

Theses on Prolegomena to Ethics

Andrey Zheleznov

Ural Federal University, Russia

0250

The Asian Conference on Ethics, Religion & Philosophy 2013

Official Conference Proceedings 2013

A large, faint watermark of the iafor logo is centered on the page. It consists of the lowercase letters 'iafor' in a serif font, surrounded by two concentric, hand-drawn style arcs. The top arc is light red and the bottom arc is light blue.

iafor

iafor
The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Theses on Prolegomena to Ethics

Building the concrete ethics (or moral) always depends on the solution of the question of the existence. "Due" (better or "Good") is determined according to the understanding of the individual's existence, its aims and sense. Existence can be understood purely metaphysically (as differenced by some transcendental bases), religious (as extension of the God's will), naturalistic (according to postulating some Nature or natural conditions), at last, the existence can be understood in the existential perspective (as the being-to-death). In any case this understanding constitutes the space of the ethics and determines the ethical landmarks. It's important to note, that in this case any ethics can be called "immanent" – any transcendent and transcendental idea is needed only for explanation or justification of individual's existence.

We can explain some typical links between the concepts of existence and ethics. So, the concept of existence as the implementing of "Unity" (order, substance, logos and others) often leads to ethics, in which due or better is defined as following the need and cognition the need. When we define the existence as the realization of some social structure, keeping concrete community, we get ethics, which sees due in the maintaining the unity and integrity of the society and increasing its performance. Naturalistic definition of the existence gives us the utilitarian ethics, which concentrates on the search of the best ways (or best compromises) to satisfice natural needs or defense natural rights in the community or by the community. Describing the existence as the co-being of the different exists, we built the ethics, which implies that better is something that can enlarge concrete individual's possibilities to realize his own ability to existence.

Here we can conclude, that any attempt of building ethics has to begin from resolving the question about existence. This way would be traditional, and also it is relevant to the good sense: it looks like we draw the general map at first, and only then, mark some reference point on it. But can we propose, that it is possible to answer the question about the individual's existence unambiguously? Or, to be more concrete, can we solve the question about the existence basing on the analyses of structure and possibilities of the mind, some limiting assumptions?

The speculation about possibility to answer the question in this way looks very disputable, first of all, because we have a lot of alternative attempts of such clarifying. We can spend a lot of time to describe all differences between approaches and their aspects without any hope for the end of this work. Here we are far from fully criticizing the principle of understanding individual's existence on the base of ontological, epistemological, phenomenological or other such analysis, but, taking into account the actual availability of the very large number of difficulties and questions, we propose to go other way. Our attempt isn't the consequence of obvious crisis of other methodologies, but it is better to identify it as some kind of "reconnaissance in force": the try to prove it's productivity and true by making the analysis.

We propose to approach the question of the construction of ethics from the other point of view: to make conclusions about the existence after analyses of ethics and ethical, but not backwards. The relationship between ethics and existence is two-way. This means that we have the possibility to make conclusions about the structure of existence based on the analysis of that, which we call ethical, based on that how Due shows itself. If earlier we subordinated the proposition of ethical to the question of

existence, now we should make contrary gesture and subordinate the question of existence to ethical. Here we of course must ask ourselves how we can authentically speak about ethical. Or, in other words, on what bases we can claim that practically identifying Better and Worse is made unambiguously, without supposing any general principles. It is clear, that it is a critical question for our method.

To clarify practical possibility to identify "better" or "due" and to describe the moment of this identifying, we propose to use the concept of "ethical situation". It is the situation in which due reveals itself, in which it is shown or appears. Obviously, such a situation should be located before or outside the limits of previously outlined or definite (based on some sources) understanding of due, outside any visions of Good and Evil. It is the situation which on the contrary leads us out of any distinctness. It's the reason why, ethical situations are disclosed as the antinomies where any decision is paradoxical and impossible, making outside any regularity, including logical or rational regularity.

We can mention some of such antinomies. First, it is moral responsibility or due, which are locked in double limits: this responsibility has to be mandatory and, at the same time it must not to have any bases; forgiveness, which forgives the unforgivable; competition, the intensity of which is based on its artificiality and frivolous; love, which does not love what it loves.

The analysis of these antinomies shows us, that the ethical situation is always a moment of creation, but not of incarnation, implementation of Due. And we shouldn't say that "we know due because it is implemented in ethical situation", but we should say "we know due, because we can see how it is produced". Due or Duty isn't relevant to Better and Worse or to Good and Evil, it is only a choice of the way in which individuals realize their own ability to exist. Strictly speaking, Good and Evil, Better and Worse lose their sense, and ethics stops to be the science about Better and Worse or the search of the base to understand Better and Worse.

In this case the moment of the appearance of Due is not the moment of the disclosure of difference in being, but it is the moment of creation, of marking this difference. The difference isn't clarified by Due, but it is produced by Due. Due is the implementation of self-own being through co-existence, through sharing of self-own existence with others. And moral responsibility is not the result of freedom of Other (or the result of the presence of Other), but Other is the result of the statement of moral responsibility. In this sense, the appearance of Due, duty, which occurs outside of any determinacy, outside any Good and Evil, for which you can put the blame, – it is the act of the being, the realization of ability multiple existents to exist.

Here we can deeper proceed this logic: as well as different existings are recognized in the ethical situation of the relying of Due, Being also is relied through the practice of love. Love isn't relevant to existing Other, which is loved for its qualities, but instead it seeks beyond Other, to it's ability to be, the ability to be different and to exist differently. At the same time love isn't only acceptance of any abstract accident, the existence of anyone, but it refers to the existence of this particular Other. Love is to give Other possibilities to be which can't be imagined or subordinated by loving or beloved, where "giving" is active action, intervention and provocation. In this sense, love turns out to be relevance to being, but not to being at all, but being of this existing. While it is actually complicity in being of Other, love is the only possibility to operate being of existing, to rely it. As well as the Due isn't the result of the

presence of Other, but the way to constitute presence of Other by relying of Due, and Being too isn't given in any experience, but it is relying in the practice of love.

Now it is important to claim that ethics that we got couldn't be reduced to the statement of Love and Due as "Good". Moreover, the very statements like "Due should be" or "to love somebody" self-destruct, they contradict themselves, no one could not follow these statements. Ethics that we obtained does not point to Good and Evil, but it only shows us the possibility to talk of due and love, the possibility how we can talk about ethics, if we want to talk about it.

After all of this reasoning it becomes clear that there is not any "Unity", because if this Unity is necessary, such picture couldn't take place. There are any bases to understand self as the Substance or its part. The ethical situations, the opportunity to feel due deconstruct necessity of the Unity, and hence, its reality. And in this case, the ontology is dependent on ethics: implementation of its ability to determine the existence in Due (and overrides the ontology).

The logo for the International Association for Future-Oriented Research (iafor) is centered on the page. It consists of the lowercase letters "iafor" in a light blue, sans-serif font. The text is enclosed within a circular frame composed of two concentric, slightly irregular arcs. The outer arc is a light blue color, and the inner arc is a light red color, creating a subtle, artistic border around the text.

