BABES-BOLYAI UNIVERSITY, CLUJ-NAPOCA

FACULTY OF HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY

Summary of Ph.D. Thesis

Zukunftswerte der westlichen Gesellschaft aus der Sicht von Hans Jonas unter der Berücksichtigung von Scham- und schuldkulturellen Merkmale

(*The Western's society values of the future from Hans Jonas's perspective and the cultural elements of "shame" and "guilt"*)

Ph.D. Supervisor:

Professor Vasile MUSCĂ, Ph.D.,

Ph.D. Candidate:

Arthur WAGNER

2012

Contents

This research concerns the ethical philosophy of the future of German-Jew philosopher of the twentieth century: Hans Jonas. Its analysis starts from two perspectives: the first one refers to the development of modern Western society during the twentieth century; the second one implies an anthropological view on the culture of "shame" and "guilt." Aim of the study, the method using theoretical analysis, is to pursue socio-cultural influences on thinking and ethical-moral vision of H. Jonas.

The twentieth century represents a period of an increased development and by a Cultural Revolution, a period with plenty of difficulties, marked by contrasts and by extremes that have arisen with an overwhelming speed and intensity. Therefore, it implies some specific concepts such as the information of the dictatorship, the technocratic or post-industrial society, the knowledge of the society or events. Especially the last decades, described by many as postmodern, have brought with them plenty of new phenomena and transformations that have acquired the interest of the humanist philosophy and of other sciences[1]. We shall continue, therefore, by an overview and an assessment of the twentieth century, taking into account the cultural elements of "shame" and "guilt" (developed in Chapter 2 of our research).

The increasing transformation, both internal and external, of the social processes and the enforcing of the social pluralism led towards a great complexity, thoroughly highlighted within terminology. Thus, there is a disagreement starting by the description of the basic concepts as "Culture" and "Modernity", and continuing by specific categories such as the "culture of shame" and the "culture of guilt" or "postmodernism".

An overview of the concepts of modernism and postmodernism shows that the latter is neither anti-modernism, nor trans-modernism[2], but rather a pro-modernism. The modernism of the twentieth century with the so-called postmodern currents represents a clear continuity of the classical modernism in the advanced significance. Actually, this realises, on Lyotard´s opinion, what was only proven in modernity by some restrained circles[3]. The inconsistency, the lack of

---

[1] Bermes and eds., p. 1.
[2] Petru Dumitriu, 1965.
[3] Welsch 2002, p. 82

objectivity, the radical plurality, the multiplicity of cultures, of traditions, of ideologies, the concepts of life and the linguistic games are the most striking observations of postmodernism[4].

Regarding the term of culture, in the social sciences there is a meaning quite comprehensive, including all the models of thought, feeling and action. By addition to these, are added also common things such as family relationships, exercise authority, dealing with feelings of guilt and shame, etc.[5]. The concepts of guilt and shame in culture refer to specific categories of ethnic and cultural groups that have demonstrated a certain reaction of the consciousness as rule's violation.

These reaction patterns, which are involved in the feeling of shame or guilt, in the particular context of socialisation of the individualism or of the collectivism, determine implications not only at the level of the individual personality, but also through the society´s system of social order as a whole. The notions of culture of the shame and guilt, especially deals with intrapersonal processes of conscience training and their impact in the social order. On the other hand, the culture´s bipolarity between shame and guilt and between individualism and collectivism are synonyms at the macro level of discussion, because even their values expresses are often identical. Thus, because the causes for the appearance of the expression *culture of guilt / shame* arise particularly in the dimension´s context of individualism and collectivism.

These social contexts defined by different auto concepts in the moral inquiry culturally comparable. Properly, there is a difference between the self-autonomous, independent and thus limited in the individualistic culture and the limited self, interdependent in the collectivist culture[6]. The traditional culture defines the identity of individualism by the following ontogenetic formula: *Cognatus ergo sumo* (I belong to someone, therefore I am), which means that participates and contributes to family life and social prosperity. This is in contrast to individualistic dictum of Descartes: "*Cogito ergo sum*" -" I think, therefore I am".

---

[4] Imbusch 2005, p. 81.
[5] See Jahoda in Tromsdorff/Kornadt, p. 386.
[6] Eckensberger L.H. in Thomas, p. 325.

Not only, from this perspective, the cultural evolution in the Western space of the twentieth century it´s a very interesting one. The industrialization and the technology have brought with them not only an increase in personal prosperity, but also changes within society. In the first half of the twentieth century, the Western world, still under the domination of rational science, was marked by the collective values and by the culture of "shame" such as morality, the social support, the commitment cohesion, sincerity and welfare´s promotion. All of these, during the turbulent time of the two world wars, were important for maintaining life. The economical recovery following the Second World War began by a radical development in all areas. The arch of the socio-cultural change includes a panorama of interrelated phenomena, such as individualization, radical pluralism, including the secularization, the change of norms and of the social values[7].

The Century´s individualism emphasizes the individual superiority with its peculiarities and the personal freedom towards the loss of the traditional structures, particularly the loss of religion and of traditional, social structures, such as family. By addition to this, there is the rejection of absolute, concrete, values, of strict moral obligations and norms. The inner orientation is the main characteristic of the self-achievement / self-fulfilment. The individual himself becomes the moral Supreme Court, which means that he is the only one responsible for shaping his life. He personally selects his social obligations. The exclusive satisfaction of his needs and desires often equates with luck. These and the aspiration towards self-fulfilment are the basic characteristics of individualism[8]. The egocentrism that outgrowth of individualism means include the removal of obligations / constraints from others and from social obligations, by example the low social involvement or the lack of children[9]. Thus, in the 20th century, the decrease of the marriages, the constantly diminution of the relationships relevance, the procrastination of the family priorities become specific phenomena in contrast to the dominance of the typical bourgeois, patriarchal, family from modernity[10].

Even if the modern´s life conduct created a limited space (by values and uniform rules), and support and protection (by connection to social union - even any form of compulsory social

---

[7] Rödder, p. 23.
[8] Ulfig 2003, p. 16-18.
[9] *Ibidem*, p. 23.
[10] Miegel/Wahl 1994, p. 60-61.

protection of the individual -) these are lost in the twentieth century. For strengthening this idea, we add that truth is no more assured by neither socially and metaphysically means. The religion loses its function of unifying and release the man towards inner loneliness. The self´s identity became a problem for many people in a world that is increasingly complex, more differentiated, fundamentally without charm, deprived by the support of collective patterns and without clear rules of behaviour.

During the post modernity, the social field is exposed to discontinuity, to fragmentation of the order of values that until now were considered as "natural". The ambivalence and the opposition find their way into all areas of life and for every individual. There are a variety of patterns of socialization and identity construction. The diversification and the questioning reveal the unique lifestyle by their own initiatives and guidelines. The new "individual" identities with "self-forced biographies" appear in contradiction to models of biography and social class marked by specific institutional identities of the past modernist period. This not only brings chances and freedoms, but also opens the risks and constraints to permanent decisions, to the delimitation and the demarcation of postmodern possibilities[11].

The individual reduced to its own "subjectivity" lives by a surplus of awareness of personality, but also by a loss of the social importance[12]. This is considered one of the biggest challenges of organizing the post-modern life. The human is more dependent of stability and public safety, which would interfere with the danger of individualization to the extent of the anonymity[13].

From this point of view, the postmodernism begins where all fall apart. Its core is the legitimacy and the safety of specific diversity. The postmodern vision is a vision of plurality. This means that society is characterized by typical features of modernity differences[14]. If the rationality and necessity prevail by unity based on guiding principles, the postmodern lives under the motto of a radical pluralism and a total individualization[15].

---

[11] Frankenberger/Meyer, p. 33.
[12] Wintels 2000, p.139.
[13] *Ibidem.*
[14] Welsch 2002, p. 39.
[15] Müller 2009, p. 130.

The intense plurality and irreducible heterogeneity of different paradigms belong to characteristics of postmodernism. Not just one individual has different inclinations, identity and values and interests different aims, but different sectors of society are characterized by incompatible standards. The plurality of different guidance systems and organizational sectors trigger inevitable conflicts and fail to imply a possible settlement. Therefore, it raises the question of the proper instrumentation such plurality. The relationship with it is marked by ambivalence. For some, such as Spaemann, it is an unavoidable evil to be accepted and compensated. Others, like Habermas, consider this an important achievement that needs the accompanying of a safe course of action, while other interpretations (as by D. Bell) are onto questioning and protection[16]. The modernism has led to "unveiling the world" by the intellectualization and rationalization of science. This includes the knowledge and the belief that, in principle, there is no mysterious, incalculable, power to be considered, but one could dominate - in principle - all things by the competence[17].

The European secularization was seen as the "rule of reason". The dialectics of the enlightenment damages the theological roots of the truth. What remains is a radical perspective, the historical relativism, the positivism, nihilism / negativity, instead of preparing for a new myth: values. We do not speak about truth and justice, but about values[18].

In the second half of the twentieth century increases the importance of the "values of self", so to outlining cultural modernism, where reigns the dominance of "values and acceptance of duty \" of materialism. There are scientific studies showing that modern humans in influence of postmodernism shows a clear trend of increasing individualistic-hedonistic goals and values, so in the future will be taken into account in these cultures highlights the strong individualistic culture[19]. Other authors speak, on the contrary, about a synthesis of values and not about an outstanding value. In addition, the competition is inevitable due to changes in their values and pluralism. This is appreciated by some as positive - as a better framework for independent individual living – and, on the other hand, there is the danger of social destabilization through the loss of consensus values. For, the fast changing values not only exerts pressure on people to

---

[16] Ibidem.
[17] Weber 1988, p.582-613.
[18] Schweidler 2007, p. 69.
[19] Inglehardt 1989.

change but also on social and political institutions (by example, on church or the education system)[20].

If there is a collective or individualistic orientation, then it assumes a form of healthy social system, which can be considered as neutral or otherwise (each with advantages and disadvantages). Thus, the collective is dominant by the culture of shame; while in the culture of guilt the self's is given pre-eminence. Between those two poles there is a dim passage. Of course, there are extreme accentuations, which exert visibly negative actions on the individual / society and therefore are negatively rated. Thus are the dictatorial, totalitarian systems in the cultural space of shame or the atomic individualism [21] with his protrusion self-centred, narcissistic, selfish in the space of guilt, which are both negatively evaluated.

The individualistic concept proved to be, according to some authors, a decline / loss of freedom. For, the longer an individual is separated from the traditional structure, the more unsafe it is in the new mechanisms of integration and social modernization[22]. Generally, the Western rational culture has had a significant contribution to improving the lifestyles and well-being. On the other hand, they did not necessarily promote[23] the cultural and moral civilization, because they can satisfy the longing and nostalgia just barely beyond rational human. The secularization finally ended in the twentieth century - a process of irrevocable phenomena. In this framework is also established the "secularization", which can be observed both in religious institutions weakened obligations and to reduce the practiced religiosity[24]. In this society, however, structured and strained by science´s technical constraints, a protest, which stands for quality and against quantification, is gradually developing. It concerns the nostalgia for a community and for human warmth and implies the concern for the human world. The size and the increasing speed of Asian´s baggage ideas in the western circles show the impoverishment and depletion by the forms of entertainment, for the compulsive consume[25]. The interest in metaphysics shows a more

---

[20] Hammes, p. 58.
[21] Weippert, p. 18.
[22] Wintels, p. 80.
[23] Huntington 1996, p. 530.
[24] Sterbling, p.75.
[25] Müller 2009, p. 117.

increased evidence of the religious nostalgia: this led to the emergence of sects, superstitions, disposition for Gurus, esoteric, etc.[26].

Such neglect of the spiritual dimension in the West that led to "new" spirituality has become an increasing need for the Christian man and the secular. The cold relations with the West pave the way for social movements that put man in the foreground and its appreciation by loss of the programs. Besides, the global society, pluralised, with multiple options creates a large vacuum and an impoverishment in the targeting ability. New forms of spirituality, which makes clear goals and instructions, are part of large successes[27]. In despite this, the Christian religious images and ideas are still available for a group of population in need for standard collective and individual guidance, which leads to some tension in society – this is not unusual for pluralistic structures[28].

Apparently dominates a competitive situation, even if only subliminally, and the battle of cultures. Are there multiculturalism and universality in the cultural landscape? - There are many opinions about this. The reality is that multiculturalism is a threat only to Westerners, while universality endangers the whole world. A multicultural West is impossible because there would be no such West. A universal world is not possible because a global empire is impossible. The West is in need to keep renewing his identity[29]. Moreover, the global security requires the acceptance of a multicultural world[30].

Given this complexity, the philosophers, the anthropologists and the social scientists have tried to find suitable models meaning to express the mood to exhibit the appropriate arguments to determine goals and new missions. In the tradition of modernism, the philosophy of advocates for the deconstruction of structures and for a positive understanding of pluralism and argues against totalitarianism with metaphysics, technology and science. A positive appreciation of diversity and variety was maintained both in the way of thinking of society and in philosophy; in postmodernity dominates the lack of grades, the discontinuity, the ambivalence.

---

[26] Raes in Kerber, p. 19-21.
[27] Müller 2009, 114-115.
[28] Sterbling, p. 83-84.
[29] Müller 2009, p. 128-129.
[30] Huntington 1996, p. 524.

Summarizing, one can see the basic feature of postmodernism. The postmodernism as a cultural revolution is characterized by uncertainty, which includes all the types of ambiguity and smuggling, is also characterized by fragmentation (meaning there are established links and totalitarianism, social and epistemological synthesis), but is also characterized by all kinds of décanonisation of the authoritative conventions. Solely the fragments have validity. So the postmodernism requires diversity, a change in meaning. This ambiguity is observed even in art: many unrealistic, not iconic works.

Eccentricities, impulsiveness, negativism and destructiveness come into play. The irony is that a new mechanism of adaptation involves uncertainty and ambiguity and can be defined by a need to indulge and express the human spirit in search of truth, which he constantly escapes. The immanence refers to the cognitive ability to generalize the symbols. Its Consequences are the diffusion and fragmentation of expanding perception, triggered by media and new technologies[31].

By the hybridization and carnivalisation we understand an undefined, a distortion of cultural forms. Thus, we merge the continuity with discontinuity, plus different cultures with the same past. All forms are available dialectically, as in Heidegger's dialectic simultaneity. The constructionist opens the way hermeneutic or post-structuralist theory.

The current assessment of the importance of culture varies, on the one hand, as was already evident between the two poles - which is an important feature of postmodernism. This leads to antagonism of three areas: first - the techno-economic, based on functional rationality and efficiency, the second - the culture, which is self-fulfilment and pleasure, and third - political, aimed at equality and justice[32].

According to Bell, capitalism, with its technical-scientific order, revealed a culture that does not suit and even threaten to fall down[33]. The inner orientation of the individualistic culture in the twentieth century must remain only an important phase of development, but should not become an end by itself, as can be seen in some areas, for that would mean its end[34].

---

[31] Kamper/Rejnen 1987, p. 159.
[32] Welsch 2002, p. 29.
[33] Wintels 2000, p. 141. Compare to Preglau in Honegger *et alii* 1999, p. 311.
[34] Ulfig 2003, p. 37-38.

Other thinkers, such as Gehlen or Hondrich refuse to see a potential danger in postmodern culture. Hondrich, for example, sees the secular individuation process, which suppresses the development community; he believes both individualization and community development as the basic elementary processes, each operating under pressure[35].

Moreover, further processing and overlapping traditional and modern values, institutions and social structures, are considered an unfinished process.

These processes of change, their classification, understanding, evaluating and all that they imply represent a series of tasks for philosophers and thinkers of the twentieth century, such as Hans Jonas. He tried to give answers to the pressing problems of the century, such as the increasing globalization and mechanization of the world, the lack of universally accepted norms. The principle of accountability was an attempt to impact, to develop the moral-philosophical theory of responsibility[36]. In Chapter 3 we present the main features of the proposed future responsibilities of Jonas in the social transformation of values and the secondarisassion of the utopianism and fatalism.

Based on the theme of values and on the situation´s values in the society of the last century, Jonas deals with the practical aspect of values. He considers them rules and conventions governing the interpersonal behaviour. The aspect of the legitimacy of values does not play an important role in the debate. If Plato made the difference between the truth, well and good, today the difference is between the truth, morality and aesthetics. Because today the truth is no longer dominated by God or by science, but the truth is starting as a plurality and we confront with its increasing forms in the field of norms / rules[37].

The empirical studies confirm the change of values, despite their different interpretation, and the shift from materialist values to postmaterialist values. Inglehart's views, Klages and Kmieciak / Noelle-Neumann, are not necessarily contradictory in their empirical results, but complementary, according to Klages, offering a more complete overview of the future. It also forecast the future for a synthesis of values seems to be plausible, even taking into account Kmieciak thesis of a new value system that has yet finalized[38].

---

[35] Ondrich in Honegger et alii 1999, p. 255.
[36] Buddeberg, p. 67
[37] Dumont, p. 251.
[38] Hammes, p. 84-85. Compare to Willi, p. 77.

Moreover, the debate on the alleged decline in values is often equated to socially destructive individualism and selfishness. This is in conjunction with two radicalized forms of individualism. First, it is hedonistic-utilitarian individualism in the Anglo-Saxon world, which occurs in parallel with the emergence and the development of capitalism. Secondly, there is the German romantic, individualism, based on an individual uniqueness, which frames it presents life as an adventure of the self-discovery[39]. The society´s values are similar to late stock model of the twentieth century: all values are huge market moves, and their rate increases or decreases the subjective excitement, panic and risk. The question is whether the phenomenon of fashion, highlighted in the media, will lead to frivolous values[40]. It is not easy to answer this question in a world where we even talk about a globalization of conscience, where the old system of values is destroyed and there is no new system of values to install, while society must overcome new challenges. In a society where dominates the cult of stress and the dictatorship of the emergency / speed, the prospect of losing is on the horizon of any meaning: loss of time and not even soul[41]. Typically for the postmodern understanding is the assumption that the systems of values have a cultural-historical dimension. This means that they "have social and cultural sustainable factors that exist at the time of their appearance"[42]. The values are not sustainable, but unchanged relatively to values connected to a specific time and a certain human society. From this point of view, Jonas´s attitude is quite contrary, for he considers values as imperishable and only convertible in its forms.

By the late twentieth century, we observe the decline of the acceptance of traditional values, such as adaptation, discipline, preparation for obligations / commitments and the increase of the individualistic and hedonistic attitudes. It was also ascertain the fusion of these two categories of values as a synthesis of values. In this respect, one can speak rather of concept "and ... and" instead of "or ... or". As combine the meritocracy and the discipline with the desire for freedom. In fact, it cannot be about the altruistic spirit of the traditional values, but about the

---

[39] Strasser in Thierse *et alii*, p. 79-80.
[40] Binde, p. 14-15.
[41] Binde, p. 16.
[42] Stegemann in Thierse *et alii*, p. 153.

increasing of the reward/gratification[43].Jonas demonstrates the theory as a decline in society, conditioned by devaluing tradition, conventions and sense of justice, mercy and truth.

As a starting point of the debate, Jonas can talk about the state of the advanced western world in twentieth century, which is characterized by technology. The technical man is "subject to its own object." The factors which start Jonas´s debate are: the increasing of the human power by the use of technology and the scientific organization, the expanding of the technical influence in human nature, the growing complexity of actions with side effects, the greater involvement of men in action confusing networks, the new science that exceeds the biosphere capacity[44]. Acquiescing the consequence of this short-term thinking is questioning about the consequences of these actions for future generations and their way of life.

The ambivalence of technology constraints they rely on utopian thinking in the infinite progress and in using it, including the dangerous part because of "too good"[45]. In the same context, Jonas also talks about a "relentless dynamism" of the "science technology". Therefore, he´s against the first dimension of utopia: the utopian expectation of progress.

What is Jonas's solution to these conditions? His answer is: People must change their attitude towards nature and technology. The assessment of action thorugh the ethics of behavior, but would not allow a view of future consequences. This ethic, which has its roots in antiquity, is a lot worthy today. Not only for the interpersonal and insufficient order, but because his conception of utilitarianism and utilitarian explains and standardizes the technology into the world. It takes an additional ethics beyond human desire to control nature in the future[46].

The issue of the ethical responsibility in the future is closely linked to a problem. The problem of power techniques that will really determine what will be done and what the challenges technology will obscure[47]. Jonas responds with a well-founded ethical, because it seems to be necessary to oppose the anthropocentric[48]. This ethical thinking of the future is not actually designed as a project of a general normative ethics. It should not replace in any way "all previous ethics"[49]. Moreover, it must complete the

---

[43] Hammes, p. 140-141.
[44] Böhler 1994, p. 310.
[45] Müller 1988, p. 17.
[46] Müller 1988, p. 20.
[47]Jonas 1993, p. 88.
[48] Müller 1988, p. 15.
[49] Schäfer 1993, p. 87.

"ethics so far" in terms that the new specific issues shares of the "technological civilization"[50]. Because of its threat focused on the survival of the species, the principle of accountability should be understood as a kind of "emergency ethics". Jonas himself speaks of "preventive ethics" to avoid "extremely bad" due to overloading the terrestrial biosphere, a suicide of the human species[51].

By the metaphysical-ontological argument, he understands that life would have liked to keep the aspect of nature. A theology of animated nature would be the basic (utility) purpose. Thus, the ethics received a biological significance, while the original "nature could be argued by itself the need to preserve them as the basis of life"[52]. This is the simplest formula of the ontological-metaphysical moral responsibility to support Jonas read: "the world is not worthless; there is at least one value in the world, the existence of the responsibility, which is better than its absence"[53].

Jonas sees the conservation task as an obligation to the Creator of man who put the world in people's hands management, which someday will have to account for how they accomplished this task. This is a part of his personal opinion and the speculative theology, while the justification of general ethics can be derived from conservation of the metaphysical topic[54].

For Jonas is not only enough to perceive the power of the technology, but it is necessary to develop a sense of solidarity with life in the future, it must become the subject of the ethical obligation[55]. . Jonas does not trust the good intentions of people, so he contrasts the heuristic of fear, which should shed light on the consequences of utopian promise negative[56].

All these levels should be enlarged by the value of maximum information on the consequences of collective action. Thus, by a never seen fear is born an attitude of restraint, abandoning not only the individual but also the technical progress. Besides, the controversy of legitimising "necessities" in the future inspire the metaphysical arguments for a new image of the human. And, last but not least, the tradition, the old value must know an upgrade in the future

---

[50] Jonas 1979, p. 26.
[51] Jonas 1994b, p. 209.
[52] Müller 1988, p. 11.
[53] Jonas 1993, p. 45.
[54] Müller 1988, p. 15.
[55] Müller 1988, p. 20.
[56] Müller 1988, p. 15 .

canon of values. The responsibility includes our future, as members of society, and our parents, our politicians and the philosophers[57].

To take the responsibility represents for Jonas an essential feature of the people, for they depend on the feeling of responsibility, which is interpreted by the lack of independence and helplessness. Jonas's concept of responsibility is three-dimensional: it implies the human as subject, the needy and the nature as objects of responsibility and the idea of an "existence of the whole in its integrity"[58]. The principle of responsibility emphasis less on the rights of others and more on the recognition of their obligations and can thus bring into question a short formula "because we can, we must act so that our descendants can do what they want"[59].

On the other hand, Jonas does not agree with the second dimension of utopia: the utopia of ideology, represented at the time by Marx and Bloch. By utopia, Jonas understands a goal to attend to and that "corresponds to a higher state of human." A religious utopia is always made through a transcendental effect. A socio-political utopia as the Marxism is a program designed to achieve a perfect society. The magic that radiates through such a program can blind or you can drive towards unrealism[60].

The problem of the positive utopia is a false image of the human, which assumes that man can reach a higher level where he can be entirely good. This is unrealistic because of ignorance and thus unusable negative potential. Neither the inevitable, nor the likelihood or the opportunity cannot form a basis for the future[61]. For Jonas, the utopia is not required to get people to act responsibly in the future[62]. From this critical utopia, Jonas proposes a new ethical responsibility to non-utopian, which is possible only by overcoming the utopian dream and fear, hope, but the responsibility remains for the humanity[63].

Furthermore, Jonas sees, given doubt to fate, an uncertainty regarding the image of the future, the danger inside the fatalism that is as large as the external threat environment caused by the irresponsible management. The fatalism is keeping the irreversible fate as self-fulfilled, but

---

[57]Seifert in Buttiglione *et alii*, p. 45.
[58] Buddeberg, p. 87.
[59] Gronke in Böhler 1994, p. 412.
[60] Jonas in Hermann, p. 125.
[61] Jonas in Hermann, p. 127.
[62] Müller 1988, p. 55.
[63] Seifert in Buttigione *et alii*, p. 47.

cannot be accepted under the pressure of objective needs. Jonas believes that "the way you think, you think, what you say and how you say your present ideas in a communication that puts you in value and that differentiates the hands or between members of society". This cannot be provided of course with success, but a fatalistic attitude makes it impossible[64].

Thus, in 1958, Jonas concludes a double threat to morality and spirit: on the one hand, trusting adaptation to technical progress, on the other hand, the attitude of humility in the sense of practical reason to avoid a possible catastrophe. Actually, Jonas calls the active responsibility and he´s an advocate of fatalism and despair of depression. Consequently, Jonas does not understand the ethics as an utopian or fatalistic future, but as realistic one.

Hans Jonas is a thinker in philosophy and in interdisciplinary field of the twentieth century, analyzing the action of modern technology, the experience and its impact on people and makes a conclusion regarding the ontological-metaphysical thinking in the sense that the essence of human action- would be changed as a consequence of the development of the technological assessments[65]. Jonas reveals that he was the one who very early brought up the issues of morality faced a technological society and he marked the importance of their careful company[66].

More or less concrete, Jonas presents into the ethical responsibility of the future a behavior responsibility for the future of humanity and the planet. Even if it feels that responsibility is a popular characteristic, he tries to provide further justification of his philosophy, which does not exceed the established purpose[67]. The fact that Jonas saw the importance of the environmental problematic, which is not deducted by a given time of humanity in its social-action is not clearly explained in his writings. It is clear that the philosophy applied, it refers to issues of technology use by people and does not address the issues of environmental morality[68].

Jonas sees the need for a person to have his own utopia to achieve a high purpose. But the utopias should not be made after the action plan of the universal abundance in order to sacrifice the present for the future. He believes that the very ethics relies on responsibility and takes over

---

[64] Böhler/Neuberth, p. 50.
[65] Jonas 1979, p. 17; 32. Compare with p. 26; 47; 61.
[66] Hadorn in Müller 2003, p. 114.
[67] Buddeberg, p. 88.
[68] Hadorn in Müller 2003, p. 114.

the expectations and big goals, despite the propagated modesty and the required limit. On the other hand, his ethics differ by the other ethics by realist objectives, hence by a cautious and analytical attitude[69].

His way of thinking has led Jonas from the ancient religious history and German existentialism, towards an anti-existentialist ontology to an ethic of environmental responsibility in a technological era to man's relationship with God after the phenomenon Auschwitz[70]. However, his ideas keep their controversial touch at the argumentative level and in terms of practical applicability.

Jonas strives in his ethic work to bring to the fore various perspectives heterogeneous: on the one hand, the context of pluralistic society and the ideologically neutral state, with modern technological challenges, on the other hand, the need to compensate a valuable cultural ethical content[71].

One of the strengths of Jonas's philosophy of the future is that he argues the issue and, on the other hand, argues its application. The question is to what extent is justified the Jonas´s argument on the sense of responsibility. Eva Buddeberg sees in this the arguing of a very comprehensive requirement and even supports the idea of preventing the danger that threatens the survival of humanity and of the planet. In terms of practical responsibility, Jonas is, unfortunately, unclear. One cannot clearly define who is responsible and who should take the responsibility or to assume this[72]. Regarding the critic of the ethics, Jonas opinions seem divided. Despite this, they largely agree to the perception of a "workaround" in Jonas's work ethic. What causes this?

The forth Chapter deals with this topic. Jonas was able to formulate his philosophy of life based on nonreligious justification of the concept of reverence and respect. On the other hand, he tried, given the prevailing discontent of the world, to bring all his personal faith the best of awe and mystery of the Spirit. Thus, the culture "naked" of honor and shame receives the compensation, at least in its personal level.

---

[69] Jonas in Hermann, p. 133.
[70]Weise 2003, p. 19.
[71] Kreß in Müller, p. 142.
[72] Buddeberg, p. 88.

The simultaneous existence of cultural factors, the guilt and shame in the life and work of Hans Jonas should not be rejected and should not be underestimated. Thus, we find the cultural elements "of shame", in his social Jewish circle, in the family traditions and in the biographical sections, but also in the social structure and within the values of the first half of the twentieth century. Thus are born the following cultural values "of the shame" that Jonas carries around a sense of collective belonging, the sense of duty, of sacrifice, the idea of likeness to God, the repentance, the shame and the dignity. Given their loss within the contemporary society, his opinion was critical about it.

The cultural elements "to blame" are the following: the freedom, the sense of self-development, the individual responsibility, the success, the justice issues and the recognition of human rights. The cultural influence of "the blame" found its way into his life by the philosophical school of thought that supports the post-modern thinking and secondly, by changing the social values in the direction of the post-modern values in the second half of the twentieth century.

Because Jonas's thinking is rooted in German philosophical tradition, he successfully used as a student of Heidegger his ideas. He has developed a profound analysis of temporality that Heidegger initiated and included its critique of modern technological period, up to ontology of nature and an ethic of the future[73]. He wanted to argue his main concern, request a responsible global future of mankind - regardless of religious groups. According to Jonas, his philosophical understanding should not be determined by thinking of a philosopher, everyone should have freedom of thought independent of religious groups. As a result, in his work one cannot distinguish between a general philosophical part and the philosophical part of a "Jew"[74].

Because of the conflict between the Jewish affiliations of the doubt concerning the elements of Judaism, the fascination of the transcendent reality, Jonas shared the ambivalence of many Hebrew intellectuals in the modern secular society. This is also marked in the ecclesiastical use of Hebrew elements in his theological speculations, such as dignity, sanctity and creating its future emergency ethics. If he himself was not fully faithful in the traditional sense, the atheism was not a reliable alternative for him[75].

This fascinating behavior becomes even clearer in between the Jewish identity and the universal claim as a philosopher. Jonas autonomy claims in his studies of philosophy that the culture is marked by "guilt", as he admits the Hebrew tradition, the culture belonging to "shame" as being of particular importance to the

---

[73]Hösle in Wiese/Jacobson, p. 37-38; 51-52.
[74] Wiese 2003, p. 10-13.
[75] Wiese 2003, p. 156; 164.

modern Western thought. He refers not only to such a meeting but also to a historical-philosophical culture, caught between the culture "guilt" and the culture "shame" from Hebrew and Greek thought, between Athens and Jerusalem. He tries to make an addition to the elements of the culture of the "guilt" and the "shame". He also shows, in this sense, not a dualism, but a unity between the two elements integrated into a whole. The meeting of its Hebrew beliefs and philosophical arguments took place in his doctrine of creation with its moral and ethical implications[76].

Jonas speaks in this context, about the tension that continues between the two dimensions that refer to two different poles of identity and of his thinking, without preferring one to the detriment of another. Regarding the assessment of the interaction between the two poles, this looks different, depending on the perceived relevance. Jonas offers, thus, the first place to philosophy by the expression "philosopher and Jew at the same time"[77].

Jonas manages to combine both foundations of its existence in his mind and his feelings – the connection with the Judaism and the intellectual aspiration for self-motivation and knowledge, so that they fill in a fascinating way. The result is that, in fact, his work, without the knowledge of the Jewish thought, can be only partially understood. This also leads to more critics of the alleged "inconvenience", and not least of the "early exuberance in a contemporary objectivity".

The inner link between the Gnosis, the philosophy of life and the responsibility, on the one hand, and the search for an adequate conception of God, on the other hand, may be deduced from the radical changes of the twentieth century in society, in personal and in Jonas´s private traumatic life experience. In fact, he has found the solution in the formulation and creation of a possible universal ethic[78].

The complex determination of Jonas´s conception of the philosophy (as the bearer of the culture of "blame") and the Judaism (the carrier of the culture "shame") may be comprehended by a commitment to the universal reason and in the context of the intra-Jewish debate concerning the relevance of Judaism into the modern, secular society[79].

Merging the different approaches remains a major achievement for the twentieth century philosophy. Jonas may not have conducted to a comprehensive philosophical work, but its philosophical spirit was always present. He treated the philosophy of the biology and its ethics in a very original manner and highlighted several interdisciplinary connections. The expansion of Jonas's ethics of the future found

[76] Wiese 2003, p. 14.
[77] Wiese 2003, p. 16-17.
[78] Wiese 2003, p. 20.
[79] Wiese 2003, p. 264.

a specific importance. His ethics of responsibility with the heuristic principle of fear has influenced the modern debate in bioethics in a sustainable manner[80]. Therefore, Jonas remains for humanity and for the future society of the 21st century, the Jewish voice of the responsibility that devoted his life to philosophy.

The benefit of this research is to highlight the importance of taking into consideration the type of reaction of the consciousness, of the individualist or collectivist socialisation that also influences the specific pattern of thinking – in the analyze and the understanding of a philosophical view.

---

[80] Höffe in Rümelin/Özmen, p. 284-285.