

S.E. Adylkhanova*

*L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: ase280884@mail.ru)*

Philosophical aspects of the ethics of responsibility by Hans Jonas

In the article the philosophical aspects of Hans Jonas' ethics were described and analyzed. The analysis of their logical coherence and consistency in the observed moral imperatives was carried out. The reconstruction of the meaning of the ideological and contextual context was carried out, within the framework of which Jonas formulates the main provisions of his ethical theory. As the main application updating the proposed understanding and ethics of the Recommendation, the solution of the technology, or rather its (their) intensive and irreversible growth, is proposed. The irrelevance of imperative ethics was emphasized in the light of the new particularly acute challenges facing modern civilization. The main epistemological and problematic aspects of Jonas's ethical theory were highlighted, formulated in the form of questions, the search for answers to which constitute the justification of these scenarios. The application of the author's logic of argumentation and the metaphysical basis of the new ethics in the key of rationalism, as well as the possibility of its application in the political dimension at the global level of environmental problems was demonstrated. The author's dichotomies were revealed when analyzing the ethical attitude to such categories as "value" and "responsibility". The substantial novelty of the Jonas concept was presented, taking into account the main provisions of Kant's formal ethics and ontological explanations of technical Heidegger. It was concluded that, unlike many irrational interests in modern philosophy, the ethics of Realization was embedded in the classical tradition of philosophical knowledge, although constructive polemics were associated with it. The question of the applicability of the practical application of the new ethics was raised.

Keywords: philosophy, ethics, Hans Jonas, alarmism, responsibility, values; technology, techne, future, generation.

Introduction

The modern world is characterized by the increased influence of technology in people's lives. The level and scale of technology development entail significant changes not only at the social, but also at the natural level. Humanity has turned out to have a powerful weapon in its hands, the careless use of which can lead to irreversible harmful consequences.

Traditional ethics proves insufficient when considering collective actions that arise from the use of advanced technologies. Such actions often have consequences that cannot be predicted and that go beyond the private sphere. It is emphasized that although it is impossible to fully understand all the consequences of our technological actions, we have a responsibility towards nature and future generations. These two aspects must be included in ethical thinking, since technologies allow us to manipulate them, making them objects of our responsibility. We must reconsider our role in society and the world, accept new moral obligations that correspond to the risks, negative, but also positive aspects that modern technologies provide. First of all, it is necessary to take care of nature, the future generation and the ecological component. Moreover, such care must be long-term, so that it has any consequences in the future. Therefore, we need flexible and accessible ethics, such ethics that can be adapted and applied by everyone and at all levels of life and functioning of society.

The effects of technological progress are irreversible and cumulative, especially in the area of genetic technologies and their impact on human nature and moral responsibility. In other words, technological impacts tend to accumulate, making it impossible to predict all their effects in the medium and long term, resulting in considerable uncertainty. What we consider to be immutable aspects of human nature may be changed by new genetic technologies. Modern technologies actively interfere with human nature, making it possible to change it significantly. In light of these changes, the question of moral responsibility requires a new understanding. We must reassess our responsibilities to other people and future generations, taking into account how technologies may change human nature.

Therefore, the ethics of responsibility of Hans Jonas seems to be an urgent necessity for technological civilization.

* Corresponding author's e-mail: ase280884@mail.ru

The priority areas of research focus for us are following:

- 1) The basics of Jonas's proposal for a new ethics;
- 2) The relationship between ethics, social order and political ideology;
- 3) The possibilities of implementing the ethics of responsibility in modern environmental policy.

Methods

The research was conducted using traditional methods of philosophical analysis, including basic procedures for inductive and deductive reasoning, as well as operations of abstraction and generalization.

The primary focus of the research was hermeneutical in nature and was aimed at understanding the holistic contextual meaning of Hans Jonas' ethics of responsibility.

Comparing H. Jonas's concepts with those of M. Heidegger and I. Kant provides a deeper understanding of the need to rethink ethical principles in light of technological change.

Results

H. Jonas, in his book "The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age", argues that traditional ethical systems are unable to cope with the challenges posed by modern technology because they do not take into account the long-term and global consequences of our actions. In his work, H. Jonas emphasizes the need for a new ethical system that will take into account responsibility to future generations and nature, adapting to the changing conditions created by technological progress [1]. H. Jonas's thesis echoes M. Heidegger's diagnosis of modernity in his work "The Question Concerning Technology", where Heidegger explored the nature of technology and its impact on human existence, arguing that technology changes our perception of the world, turning everything into resources for exploitation [2].

The essence of Heidegger's thesis on the essence of technology is that it represents a special ontological disposition, which he calls "Gestell". "Gestell" is a way of revealing the world in which both nature and man are seen as resources for satisfying the needs of society. Technology turns nature into raw material for manipulation, and in this context, man sees everything as part of an ordered reservoir of resources. This perception of the world is not just one of the threats, but the primary threat that determines man's relationship to the environment.

In light of ancient Greek philosophy, which can be traced in Heidegger's ideas and concepts, it makes sense to think that art (poiesis) can serve as a counterweight to the technical and instrumental way of revealing the world (techne), offering a deeper and more authentic understanding of being.

Jonas uses the term "techne" like M. Heidegger [3]. In ancient times it meant skill or craftsmanship, which were the basis of development, craftsmen and artisans created technologies for that time. Today we have different technologies, but the essence is the same. Developing technologies no longer fit into the framework of existing ethics. Heidegger looks at how technologies affect our lives, but Jonas looks at technologies from the point of view of ethics, that is, how to use them correctly or incorrectly. Jonas presents new grounds for creating the very ethics that takes into account modern technologies:

Ethics traditionally focuses on humans and their relationships with other humans, without taking into account the impact on nature and future generations.

Traditional ethics focuses on the immediate and visible consequences of actions, ignoring long-term and cumulative effects.

Ethics assumes that moral actions occur in personal and immediate interactions, without taking into account complex, technologically mediated actions.

The basic conditions of human existence are assumed to remain unchanged, which does not correspond to the rapidly changing reality of the technological age.

Based on the presented features, it can be assumed that traditional ethics should be expanded, that is transformed into a new ethics, to include the impact on nature and future generations, taking into account the long-term and cumulative consequences of technological actions.

In today's world, where technology is everywhere, we need an ethical approach that values individuals and considers the long-term impact of our actions. Kant's idea to "treat humanity... not only as a means, but also as an end" [4; 97] reminds us to respect people for who they are, not just for what they can do for us. Similarly, Hans Jonas's advice to "act so that the consequences of your actions are compatible with the constancy of genuine human life" [5; 321] stresses the importance of thinking about how our actions affect fu-

ture generations. Together, these ideas encourage us to respect human dignity and ensure our actions support a sustainable and good life for everyone, now and in the future.

The key point to understand here is that preserving nature is crucial, especially for the well-being of future generations, because humans are deeply connected to nature and cannot survive without it. Therefore, the destruction of nature will ultimately lead to the destruction of humanity itself. Consequently, it is essential for humans to be highly conscious of the importance of protecting and preserving nature.

Should we change human beings? Is it right to extend life with technology? Can modern inventions make our life easier and longer? These questions come up because of recent inventions in biomedicine and genetics. These technologies have greatly impacted our lives. Jonas thinks that because of these inventions and changes, people are becoming subjects of scientific experiments and interventions. We should raise important questions about how these actions are right and acceptable. This suggests that we need a new set of ethical guidelines to address these issues.

Biomedicine can be used to control behavior, which affects our moral consciousness. Jonas is concerned about how this change will affect people and their responsibilities. It is important to consider what kind of human being we aspire to, who defines it, and on the basis of what knowledge. It is also important to consider that future generations may have different values and moral preferences than ours. The question is how modern technologies can change people and what will be the moral consciousness of future generations.

- In light of this, it is necessary to consider the following questions in the frames of new ethics:
- What kind of human being do we consider ideal?
- Who has the right to define this image?
- On what knowledge and principles should this definition be based?
- On what moral grounds can we justify our assumption that future generations will adhere to the same values as we do?
- How can modern technologies transform human nature and how will this affect the moral consciousness of future generations?

Jonas emphasizes that without including metaphysical foundations in the ethical debate, it is impossible to create a sustainable and comprehensive system of norms that would cope with the challenges of the technological age. He insists that metaphysics provides a deep understanding of existence and moral obligations that go beyond purely empirical data. This understanding is necessary to create ethical standards that take into account not only present but also future generations. Jonas believes that the restoration of metaphysics in philosophy can help to overcome the moral crisis and ensure a more responsible approach to the use of technology.

Let us consider Jonas's questions from a philosophical perspective. A key aspect of normative assessments of the relationship between technology use and future generations is the uncertainty of future generations' value preferences. We cannot predict with certainty how future technological innovations will change the perception of current resource problems or whether our current actions will be valued as beneficial. This uncertainty raises doubts about whether we should base our assumptions on future generations' preferences. However according to Jonas, these uncertainties should not distract us from our responsibility to ensure the well-being of future generations and to take actions that we believe will be in their interests. It is important to develop an ethics that takes into account possible scenarios and aims to minimize risks and maximize benefits for all generations.

The problems that arise with new technologies can also be related to our knowledge, our ability to see the future, and problems of a more global level, such as the nature of things themselves. Solutions to such problems cannot be made immediately and based on something that does not yet exist, such as the idea that there will be unlimited access to clean energy in the future. Values are of primary importance we must base decisions on what we have now. This distinction can help make informed decisions that consider possible risks and benefits for future generations without ignoring our current ethical and environmental responsibilities.

There are questions that force us to consider how current events and society's actions will affect future generations. Overpopulation or on the contrary population decline are not the only problems. Ontological and epistemological problems are aspects of philosophy and are related to questions of knowledge, uncertainty, human existence, and the morality of future generations. We need to consider how ignorance, or uncertainty will affect our sense of responsibility to future generations, and whether we understand their needs

and lives well enough to take their well-being into account when making decisions. Additionally whether we have duties to people who have not yet been born, and whether future people can have rights.

As mentioned, Jonas believes that traditional ethical theory fails when it comes to the concerns of future generations. So, let's look at the utilitarian principle of maximizing the overall welfare, taking into account the above-mentioned differences. Utilitarianism, which focuses on maximizing happiness and minimizing suffering, may not take into account the long-term and cumulative effects of our actions on future generations. Moreover, the utilitarian approach often fails to take into account moral obligations to people who do not yet exist, which is a critical aspect of the ethics of future generations.

Despite the fact that I. Bentham mentions that temporal distance has no ethical significance, the utilitarian faces difficulties. According to I. Bentham "first, how far into the future do our responsibilities for our descendants extend? Should distant generations be given the same weight as the interests of our own children and grandchildren? If all future generations are equal, an equal distribution of goods means that we ourselves will receive very little. However, the utilitarian has difficulty finding a moral justification for preferring near generations over distant ones. Second, how should the utilitarian evaluate the welfare of future individuals if their preferences and needs are unknown? Should we maximize the average welfare of future individuals or the total amount of welfare for future populations?" [6].

Responsibility to the "idea of man" for Jonas consists of adhering to a binding code of conduct that is based on an ontological imperative. Jonas is less concerned with specific questions about how much we should take into account the well-being of future generations or how much current generations should sacrifice to prevent future losses of well-being. The main emphasis is on the need to develop an ethical code that is universal and binding for everyone. This code must be based on metaphysics, which allows us to justify its imperativeness. For Jonas, the metaphysical justification of ethics is important because it provides a deep understanding of human existence and moral obligations that goes beyond purely utilitarian or pragmatic approaches. In other words, we can assume, that responsibility to the "idea of man" presupposes adherence to ethical norms that guarantee the preservation of human essence and well-being in the long term.

It is assumed that if politicians recognize and accept this, they will adopt a binding code of conduct based on the imperative "the welfare of mankind must be guaranteed in the future" [7; 52]. This code of conduct will manifest itself in the regulatory regulation of the use of potentially dangerous technologies.

Let us follow the author's own way of expressing his thoughts, which is quite interesting, since Jonas begins with a radical proposal: in order to determine whether humanity ought to exist, we must first confront Leibniz's fundamental metaphysical question: "Why is there something rather than nothing?" [8; 16]. In examining ethics and our moral obligations, it is important to define what we mean by "value" in the broadest sense. Only when we understand the objective nature of value, we can develop objective moral standards and understand what we should do, and will this allow us to establish our duties to the very fact of existence and our responsibility for maintaining and preserving that existence, making the objectivity of value the foundation for defining our ethical obligations [8; 16].

This approach directly challenges the tenets of contemporary philosophy, which often dismisses terms such as the "objectivity of value" and "objective ought" as outdated or irrelevant. In arguing for the necessity of these concepts, Jonas places himself in opposition to thinkers such as G.E. Moore, who criticized the derivation of ethical norms from natural properties, a criticism known as the "naturalistic fallacy." Jonas argues that ignoring the objective basis of values leads to a superficial understanding of ethics. He believes that without recognizing the objective nature of values, our ethical frameworks remain incomplete and insufficient to address the profound moral responsibilities we face, especially in the context of technological advances and their impact on future generations. This approach emphasizes the need for a holistic ethical system that not only addresses immediate human problems but also considers the long-term consequences of our technological and moral choices.

Therefore, Jonas proposes that nature possesses an ontological "locus," where we can bridge the supposed gap between "is" and "ought" without falling into the naturalistic fallacy. Jonas introduces the concept of a "self-affirmation of being" inherent in all biological life, suggesting that this self-affirmation embodies a fundamental sympathy between life and death. According to Jonas, life is a clear confrontation between being and non-being, where the essence of life actively asserts itself against the void of non-existence [9; 510]. By acknowledging such ontological dimension, Jonas looks to develop a more comprehensive understanding of our moral responsibilities, especially in relation to the impact of technological advancements on future generations.

Thus, there is the fundamental duty to guarantee the continuation of life into the indefinite future and to maintain the essential conditions for human existence. The development of a new ethical framework relies on the ability to justify an objective “should-be” with solid reasoning. The author suggests three necessary conditions for responsibility: first one is the causal effect, which means actions must have an impact on the world; the second one is the control, i.e. the action must be under the control of a moral agent; the last one is the predictability, or in other words the agent must be able to foresee the consequences of their actions to some extent. Our primary ethical duty is to ensure the ongoing existence of life and the foundation for human life. For a new ethical system to be viable, it must convincingly establish why certain things “should” happen. In these frames there are two types of responsibility: for actions and for the consequences of those actions.

Jonas emphasizes “meaningful” responsibility, where individuals are accountable for their actions that affect specific things. This includes our duty to future generations. With today’s knowledge and abilities, we can predict and reduce the harmful impacts of technology on nature and people in the future. Previously, limited understanding meant we didn’t worry much about the future, assuming conditions for human life would always stay the same. Now, with greater awareness and capability, we must take on the meaningful responsibility to ensure these conditions are sustainable.

The ethics of responsibility cannot rely solely on the idea of something being “objectively good” as an absolute obligation. It must also address the motivation to act. According to Jonas, what drives us to uphold strict responsibility for future life is a “natural sense of responsibility,” an inherent feeling within us. This type of responsibility is inherent and fundamental, unlike contractual responsibility, which is based on agreements. Natural responsibility is the original form from which all other responsibilities stem. The archetype of this responsibility is parental responsibility, which is characterized by unconditional care. This serves as the model for the meaningful responsibility previously discussed.

Jonas’s unusual comparison highlights that both parental and political responsibilities involve a commitment to care for others and ensure their well-being. In parental responsibility, parents naturally assume the duty to care for and nurture their children, driven by an inherent sense of responsibility. Similarly, political responsibility involves leaders who willingly take on the duty to govern and protect their citizens, aspiring to power to effectively manage their responsibilities. Jonas sees a connection between the two through the concepts of “totality”, (both responsibilities encompass a comprehensive care for the well-being of those under their charge, whether it is children or citizens) “continuity”, (both involve ongoing duties that persist over time, requiring consistent attention and commitment) and “future” (both types of responsibility are oriented towards securing a better future for the next generation or the society as a whole). This threefold concept leads us to the thought that we can be responsible for those who do not yet exist?

Jonas argues that responsibility should not rely on reciprocity. It requires an unconditional commitment, not based on compensation or selfish motives. The model for this type of responsibility is how we care for our children, driven by a natural, selfless obligation. Children inherently evoke our sense of duty, prompting responsible actions. Thus, responsibility is rooted in the inherent qualities of those we care for. Ethical responsibility also needs to address the rational justification for obligatory commitments and the psychological motivations behind them. The sense of “ought” guides the will, requiring moral agents to determine their actions’ direction. We suggest that Jonas views responsibility as an inherent part of human nature, deeply connected to our natural instincts and moral reasoning. By grounding responsibility in these fundamental aspects, Jonas believes we can develop a more robust and universal ethical framework.

Therefore, ethics encompasses both objective and subjective dimensions. The objective aspect pertains to rational thought and logical principles, while the subjective aspect is connected to emotions and personal feelings. This dual nature of ethics ensures that moral considerations are balanced, incorporating both reason and empathy. The ethical ability to feel responsible is part of what makes us human.

Although the idea of future generations seems to be something completely abstract and distant, it is us who are responsible for their potential existence. Jonas believes that the attitude towards future generations should be based on our responsibility to them. Each individual person in modern society should bear a “moral imperative” that is based on the very foundations of existence, i.e. the continuation of the family (life), responsibility for descendants, both close and distant.

There are two types of values: internal and external. Jonas’s idea is that our responsibilities to future generations are those values that must not only be cultivated in ourselves, but also transmitted to others, creating the so-called value network. Future generations cannot impose a sense of responsibility on us, since they do not yet exist, but nevertheless, we must think about their well-being, which correlates with the con-

cept of humanity in general. The first type of values includes what is inside, for example, the value of life as such, while the second type of value is more associated with external factors that make this very life more comfortable and acceptable, for example, tools that include benefits. Jonas calls for forming and taking responsibility for future generations based on internal values, accepting life as the most important value, realizing that the maintenance of human life is inherent in us by nature.

In other words, it is necessary to rely on the subconscious, where the goals of existence are inherent in nature itself in the entire living world and are the engine of life itself, what saved us in the past from total extinction. Jonas's biocentrism is a concept that puts internal values at the forefront, from which ethical considerations are formed. Jonas argues that by accepting the law of nature — to support life, to take care of it — as our internal value, the ethics of coordinating our actions with the aforementioned goal is also accepted.

This means recognizing the inherent worth of all forms of life and making decisions that support and preserve the natural world. By understanding that all organisms strive to maintain their existence, we can develop an ethical framework that respects and protects the continuity of life, integrating this biocentric perspective into our moral duties and obligations.

In this perspective, people should stand out by taking responsibility for other living beings. Jonas's biocentric ethics suggests that humans, with their unique ability to think morally and plan ahead, have a special duty to protect and sustain the natural world. This responsibility includes caring for all living things, not just human interests. By recognizing the value and purpose of all life forms, humans are called to be caretakers of the environment. This means making ethical choices that support the well-being of all organisms and ensure our actions do not harm the balance of nature. In this way, we meet our ethical duties to both current and future generations, helping to maintain the continuity of life in line with nature's ultimate goal. Thus, the question is "who is responsible for what"? Answers to these questions have been already given but we need some clarifications how responsibility and political power relate.

Of particular interest is the fact that Jonas identifies different types of responsibility. He distinguishes between formal responsibility, which is the accountability an individual has for their actions, and substantive responsibility, which involves a deeper ethical commitment to the well-being of others and the environment.

When it comes to protecting the "idea of humanity", we must all act to safeguard it, as our collective actions threaten the future of human existence. It is essential that everyone is motivated to make sacrifices for the future. This implies that responsibility has no fixed level; it is shared among individuals, groups, and institutions. The responsibility of political leaders, however, is amplified by the power of technology. The extent of responsibility should match the extent of our power. This directly counters any attempt to dismiss the negative impact we may have on the future.

Fear is what can impose restrictions on our actions, thereby creating a long-term responsibility that will extend not only to society, but also to politicians, leaders, and managers. The "fear heuristic" uses fear to foresee and, as a result, prevent bad consequences of our actions, especially when it comes to technology and the environment. Inventing potential worst-case scenarios allows us to avoid future dangers.

If society begins to think in this way, then perhaps we will be able to protect future generations, but for this it is necessary to translate this type of thinking into a moral foundation that should form ethics. It is important to remember that such a concept should primarily be adhered to by the leader when developing plans for the future of society.

The concept of fear or "Fear Heuristic" Jonas has three bases. The first base is related to the fact that fear helps to come up with the worst scenarios for the future and the development of events. We think ahead, evaluate our actions and imagine the worst that can happen (no one has canceled the reference to Murphy's Law). Thinking about negative consequences in the future allows you to make the right decisions in the present. The second foundation is connected with a sense of caution and responsibility in the present. Risks and challenges become more real. We want to avoid negative scenarios, which means we think and reason more. The third foundation is planning for the future, where fear is the main driver, i.e., based on the care for the future generation inherent in nature, we begin to think about how today can affect tomorrow. The desire to protect is actualized, even for the generation that is very far from us.

Discussion

Despite the fact that Jonas's ideas are logical, perhaps too radical in some places, one should ask the question: is it possible to spread Jonas's ideas throughout the world and introduce them to modern society? Politics is the driving force. People who want to change their behavior must first change politics. The values of life are at the forefront of ethical responsibility, and the values of the lives of future generations. Isn't this

too general? Is it possible to instill such general moments in society and politics? Yes, Jonas's ideas and concepts are quite profound and well-founded, the author's position is strong and inspires confidence, but are they feasible?

Jonas emphasizes the necessity of considering long-term consequences and the moral obligation to future generations. The strength of the theory is its comprehensive approach which integrates both rational and emotional aspects of ethics making it relevant for addressing complex global issues.

Take climate change as an example. There is much debate about whether it is caused by natural factors or human activities. According to Jonas's ethics of responsibility, if there is reasonable doubt that natural fluctuations are to blame, we have no ethical excuse for inaction. We must take responsibility for the possibility that humans are causing these changes and act collectively to address it. Uncertainty about the causes of climate change does not absolve us of our ethical duty to take responsibility and take action.

The most challenging aspect of Jonas's ethics of responsibility is figuring out how to inspire the widespread commitment to responsible behavior that his theory demands. Encouraging individuals and societies to adopt this level of ethical responsibility requires more than just understanding the theory; it necessitates fostering a deep-seated motivation to act in accordance with these principles. This involves creating a cultural and educational shift where the importance of long-term consequences and the well-being of future generations are ingrained values.

The author himself sees this problem and doubts that democracy is the right system to solve our environmental issues. Jonas does not believe that democracy effectively addresses ecological concerns. He even explores the idea of an environmental dictatorship, suggesting that temporarily setting aside Western democratic values might help solve urgent environmental problems. He examines whether a right-wing or left-wing dictatorship would be better and concludes that a left-wing environmental dictatorship would be preferable. Jonas argues that a needs-based economic model, focused on meeting society's essential needs, is more efficient in managing limited resources compared to the profit-driven capitalist model. He believes that the future of human existence must take priority over everything else. Jonas is open to the idea of a temporary "green" dictatorship if it ensures the survival and well-being of future generations. This strong position highlights his belief that drastic measures might be necessary to address the environmental crisis and fulfill our ethical duties to future humanity [10].

This is a strong position, reflecting Jonas's urgency regarding the environmental crisis and his skepticism about the effectiveness of democracy in addressing it. He highlights a common issue in the environmental debate: the ecological crisis is often seen as a result of an imbalance between human activities and nature. Jonas argues that democratic systems, with their short-term focus and susceptibility to political and economic pressures, may be ill-equipped to restore this balance and implement the necessary long-term solutions.

It is worth considering whether it is puzzling that democracy has primarily been practiced in countries that have benefited from the exploitation of natural resources. One might question if democracy is partly responsible for the environmental crisis due to its connection with industry, technology, economic growth, and environmental threats. Additionally, it is important to explore whether political freedom has a downside, as it may contribute to the overuse and depletion of natural resources through widespread self-expression and consumption.

It is, therefore, useful to talk about the need to choose between different values in the context of environmental crises. The connection between these crises and our values is emphasized, as well as doubts about our ability to set priorities correctly. In order to express an opinion on sustainable development, one must understand which values are more important. For example, survival is more important than income equalization. However the question arises as to how simple a life limited by consumption, we are prepared to lead for this.

Jonas hopes that the necessary changes will be based on people realizing the need to take responsibility. International agreements and joint projects can help to effectively solve environmental problems. Education plays a key role in shaping a new generation that will recognize the importance of preserving our planet. The environmental revolution, as Jonas understands it, is a rethinking of values. Internal and external moral foundations must move into the global sphere and form a new ethic. Technological progress is gaining momentum and is becoming almost unstoppable. Our society needs a new ethic even more urgently.

Conclusion

In general, the ethics of responsibility of Hans Jonas is a positive example of long-term strategic thinking, which problematizes modernity, despite the apparent security.

Unlike many irrationalist trends in modern philosophy, the ethics of responsibility is embedded in the classical tradition of philosophical knowledge, although it conducts constructive polemics with it.

Jonas convincingly proves the inconsistency of some ethical imperatives in the conditions of technologically complicated modernity. He offers completely different (new, unusual) parameters of thinking, arguing his position in favor of a guaranteed future.

References

- 1 Jonas, Hans (2001). *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. The University of Chicago Press.
- 2 Heidegger, Martin (2013). *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Harper Perennial Modern Classics.
- 3 Jonas, Hans (2008). "Ethics and Biogenetic Art". *Social Research*, 75, 3, 491–504.
- 4 Kant, Immanuel (1997). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Cambridge University Press.
- 5 Jonas, Hans (2007). "Causality and Perception". *The Journal of Philosophy*, 104, 11, 319–324.
- 6 Bentham, Jeremy (2007). *Deontology or the Science of Morality*. Clarendon Press.
- 7 Jonas, Hans (2001). "Ontological Grounding of a Political Ethics: On the Metaphysics of Commitment to the Future of Man". *Graduate Faculty Philosophical Journal*, 22, 1, 47–62.
- 8 Jonas, Hans (2006). "Freedom of Scientific Inquiry and the Public Interest". *The Hastings Center Report*, 36, 4, 15–17.
- 9 Jonas, Hans (2009). "The Nobility of Sight". *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 79, 3, 507–519.
- 10 Jonas, Hans (2004). "Toward a Philosophy of Technology". *Hastings Center Report*, 34, 3, 34–43.

С.Е. Адылханова

Ханс Йонастың жауапкершілік этикасының философиялық аспектілері

Мақалада Ханс Йонас этикасының философиялық аспектілері сипатталған және талданған. Бақыланатын моральдық императивтерде олардың логикалық үйлесімділігі мен дәйектілігіне талдау жасалады. Йонастың этикалық теориясының негізгі ережелері тұжырымдалатын идеологиялық және контекстік мағынасын қайта құру мәселесі қарастырылған. Жаңа этиканы өзектендірудің негізгі факторы — заманауи технология және оның қайтымсыз өсуі. Ханс Йонастың этикалық теориясының негізгі гносеологиялық аспектілері сұрақтар түрінде назарға алынып, оған жауап іздеу жаңа этиканың негіздемесін құрайды. Осыған байланысты рационализм кілтінде жаңа этиканы дәлелдеудің авторлық логиканы қолдану, сондай-ақ оны саяси өлшемде пайдалану мүмкіндігі көрсетілді. Авторлық дихотомиялар «құндылық» және «жауапкершілік» тәріздес категорияларға этикалық қатынасты талдау кезінде ашылады. И. Канттың формальды этикасының негізгі ережелерін және М. Хайдеггердің техника философиясының онтологиялық түсіндірмелерін ескере отырып, Ханс Йонас тұжырымдамасының маңызды жаңалығы берілген. Сонымен қатар, қазіргі философиядағы көптеген иррационалды ағымдардан айырмашылығы сол, ол Ханс Йонастың этикасы өзіндік полемикалығына қарамастан, философиялық білімнің классикалық дәстүріне енген деген қорытынды жасалған. Жаңа этиканың іс жүзінде қолданылуы туралы мәселе көтерілген.

Кілт сөздер: философия, этика, Ханс Йонас, алармизм, жауапкершілік, құндылықтар, технологиялар, әдістер, келешек, ұрпақ.

С.Е. Адылханова

Философские аспекты этики ответственности Ханса Йонаса

В статье проанализированы философские аспекты этики Ханса Йонаса. Проведены анализ их логической согласованности и последовательности в наблюдаемых моральных императивах, а также реконструкция идеологического контекста, в рамках которого Х. Йонас формулирует основные положения своей этической теории. В качестве основного фактора актуализации новой этики выступают современные технологии и их необратимый рост. Выделены основные эпистемологические аспекты этической теории Ханса Йонаса, сформулированные в виде вопросов, поиск ответов на которые составляют

обоснование новой этики. Продемонстрировано применение авторской логики аргументации новой этики в ключе рационализма, а также возможность ее использования в политическом измерении. Авторские дихотомии раскрываются при анализе этического отношения к таким категориям, как «ценность» и «ответственность». Представлена содержательная новизна концепции Йонаса с учётом основных положений формальной этики И. Канта и онтологических разъяснений философии техники М. Хайдеггера. Сделан вывод, что, в отличие от многих иррациональных течений в современной философии, этика Ханса Йонаса, несмотря на свою полемичность, встроена в классическую традицию философского знания. Поднимается вопрос о практической применимости новой этики.

Ключевые слова: философия, этика, Ханс Йонас, алармизм, ответственность, ценности, технологии, методы, будущее, поколение.

Information about the author

Adylkhanova Samal — PhD student, L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan. <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2502-3531>