Eastern-European Journal of Medical Humanities and Bioethics

2017, Volume 1, Issue 1, December, pp. 56-60

The Faces of Responsibility.

Review of the volume *Ethics of Responsibility in Knowledge Based Society*, by Ecaterina Croitor, published in 2017 at Lumen Publishing House

Loredana VLAD

<https://doi.org/10.18662/ejmh/b/04>

©2017 The Authors. Published by LUMEN Publishing House.

Selection and peer review under the responsibility of LUMEN Publishing House.

How to cite: Vlad, L. (2017). The Faces of Responsibility. Review of the volume *Ethics of Responsibility in Knowledge Based Society*, by Ecaterina Croitor, published in 2017 at Lumen Publishing House. *Eastern-European Journal of Medical Humanities and Bioethics*, 1(1), 57-60. <https://doi.org/10.18662/ejmh/b/04>

The Faces of Responsibility.

Review of the volume *Ethics of Responsibility in Knowledge Based Society*, by Ecaterina Croitor, published in 2017 at Lumen Publishing House

Loredana VLAD¹

Abstract: Reflections on facets of responsibility in post-modern or transmodal postmodern society are recent appear at Lumen Publishing House of the volume of *Ethics of Responsibility in the Knowledge-based Society* of Suceava, Ecaterina Croitor.

Keywords: ethics, communication.

The contemporary society

Contemporary society has reached a turning point in its ability to act on the surrounding world with a beneficial impact on the quality of life - especially in degraded societies but potentially devastating for man, as well as for nature, unless responsibility is established as a dimension axiological and central ethics of knowledge-based society. Reflections on facets of responsibility in post-modern or trans-modal postmodern society are due to the recent publishing of the volume *Ethics of Responsibility in the Knowledge-based Society*, authored by Ecaterina Croitor, by Lumen Publishing House.

“The issue of responsibility stands for critical thinking and the theory of contemporary social action. It is, at the same time, an unavoidable and privileged field of the systematic moral reflection nowadays: unavoidable, because it is hard to believe that the serious problems faced by human society, which reached its peak in the technological age, can be solved without the call to responsibility; privileged - because more and more specialists from the most varied domains: engineers, lawyers, educators, scientists, doctors, business people, etc. invoke individual and / or collective responsibility as the only solution to the challenges of our time. (Croitor, 2017)”

In turn, the prefatory of the volume, Professor Sorin Tudor Maxim shows that:

¹ PhD Candidate, Stefan cel Mare University from Suceava, Romania, loredanaterrec@gmail.com.

„An indisputable feature of the ethical thinking of the beginning of the third millennium, emerging as a constant concern of the second half of the 20th century, is the shifting movement of moral discourse from classical interrogations into virtue or debt to responsibility (Maxim, 2017).

It is vaguely, however, what responsibility ultimately represents, it is a virtue, a duty, an original structure of consciousness (Maxim, 2000, 2010, 2017), or a proof of the existence of moral consciousness.

The ethics of responsibility as an ethics of dialogue and communication

The work of Ecaterina Croitor is based on a principle, which is the need to simplify ethics precisely by calling for the value of responsibility, which is considered to be the only one able to humanize the technological society so-called based on knowledge. The main way in which the author sees the value of responsibility is communication, since the present society is one of mass communication and distance. The idea of ethics of communication as an ethics of responsibility is taken over and developed by the author, starting with Karl Otto Appel (1987, 1998), and Jürgen Habermas (2000, 2003).

Towards a phenomenology of responsibility.

The author attempts to first develop a documented synthesis of phenomenological and existentialist literature in the area of responsibility, and here comes the most important element of originality in our opinion, to distinguish the phenomenological dimension of responsibility by conjugating it to the habermasian ethics of communicative action (Croitor, 2017). The call to Levinas, Simone de Beauvoir, or Sartre anchors the work in the tradition of moral philosophy, seeking to recover the phenomenology of responsibility from the structural phenomenological perspective. The new phenomenology with incursions in the philosophy of language and the mind, but also in transhumanism and postmodern philosophy, is a unique successful synthesis of the author, which we present in his own words:

“The ethics of responsibility in the knowledge-based society is based on communication as a reception of Alterity, both in its rational side, as well as its extra-rational components, such as anxiety as primary emotion, care, etc.

The ethics of a knowledge-based society must necessarily include a series of humanistic particularities, and especially responsibility, tolerance, care, which is the core of a communication ethic. This can be thought in

terms of a transhumanism, as proposed by Basarab Nicolescu, based on the principles of transdisciplinarity.

The ethics of the discussion can therefore outline the collective and consensual management of the responsibility for technological advance, and the risks generated by it.

The universalism of ethics is consensual, not transcendental. The trans-modern synthesis based on the secret third includes a synthesis of ontological responsibility, as a human-levinasian existential, and the institutional as a moral foundation of normality in the sense of Jonas and Appeal (Croitor, 2017).

The responsibility in bioethics and applied ethics

A significant part of the paper speaks of the bioethical significance of responsibility. Classical themes of bioethics, such as principality (Beauchamp & Childress, 1994), assisted human reproduction, but also euthanasia, the right to autonomy, and self-responsibility for one's own health are invoked. In this context, as regards the responsibility for the use of new medical technologies, the author assumes an original position:

The responsibility for dignity is seen in the Levinasian sense as a precursor to the dignified being (Croitor, 2017).

The author does not miss the opportunity to argue for redefining responsibility in the bioethical context:

It is necessary to redefine the moral responsibility of all peoples in order to survive humanity that cannot be achieved beyond the process of sustainable development. The concept of dignity also undergoes a transformation in the direction of its expansion from the individual to the dignity, to the whole humanity as the source and receiver of the dignity of the human species. (Croitor, 2017).

We must observe the concern for the Christian perspective on bioethics, and in this context the problem of the sacredness of life as a responsibility to the other is explained!

Instead of conclusions

As the author himself (Croitor, 2017) declares in his book, it was "how and if it is possible to develop an ethics of responsibility specific to a particular type of social organization - the knowledge-based society." The book's first value is the answer to the question "If, beyond the syntagm of knowledge-based society with political-ideological valences - does this term really correspond to a civilization reality? The answer is affirmative because

the author has found that an ethics can be founded to manage the particular intersubjective realities of this society. As such, "the beginning was a legitimization of responsibility in line with the challenges / challenges of today's society" (Croitor, 2017). In order to legitimize a knowledge-based society as the generator of a new form of moral responsibility, the author researched the positioning of the individual in the society (in the past - what the history of his deeds is responsible for, in the future - taking into account both the responsibility for self, but especially for the other), which made it possible to understand each person's responsibility as an individual responsibility, but for the society as a whole, as collective responsibility, for its own actions, for what he did or did not achieve, and depended on his own person, being invoked a way of assuming responsibility towards himself, towards the Other, towards mankind as a whole - present and future.

References

- Beauchamp, T., & Childress, J. (1994). *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Apel, K.-O. (1987). *L'éthique à l'âge de la science*. France: Presses Universitaires de Lille.
- Apel, K.-O. (1998). *Discussion et responsabilité. II. Contribution à une éthique de la responsabilité*. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf.
- Croitor, E. (2017). *Etica responsabilității în societatea bazată pe cunoaștere*. Iași, România: Editura Lumen.
- Habermas, J. (2000). *Conștiință morală și acțiune comunicativă*. București: Editura All Educational.
- Habermas, J. (2003). *The Future of Human Nature*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Maxim, S.-T. (2000). *Responsabilitatea morală*. Suceava: Editura Mușatinii.
- Maxim, S.-T. (2010). *Peripathetice*. Iași: Editura Pim.
- Maxim, S.-T. (2017). Prefață. In Croitor, Ecaterina (2017), *Etica responsabilității în societatea bazată pe cunoaștere*, Editura Lumen, Iași, România.