

Filozofijas maģistru studiju programmas ietvaros ielūdzam uz vieslekcijām

Danute Baceviciute

23.09.2014

Aspazijas bulv. 5, 506. aud.

16.30 -18.00

18.15-19.40

‘Inflation’ of Responsibility

In this lecture I'll analyse contemporary phenomenon that could be called 'inflation' of responsibility. This inflation of responsibility means that expanded and increased range of responsibility is accompanied by its 'shallow', devaluation and degradation. I am primarily interested in following Paul Ricoeur's analysis of transformations in juridical and moral concepts of responsibility. In contemporary civil law, one can see that the idea of responsibility for an action was substituted by the idea of the risk management as well as by the idea of responsibility without fault. Whereas, in the moral plane of responsibility, one can notice that judgement bearing on relationship between the author of action and its effect in the world was substituted by the idea of the vulnerable and fragile other person for whom one has responsibility.

Here opens the field of unlimited responsibility for the humanity and its environment. The analysis of these processes leads me to reflection of general concept of responsibility, its conditions and criteria. Authors such as

Paul Ricoeur, Georg Picht and Jacques Derrida are basic for my reflections.

Ethics and Ontology

In this lecture I'll focus on the problem of relationship between ethics and ontology in Hans Jonas' search for the imperative of responsibility in the age of technology. One can see the relationship between ontology and ethics as problematical not only because of the traditional distinction between theoretical and practical reason, but also because of the Martin Heidegger's attempt to return to fundamental ontology in terms of the phenomenological *Dasein* analysis which differently incorporates the practical dimension. Jonas follows Heidegger when he notices that the nature of human action has changed in the technological age: the phenomenon of technology is constitutive for Jonas' formula of the responsibility imperative. However, Jonas' stand against anonymity of Heidegger's being, which can annul the ethical dimension and make one to resign facing necessity should also be emphasized. The question is whether Jonas' neo-Aristotelian teleology can offer an adequate counterbalance for the dominant anonymity of modern technology. Maybe ethics should remain as an alternative to ontology instead of seeking for its ontological grounding.