the company's employees. But, at the same time, the company paid record dividends to its top managers, which goes against the basic requirements of effective management.

Moreover, the irresponsibility manifested itself in the long term: the deductions from the company's foreign exchange earnings to the country's budget fell. As a result, the budget deficit will only grow in the coming years. And compensation for lost income is traditionally made up for by increasing taxes. And this is already happening. At the same time, none of the «culprits» of the current situation was punished.

In connection with this and similar situations, it should be recognized that in modern Russian society there are naturally two most common types of homo economics: the "merchant type" and the «parasite type». All other social types (misers, spenders, spenders) are much less common. Social irresponsibility in this case is due to the social and legal impunity of those who manifest it, mutual responsibility and criminalization of many areas of the economy, and the merging of monopolistic and state capital. In other words, the Russian economy has developed a rather inefficient model of state-monopoly capitalism (MMC), which has turned into the so-called «peripheral capitalism» (R. prebish). Accordingly, such a perverse and irresponsible «economic» attack is directed at the entire system of values [3, p.80-81]. And this is the result of the degradation of the principle of social responsibility of the individual.

The transformation of modern man's mentality in conditions of political, cultural and macroeconomic instability and uncertainty generates an aberration of consciousness as a whole. And economic consciousness in particular [19]. The ancient postulate that «everything flows, everything changes» takes on a completely different meaning and algorithm in the context of the new scientific and technological revolution. It is no accident that Deutsche Bank experts have already called 2020 the beginning of the «global era of disorder». Further world development will illustrate the growth of «planned chaos» (I. Prigogine) until a person again realizes the simple fact that «the creation of the world is the formation of blood through the spirit» [20].

At the same time, it must be remembered that the spirit can also be different. This is not about the spirit of destruction and the mentality of nihilism, not about economic selfishness and greed, which have always destroyed the world. We are talking about the spirit of

creativity, creation, construction, which the world creates. And humanity every time, every generation of demolition and again has to "learn not from lies" (L. Tolstoy), realizing the simple truth that "you need to live not for yourself (egoism), and not for others (altruism), but with everyone and for everyone" [21].

This «mutually beneficial» solution of the problem is the main function of social responsibility. Its devaluation is not only evidence of moral degradation. The problem here is that the modern spiritual crisis is primarily associated with the gap between the ethical attitudes of the individual and the requirements of the social environment [22].

These words sound relevant especially in modern conditions, when traditional forms of social destruction are replaced by a new form - the so-called «digital slavery» [23], which is gradually becoming a kind of social engineering. With its help, a person becomes an appendage of technology, an obedient consumer and an executor of someone else's will. Accordingly, it is easier to manipulate them and remove personal responsibility. This suits a certain type of people, but does not bring us any closer to the new quality of the economy - the «economy of happiness». On the contrary, a person who has transferred his personal responsibility to an automated and computerized system is held hostage to various force majeure situations that arise due to the imperfection of the modern technosphere. Plane crashes and transport collapses, failures in the power supply of megacities and other manifestations of such imperfections only confirm the importance of the «human factor», which is fundamentally different from all highly organized and endowed with artificial intelligence devices by the presence of its personal responsibility as an imperative of duty towards itself and other people. In choosing the most effective solutions, the machine is guided by the program and the scale of costs for the question, while the person is guided (and should be guided, since this is his personal responsibility) by the duty to «live with all and for all».

4 Discussion

Among the key issues of modern sociology in General, and the sociology of culture in particular, are the issues of socio-cultural differentiation [24], one of the manifestations of which is the degree of social responsibility of a person.

A significant transformation of the motivation of modern human behavior, in particular, the ratio of economic and non-economic motives, is noteworthy [25]. This is manifested in the practical plane (a huge gap in people's incomes and living standards), in the mental plane (violation of the principles of social justice, social responsibility, social security), as well as in the political aspect (devaluation of civil rights, degradation of democracy, increase in violence and extremism).

The analysis allows us to draw the following conclusion. On the one hand, the social responsibility of the individual is its ability to carry out its activities, to perform actions in such a way that would maintain a balance of their own and other people's interests. As in the famous formula: «if you live by yourself, let others live».

On the other hand, the social responsibility of an individual is its obligation (duty) to perceive and assimilate the values and interests of the outside world, which is possible on the basis of serious humanitarian education and upbringing, through "spiritual work" (I. A. Ilyin), thorough and everyday "work with meanings" (V. S. Solovyov).

5 Conclusions

In this regard, it is necessary to return humanitarian education to the high rank that it traditionally had in Russian higher education. It is necessary to stop as soon as possible the

practice of its vivisection, infringement and «optimization», which is carried out by modern "education officials". It seems only right to create a broad interdisciplinary humanitarian field of knowledge in the higher education system that will allow University graduates and future specialists to competently master modern technologies for strengthening personal social responsibility and social security. Through the individual, this task can be successfully solved in the General social plan. After all, as it is said, «save yourself, and thousands will be saved around you».

References

1. D.E. Frolov, A.A. Somkin, A.N. Semkina, A.V. Stafeev, *Humanities. Actual problems of Humanities and education*, **19(3)**, 295-305 (2019) (In Russ.)
2. G. Marcuse, *One-dimensional man*. Research on the ideology of A developed Industrial Society: TRANS. from English (Moscow: Refl - book, 1994) (In Russ.)
3. M.V. Bukaros, A.V. Zelensky, *Actual problems of Humanities and education*, **2(38)**, 7 - 82 (2017) (In Russ.)
4. P.B. Struve, *Patriotica: Politics, culture, religion, socialism* (Moscow: Republic, 1997) (In Russ.)
5. V.S. Solovyov, *Dispute about justice* (Moscow: Eksmo-press, 1999) (In Russ.)
6. I.A. Ilyin, *Path to evidence*. Essays (Moscow: Eksmo-press, 1998) (In Russ.)
7. K. Jaspers, *The meaning and purpose of history: TRANS* (Moscow: Republic, 1994) (In Russ.)
8. V.V. Slyusarev, T.M. Khusyainov, The age of globalization. Research of modern global processes, **4**, 145-151 (2018) (In Russ.)
9. V.A. Spivak, *Corporate culture: Theory and practice* (St. Petersburg: Piter, 2001) (In Russ.)
10. M. Woodcock, D. Francis, *The Liberated Manager: translated from English* (Moscow: Delo, 1991) (In Russ.)
11. S.S. Parapanov, *Sociosphere*, **1**, 77-80 (2016) (In Russ.)
12. K.P. Stozhko, O.V. Tarasova, A.E. Novozhilov, N.N. Mayakov *Social dialectics of entrepreneurship: Personality, Selfgovernment. Culture. Creation* (Yekaterinburg: publishing house for Ural university, 2005) (In Russ.)
13. P.A. Kropotkin, *Ethics*, Selected works (Moscow: Politizdat, 2001) (In Russ.)
14. F. Bastia, *Economic harmonies*, Izbrannoe: translated from french (M.: Eksmo, 2007) (In Russ.)
15. P.B. Struve, *Intelligentsia and revolution*. Milestones. Intelligentsia in Russia. 1909 - 1910 (Moscow: Molodaya Gvardiya, 1991) (In Russ.)
16. I.I. Lapshin, *Philosophy of invention and invention in philosophy* (Moscow: Republic, 1999) (In Russ.)
17. S.N. Kontorovich, T.A. Yavkina, *Actual problems of Humanities and education*, **2(38)**, 53 - 60 (2017) (In Russ.)
18. I.V. Lavrov, *News Ural state University of Economics*, **9**, 106-113 (2004) (In Russ.)
19. K.P. Stozhko, *Economic consciousness* (Yekaterinburg, Ural publishing house. UN-TA, 2002) (In Russ.)
20. F. Volters, *Questions of philosophy*, **5**, 164 - 167 (2013) (In Russ.)
21. N.F. Fedorov, *Filosofiya obshchego dela* (Moscow: Eksmo-press, 2008) (In Russ.)

22. V.V. Petukhov, *Sociological research*, **12**, 18 - 40 (2015) (In Russ.)
23. P.V. Piven, *Age of globalization*, **4**, 107-113 (2018) (In Russ.)
24. E.A. Lazukova, *Bulletin of the Perm national research Polytechnic University. Series: Social and economic sciences*, **3**, 47-55 (2017) (In Russ.)
25. I.V. Shcherbakov, *Economics: yesterday, today, tomorrow*, **7(3-a)**, 5 - 13 (2017) (In Russ.)