

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MORALITY, RESPONSIBILITY AND SOCIAL FREEDOM: A PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECT

Shandra Bohdana

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61345/1339-7915.2025.3.11>

Annotation. The article is devoted to the study of the interaction between moral norms, responsibility and social freedom in the context of philosophical aspects. The author analyzes the importance of philosophical aspects that stimulate reasoning about how these aspects interact with each other in modern society. The analysis of philosophical aspects includes the study of the historical development of the concepts of morality and responsibility, as well as their relationship with the concept of social freedom.

This process makes it necessary to take into account the difficulties and contradictions that may arise in the process of understanding and practical application of these concepts. In addition, the study of the philosophical aspect of the relationship between morality, responsibility and social freedom can contribute to the development of more principled and effective approaches to practical issues of modern society.

The purpose of the article is a detailed analysis of the philosophical aspect of the relationship between morality, responsibility and social freedom. To investigate the theoretical connections between these concepts and reveal their impact on society and the individual.

The article analyzes the importance of moral norms as restrictions and at the same time guidelines for the exercise of freedom of choice. It is noted that moral principles are able to narrow the available options in individual cases, setting the boundaries of an individual's behavior. At the same time, they can serve as a guide, offering a morally acceptable direction for making decisions and implementing actions.

It also examines the conflict that can arise in a person when his moral beliefs collide with other goals or circumstances, and he is forced to choose between them. The author emphasizes that morality is a necessary component of freedom: the exercise of one's own will by an individual must necessarily take place without infringing on its freedoms and the rights of other individuals. The article emphasizes that freedom is directly related to responsibility: taking into account the general crisis of civilization, the progressive growth of destructive, destructive capabilities of a person as a subject of activity, any reflection on freedom is unthinkable without correlating it with responsibility. The general crisis of the social system and new processes of development of modern society require the development and expression of a new ideological paradigm.

Key words: responsibility, crisis of civilization, morality, law, individual freedom, social system, social norm, public morality.

1. Analysis of Source Materials.

At the turn of the millennium, a significant number of works were published that show new approaches to considering the change in the concept of freedom in general, in a new understanding of the essence and content of the problem of the ratio of freedom and responsibility using alternatives in the development of modern society. They showed multi-level variability in the evolution of social systems, their self-organization, and the nonlinear nature of development.

It should be noted that most of the above studies, as a rule, do not consider the phenomena of freedom and responsibility in relation, comprehensively with morality, responsibility and social

freedom. We believe that in the current conditions of social development, there is an urgent need to conduct systematic and comprehensive socio-philosophical studies of the phenomenon of freedom and responsibility in the context of new data of social and humanitarian knowledge. This will allow us to create the necessary changes and conditions for conceptualizing this complex and multi-level problem and updating it in modern social practice.

2. Research Objective.

The purpose of this study is a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between morality, responsibility and social freedom in the context of philosophical aspects. A comprehensive socio — philosophical understanding of these concepts , as well as an analysis of its manifestations in various spheres of reality-historical, social, personal-requires the use of a phenomenological approach within the framework of social philosophy.

3. Presentation of the main material.

In today's world, the concepts of morality, responsibility, and social freedom are becoming increasingly important as more and more people face ethical dilemmas and social challenges. This research provides us with an opportunity to better understand their relationship and impact on our lives.

The main problem of any moral doctrine is how to recognize what is good and what is evil. According to Kant, there is no residual answer to these eternal questions, the fragments of stench in each case are the result of a creative decision of an individual or group of individuals who identify with a specific moral choice. The principle of morality can be considered as the principle of constant pursuit, search for history, and the principle of creativity.

Man, as a moral being, must do good. You can create it as directed. Thoughtless and blind submission is always evil, even if it is submission to one's own line or passions. Evil is the thoughtless submission of other people's thoughts, power, power, and circumstances. Individuals, generations of people, countries, can slide into such a historical abyss when they on a massive scale will act according to the laws of antimorality, so no epoch, not a specific person, should be proclaimed the embodiment of morality as such, in general, claim that from some singing empirical case or set of circumstances, from a specific interior or set of interests can deduce the rules of morality.

It is in this that Kant sees the fundamental difference between theoretical and practical reason. The theoretical mind is built on reason and is guided by a priori principles, but through reason it retains its connection with sensitivity. In the field of morality, sensitivity cannot be indulged [4, p. 55].

Morality cannot be relative, it must be relative, universal. From a moral point of view, the individual has no support other than his own mind. Only those that a person does himself, of his own free will, are real good, and everything else is slavery. According to Kant, the dignity of the individual lies in the fact that it itself represents the face of Eternity, which is practically unknown to us, precisely through the act, as a fact of our life, but a life organized according to the laws of freedom. First of all, freedom is independence from the impulses of sensitivity. Kant does not consider arbitrary choice to be completely free, because in the end it is only the result of a struggle of sensitive motives. Evil people from childhood, who, due to the constancy of their behavior, can even be considered natural criminals, are still convicted for their actions. This is possible only because when people have freely obtained their "definite foundations"; a bad human character is "a consequence of voluntarily accepted evil and unchangeable fundamental ones, so a person becomes even more worthy of condemnation and punishment" [5, p. 429].

Of course, Kant points out, a person's choice of their teachers is always free. But the change in these foundations is "a revolution in the way of thinking, when a person destroys the old foundations with a single firm decision and through this becomes a new person." The movement towards a universal moral law is carried out through a conscious, intelligent, truly human formation of maxims. And for those who would be surprised by this friction between empirical and relative maxims and the general moral law, Kant suggests paying attention to the beliefs of that amazing possibility called Conscience. When we happen to do something unworthy, dubious, or morally harmful, we calm our conscience,

tell it – it's not my fault, I had to do it ... However, conscience is opposed to moral conformity, so everyone knows the seed of conscience, unless he has turned into an animal, deprived of the very possibility of reasoning and introspection. However, Kant insists that even a person who has sunk to the bottom of life is familiar with the beliefs of conscience. "There is something extraordinary in the infinitely high appreciation of the pure, free from any benefit, moral in the form in which the practical mind presents it to us for observance; its voice makes even the bravest criminal tremble and be embarrassed before his eyes" [5, p. 269].

Moral experience is always a "living" experience of freedom, an experience that is renewable and supported only by the person himself. The fact that people are not allowed to be completely themselves at once and initially - subject, creator, person - contains great wisdom. Plants and birds contain all the essential fullness of the possibilities of their kind and species, but also all the limiting, ready-made specificity that separates "what can" from what, in principle, cannot be "a given story. Man is not given such fullness; he does not present even his very essence in its most important components, he lacks himself as the present. But it is precisely this task that he is gifted with ontological freedom: to fill his essential incompleteness through cultural formation and self-realization. The task of finding yourself is born precisely from the free decision to meet in others and through others something that is worthy to create an enriched self. The unity of the human "I" can only be realized by the relentless task of asserting the hidden essence, the essence of freedom. Freedom is the only condition for adequate perception and understanding of reality, as a residual realization of the inner harmony of the individual, the highest expression of his overcoming "ego". Self-awareness of the "I" is beyond the natural and non-physical precisely because there is a place for a sense of freedom. The boundaries of the individual coincide with the area of his freedom and responsibility. Thus, a person is responsible for everything, but, above all, for his life. Thanks to freedom, a person is able to preserve his uniqueness, remain himself even in the modern era of ecological, social, spiritual and moral crisis. [1, p. 29].

The inner world of the individual can be transformed into the external being of the individual, through an act. When a person accepts his actions, he is responsible for them and can freely express his will and choice in relation to the outside world, coordinating this with his personal beliefs.

On the basis of freedom, the Will is a person who establishes himself in the world, takes his own place in being. According to Kant, the ethical potential of the individual arises not as a result of the gradual accumulation of good qualities, but immediately, by turning the world perception around. So, for Kant, the categorical imperative is a general moral law that must determine all the diversity of practical human behavior. The ethical and anthropological problem raised by Kant concerns the realization of a person's spiritual and moral capabilities, a person's existential choice of himself, his internal personal values, orientations, universal ideas and moral aspirations.

The moral dimension of the individual is based on the existence of practical freedom, and the characteristic feature of the moral personality is its independence from the sensitive-natural sphere and the ability to choose the morally good. A moral person in Kantian philosophy is a person who does not violate the rights of other people, and contributes to the creation of universal moral good. The philosopher puts forward the demand for the creation of a "realm of goals", by which he means a systematic connection between individuals. The center of the "realm of goals" is the creative person as the highest value and absolute goal. Additionally, the problem of responsibility and Free Will is developed in the work of the German philosopher W. Windelband. In his book on free will, he draws a subtle distinction between freedom of motive, freedom of choice, and freedom of moral consciousness, awarding true freedom only to the latter. Windelband writes: "the right to work for a person responsible for his actions is based on the value of those norms that should be implemented through Responsibility and which can only be implemented with its Help" [7, p. 49].

He goes on to emphasize that responsibility can only fall on the individual. The person is appropriate insofar as he is the unhindered cause of his actions.

The Austrian scientist V. Frankl addresses the conscience and responsibility of a person. Considering the obvious predictability of human behavior, he refutes its preconditions. According to him, necessity and freedom do not exist on the same level, and freedom is higher than any need. Frankl analyzes a person's freedom in relation to three aspects: his desires, heredity, and the influence of external factors and circumstances. Freedom in relation to desires is shown in the snake to say "no" to them, to accept or reject them. [2, p. 42].

In situations where a person acts under the influence of immediate needs, they have the ability to recognize their behavior and maintain freedom of decision. Freedom in relation to heredity consists in the ability to consider it as a material for building what is necessary for the free development of the spirit. The character of a person may change depending on their own likenesses. The freedom of the individual in relation to external circumstances, wants and is limited, but exists in the snake of people to take a certain position in them. A person is free because his behavior is primarily determined by values and meanings that are not influenced by the above factors and are manifested in Noetic dimensions [6, p. 49].

In this position, a person is characterized by two main ontological features, namely: the ability to go beyond himself (self-transcendence) and the ability to rise above himself and the situation (Self-withdrawal). The first is expressed in the person's departure from self-determination, in his orientation to something. The second is the ability of the individual to rise above himself and the situation, to see the challenges on himself. These skills allow the individual to be, within the limits of singing, a self-fulfilling story.

Viktor Frankl believed that a person, as a spiritual story, always has the opportunity to "establish relationships" or "behave" in the world. At every moment of his life, a person takes a certain position not only in relation to nature and the social environment, but also in relation to his own inner world, to his inner environment. Those that can resist the social, physical, and even mental aspects of a person, Frankl called spiritual. It is by definition free in man. The ability of a person to rise above everything also includes his ability to rise above himself." A person can only dissociate himself from what is in the person himself. A person only has a certain type or character. "This is freedom from its factual nature, freedom from its existential nature." [2, p. 110].

4. Conclusions.

So, in general, the freedom of the individual from society is a kind of tribute to the mass personality, and the true freedom of the creative and mature personality is manifested, first of all, in relation to its imperfection. Freedom always implies a choice between alternatives, motives, good and evil; it is in a situation of choice that the individual most clearly demonstrates himself as a subject of freedom. Morality is a necessary component of freedom: the exercise of one's own will by an individual must necessarily take place without infringing on its freedoms and the rights of other individuals. Freedom is directly related to responsibility: taking into account the general crisis of civilization, the progressive growth of destructive, destructive capabilities of a person as a subject of activity, any reflection on freedom is unthinkable without correlating it with responsibility. The general crisis of the social system and new processes of development of modern society require the development and expression of a new ideological paradigm. The individual is formed in an indissoluble and constant interaction with nature, society and himself, which means that the patterns of its development are created and determined by many accidents. The main imperatives of the current civilization are the self-government of society, the opening of new spheres and prospects for the free development of the individual, the preservation of personal autonomy and moral integrity, while the activities of society should be aimed at strengthening the truly humanistic principles of human existence.

References:

1. Blikhar M.M., Bodnarchuk V.S. Filosofs'ko-pravova obumovlenist' realizatsiyi pryntsyviv svobody ta vidpovidal'nosti u pravookhoronniy diyal'nosti: monohrafiya. L'viv: Liha-pres, 2016. 252 s.
2. Blikhar V. (2016). Principle of Liability for Moral and Approval of Professional Employees of Law Enforcement (Legal and Philosophical Reflection) / Filosofs'ki ta metodologichni problemi prava. 2016. № 2 (12) 252 p. [in Ukrainian].
3. Husserl E. Kryza yevropeys'koho lyudstva i filosofiya / E. Husserl // Suchasna zarubizhna filosofiya. Tetsiyi ta napryamky. K.: Vakler, 1996. S. 69–83.
4. Karas' A. Avtentichnist' ta identychnist' v perspektyvi zdiysnennya demokratychnoyi svobody // Stanovlennya novoyi sotsial'no-kul'turnoyi diysnosti v Ukraini: Kolektyvna monohrafiya za zah. red. d-ra filos. nauk, prof. V.P. Mel'nyka. L'viv: LNU imeni Ivana Franka, 2017. S. 5–50.

5. Kant I. Krytyka chystoho rozumu. K.: Yunivers, 2000. 504 s.
6. Lyakh V.V. Ekzystentsiyna svoboda: vybir i vidpovidal'nist' (Filosofs'ka kontsepsiya Zh.-P. Sartra) // Filosofs'ka i sotsiolohichna dumka. 1995. № 5–6. S. 110–117.
7. Windel'band Vil'helm // Filosofskyy entsyklopedychnyy slovnyk / V.I. Shynkaruk (hol. redkol.) ta in.; Instytut filosofiyi imeni Hryhoriya Skovorody NAN Ukrayiny. Kyiv: Abris, 2002. 742 s.
8. Harhots A., Shandra B. (2024) The philosophical concept of freedom by J.-P. Sartre // Science of Europe. Prague: Vol. 4, No. 136, pp. 74-77 [Czech Republic]. <https://www.europe-science.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Sciences-of-Europe-No-136-2024.pdf>

Bohdana Shandra,

*Candidate of Juridical Science, Associate Professor
Associate Professor of the Department of Philosophy
of SHEI "Uzhhorod National University"
E-mail: bogdana.shandra@uzhnu.edu.ua
ORCID: 0000-0003-4104-2744*