

advancement of the society the crucial are the promoted by the society ideological priorities, the degree of vertical mobility and the criteria for financial policies, while ensuring a social cohesion of the market economy.

The article displays methodological significance of the category «the avant-garde power» as the ability of a society to ensure systematic advancement of scientific, technological and socio-economic knowledge; sets out the avant-garde mechanism, which is the advancement of science, technology and society through the acquisition of a breakthrough knowledge; and with the introduction of such an innovative knowledge achieving the leading position in the competition of civilization. The use of the category of «the avant-garde power» in the philosophy of technology has revealed a key driving role of the research and development breakthroughs in the advancement of the society and establishment of the decent relative position of the society in the global competition of civilizations.

Keywords: the avant-garde power, breakthrough, leading development, knowledge advancement, a method, scientific and technical knowledge, social and economic advancement, research and development.

Надійшла до редколегії 28.02.2013 р.

УДК 17:33

A. Razin

ECONOMIC ETHICS: EPISTEMOLOGICAL STATUS AND CONTENT

As economic ethics understand set of rules, norms, the principles of behavior of managing subjects, imperatives and the demands made by society to nature of actions and the relations between them. On degree of the importance and range of problems economic ethics are one of the most important and difficult component of economic ethics. First of all, economic ethics raise a question of justice and of the expedient device of the human life, caused by economic and social factors. Object of research of economic ethics is the behavior of the person, social groups, various associations within economic structures and in relation to these structures. Investigating a problem of the organization of economy, economic ethics are not engaged in searches of absolutely humane economic order, disclaiming all existing and possible forms of the organization of economy as not corresponding to an ideal. The main, fundamental goal of economy is usefulness for life, service to it as economic activity is guided by needs of the person. The economy can be means, but not the purpose the crisis caused by a distortion of meaning of economy is otherwise inevitable.

One of important problems of economic ethics is research of the conditions promoting creation of more humane, in comparison with existing, an economic order in society. Economic ethics carries out accurate distinction between the coercion caused by economic need, and the coercion caused by structures, created by the person. Concerning these «compulsory circumstances» it comes to a conclusion that contradicting the humane cannot be originally expedient and constructive. To the account are subject both rational, and the moral, humane beginning, thus any their these values should not force out another. In thoughts about moral it is impossible to lose track of rational aspect of economy and, on the other hand, in the economic argument it is not necessary to ignore aspect of humanity. The problem of a correlative combination is actual in the appendix not only to rational and humane, but also to other values. From the economic point of view such values, as a personal responsibility and private interests, solidarity and collectivism are important first of all. It is possible to estimate as anti-humane those economic systems and orders which absolutize one of these values.

Keywords: economic ethics, business ethics, social ethics, culture-central approach, social capital, entrepreneurial ethics, institutional ethics.

The new reality is characterized by that ethical standards and the principles turn into the social criteria of processes having the objective, institutional status, finds reflection and that to the place of a traditional ratio of the concepts «morals and economy», «morals and household», etc. the concepts «economic ethics», etc. come. In modern society the type of social regulation integrating in elements of universal ethical values and concrete social requirements, in particular, of the economic is established. In the center of attention of social ethics there is an ethical responsibility, it is connected with that the relations in which system each person is directly included, are mediated and issued by structures of public institutes.

The social ethics is comprehensive as includes ethics of public structures and responsibility for the mediated interpersonal communication, thereby integrating all main aspects of ethical responsibility. It seeks to develop such structural organization of the institutionalized life which would not disturb individual, collective, etc. types of responsibility, and would promote it [2, p. 24]. The maintenance of social ethics are the theory and practice of responsible existence of the person in his relations with other people and the nature not in a direct form, and in a form mediated by public institutes. The social ethics is urged to proclaim and establish such principles and maxims which fit into a context of social being and are capable to influence it structurally in compliance with real requirements of society. It takes up the issue of justice of organization and functioning of public institutes, looks for humane and fair in business and concrete.

The problem of social ethics consists not in studying efficiency of the project of any public structure, and in defining how, having realized, it will influence quality of human life [13, с. 78-87]. The social ethics outputs ethical responsibility for a framework of directly personal responsibility and promotes understanding by mankind of its responsibility for all processes occurring in society. Thus, it emphasizes, it is necessary to consider requirements of concrete

usefulness, constructibility, efficiency if it is a question about really useful, instead of the requirement substituting it «business expediency and justice» [4, p. 1024]. The social ethics is not limited only to development of standards of justice, humanity. It seeks to find the practical forms capable really to embody the requirement of a business orientation of ethics.

For our country problems of economic ethics are of particular importance that is connected with features of historical and cultural development of Russia, and also formation and development of the market relations in the country. Many modern researchers of economic ethics criticize the approach considering an economic component of economic and economic development of the post-socialist countries as main and not considering thus spiritual and moral component [17, c. 34]. Ethical concepts and categories can successfully be applied to the analysis of the processes happening in economy, often moral and ethical representations are the only limiters of economic feasibility. Economic ethics studies compliance of moral standards to the purposes and values of economic activity. It is not a simple set of certain moral standards, and represents the tool of the analysis and the solution of the problems arising at participants of production. Economic ethics finds out, what moral standards, ideals and values can matter for operating subjects in the conditions of modern economy and society.

The problem of a ratio of morals and economy had been put already in medieval ethics in which immoral the trade which is carried out for the purpose of extraction of a profit was considered [5, p. 56-59; 19, c. 144]. Idea of existence of the inconsistent relations between ethics and economy found reflection in modern discussions that in these spheres the requirements of morals and profitability enter the inevitable conflict.

Norms and the principles of economic ethics have got development in concepts of the Protestant and Catholic theologians reflecting over problems of economic morals. The Protestantism authorized moral consecration of aspiration to profit of owners, established moral standards for achievement of economic targets, that made possible formation of economic ethics. For secular option of Protestant ethics conviction that it is possible to be person at the same time virtuous and succeeding in business, and also representation that moral virtues are necessary conditions for successful economic activity is characteristic.

Process of formation of economic ethics is in the course of the general tendency of socialization of the morals connected with transition from ethics of individual virtues to ethics of social institutes. For understanding of the principle of action of ethical factors in household economic activity, the system, holistsky approach considering society in its unity and integrity is necessary.

In modern economic science the most influential are: naturalistic, anti-naturalistic (kulturtsentristsky), the technical and centrist research programs differing among themselves with understanding and the solution of a question of a role of the state, culture, the person and his psychological, moral motives and the purposes in economic process. In process of growth of state regulation of economy the increasing popularity receive within anti-naturalistic approach of the concept of the historical school, adhering to historical and ethical approach to economy. At sources of this theory – the German sociologists and economists M. Weber, V. Zombart, G. Schmoller who emphasized the welfare specifics of economic science considering motives and ways of behavior of the managing subject. In their opinion, the economy studies actions of the people expressing their sincere life, experiences which, in turn, can be understood on the basis of estimated motives and the purposes [6, p. 154; 9, c. 34; 23, c. 112]. If M. Weber and V. Zombart emphasized communication of religion, culture and economy, G. Schmoller considered economic changes as consequences of changes of maintenance of the sincere life, being shown in the economic sphere, in other words, it connected the economic relations with all complex of cultural, psychological, moral and ethical, economic and other factors [3, p. 177-196]. It is necessary to notice that in modern economic science there are also opposite views which characterize the so-called analytical school denying or assigning a supporting part to noneconomic factors. But, in our opinion, this model shows unilateral approach for an explanation of modern realities, that fact is indisputable that the economy experiences on itself huge influence of culture, as confirmation of that the fact of emergence of such new concepts of economy as can serve, in particular: «social capital», «the cultural capital», etc.

The social capital, according to F. Fukuyamy, represents «the set of informal rules or the norms shared by members of group and allowing them to interact with each other» [22, c. 129]. He emphasizes that the social capital is based first of all on spiritual and moral values, such as: trust, honesty, respect, etc. The social capital is an indicator of real changes in society as is a basis of the economic capital and the social capital, the is more developed more successfully and more effectively the economy in society functions.

There is a position starting from A. Smith, claiming that the economy both historically, and systematically is based on ethics since their major purpose is orientation to public advantage, the benefit. In the work «The theory of moral senses» A. Smith considered a private interest

as fundamental incentive of effective managing and, as a result of it, the most important factor of growth of welfare of society [16, с. 151]. He considered that in human nature the moral beginnings (compassion, sympathy, etc.) are put which induce it to take part in destiny of other people. He understood natural tendency of the person to like feelings of the neighbor, to perceive his cares as own as sympathy. The sympathy is a feeling of solidarity with other people. Solidarity interest to destinies another, according to A. Smith, the same important property of a human nature, as well as the private interest directed on ensuring own welfare. It is a question not of full refusal from personal in favor of public, not of altruism as that, and of consideration of the person as subject at whom the aspiration to achievement of own interests is limited to interests of other people, thus their private interests promote the general benefit. Finally, possibly to reach harmonization of opposite interests because there is the certain hidden order, allowing to operate collision of interests of individuals within the market competition so that it promoted enhancement of the general benefit. A. Smith chooses model of competitive market economy as it focuses private interests of participants of the market on achievement of the general benefit, thereby promoting behavior of certain economic subjects in the spirit of humanity. He realized the importance and importance of ethical aspect of the organization of market economy. The classical concept of the market developed by A. Smith, has nothing in common with extremes in approach to a problem of the organization of an economic order: decisions cannot be based on absolute freedom, on the contrary, on collectivist coercion. Economic immorality was peculiar to some extent to the doctrine B. Mandevil considering defects as a source of the general benefit [11].

Economic ethics try to analyse moral quality of new economic opportunities and to establish unity and internal communication of economical household activity with moral consciousness of society. Ethics are considered as some kind of instance checking and estimating moral quality of economic events and processes, such, for example, as the market, the competition, about their compliance and compatibility with moral values and ideals of modern society. The economy represents a cultural and historical phenomenon therefore no economic system can be abstracted from real human wants, desires and other conditions. The question of an essence of economy is inseparable from ethics. Economic structures often hide under themselves valuable preferences and ideals. Economic decisions finally have ethical characters, it belongs even to purely pragmatical decisions. Planning, the competition, profitability etc. caused by economic activity of the person and with all the pressure should not contradict the principle of human justice. Rationally reasonable economic regularities do not contradict requirements of human justice as the economy is a product of a human civilization, and its regularities are defined by its valuable installations and orientations even if they oppose the subject of economic activity as objective force. These regularities are implanted in rationality, they belong to need of the same sort to which justice and therefore at all the business orientation are subject to an ethical assessment belongs also. In this sense of concept of justice and economic rationality, despite their belonging to various measurements, finally are inseparably linked among themselves. This communication is found out that all ethical contains a component of objective usefulness, and all objective the useful contains moral elements [12, с. 74].

The question of an essence of managing belongs to the sphere ethical, one of the reasons of it is that fact that the economy is the institute created by the person and for the person. It makes sense in that measure in what the economy serves requirements satisfaction of the person if it does not satisfy the most important needs of the person, it becomes senseless, absurd. The main, fundamental goal of economy is usefulness for life as economic activity is guided by needs of the person [14, с. 106]. The economy can be means, but not the purpose the crisis caused by a distortion of meaning of economy is otherwise inevitable. According to modern Swiss theologian A. Rich: «the main aspirations and the related major humane ethical decisions in public or economic spheres are similar on the essence to religious belief and have character of the obligation. They do not seek to find the status of the dogmatic principle which is not subject to revision, once and for all recognized true and applying for objective obligation for all. It is rather, they are considered as mobile, subject to criticism and capable conviction to a self-reflection, assuming the analysis and interpretation of traditional representations and subjective experience» [15, с. 110].

For modern economy difficult schemes of process of production with a large number of participants of this process and increasing their interdependence are characteristic. Interdependence is understood as dependence of results of actions of the certain participant of production not only on its personal efforts, but also that other participants of this process do. For understanding of specifics of economic ethics it must be kept in mind the next moments: first, – the general ethically the significant result is result of actions of a huge number of participants of production in a bigger measure; secondly, – it is very difficult to estimate a contribution of the certain person or the enterprise at a cumulative social production for the reasons of labor

division, anonymity of the production, amplifying interdependence, etc.

The moral in market economy should not be reduced only to moral motives of participants of production or their individual moral qualities. Studying of moral behavior and moral motives has to be an important component of the functional analysis of all market economy and its elements.

As initial norm in economic ethics the principle of solidarity which is understood as the modern version of «a golden rule of moral», existing in the history of ethics in various modifications is considered. The main issue here is the question of that, as well as in what forms in the conditions of modern economy to realize this principle. In order that the requirement, the rule of personal will had moral and ethical character, they have to be universalized, generalized. The benefit as the supreme value characterizes «originality» of moral standards and values and reflects solidarity of all people. According to Yu. Habermasa is inherent in ethics «communicative rationality» as which he understood the rationality based on recognition only «the good bases» and essentially different from «strategic rationality», based on economic counts of benefit or profit of participants of a production activity [1, p. 201].

In economic ethics allocate two directions: individual ethics, or «ethics of preferences» and institutional ethics, or «ethics of restrictions». The main distinction between them consists in understanding of the mechanism of implementation of moral obligations in economic activity. So-called «individualistic» theories address to moral consciousness of managing subjects. Implementation of moral requirements is put here in dependence on preferences of those who makes the decision and bears responsibility for economic activity. «Institutional» theories place emphasis on morally mediated influence on so-called «game courses», connected with frame order, i. e. conditions of a production activity which are shown in a look «coercions or restrictions with merits of case». In the conditions of the competition it does not make sense to look for moral aspects in separate actions of participants of economic production, in «game courses». Moral and ethical problems of economy cannot be solved by certain acting individuals but only collectively, together, as desirable moral behavior of the businessman or the businessman possibly provided that also other participants of this process are also ready to commission of similar actions. Readiness for such behavior is possible only in case for each certain acting subject is unprofitable, first of all, financially, to violate collective arrangements.

It is expedient to be guided on neutral in relation to logic of competitive fight moral values, doing them significant in rules of the game which are equally effective for all participants of the market. Results of activity of participants of production are defined by frame order therefore if results of economic activity are unacceptable for the moral reasons, it is necessary to change rules of the game as to expect existence of moral motives and reasons in separate actions of businessmen (game courses) is useless. Morality of actions of economic subjects is provided not so much with moral intentions and motives, how many logic of economic efficiency, establishment of rules for these actions. It is possible to receive the moral importance of actions of participants of the market only in rules of the game, which *общезначимы* for all participants. Rules of the game are formed on the basis of the progressive moral consciousness, rich moral experience of the individual. Specifics of economic ethics consists that morality of actions is reached, as a rule, not thanks to good will, and due to logic of a situation which can be morally neutral or even morally negative. And in it the paradoxicality of economic ethics is found: the person is compelled to be moral besides even the desire.

In the modern economic theory of morals the morals are understood as defined «the public capital which according to the theory of the public benefits is subject to special conditions of production and preservations». Ethical standards and values are considered as some kind of investments into the public cooperation, capable to bring economic advantages to society as a whole. In this sense moral standards and rules are understood not as restriction of freedom of the individual, and as ensuring the greatest freedom, providing reliability and definiteness of mutual behavioural expectations. In this sense morals it is possible to consider as certain «the collective self-obligation» on advantage of all people which can be explained proceeding from economic interests of certain participants of the market. Supporters of this economic theory of morals come to a conclusion that as a whole favourably and domination of the general competition conducting to a growth in prosperity and prosperity of society is useful for society.

The modern market economy is in many respects in a contradiction with altruistic morals and ethics of individual virtues. To understand difficult dialectic interrelations between moral motive and social result, it is necessary to consider the general rules which define the certain operations procedure which has received the name a frame order, i. e. an order operating in a certain economic framework [21, c. 76]. The frame order unites the general rules of behavior in the sphere of the modern economic activity, observed by subjects of managing. The frame order includes the general norms and rules for actions which have to be observed at their commission, the Constitution, legal laws, and also moral and cultural standards of behavior concern to that, for

example. Reliability of mutual behavioural expectations is provided with deduction of specific actions of individuals in a frame order therefore there is possible a behavior coordination, and also probably long-term planning. According to Martin Bucher, the director of Institute of economic ethics of University of Saint-Gallen (Switzerland), the moral bases of modern system of managing it is necessary to look for not in direct moral and psychological motives of actions of economic subjects, and in the institutional mechanisms acting in economic actions as a certain framework, restrictions [8, c. 123]. It is necessary to seek for formation of such system of rules which will provide individual moral behavior and ethics of individual virtues as a whole.

Moral problems of economy have backbone character and therefore decide not a separate character, and the general subject of managing. In order that in the conditions of modern production to make valid moral values, it is necessary to create the corresponding economic order, a frame order therefore economic ethics often characterize as ethics of an order. Within these rules subjects of economic activity are guided by own interests and such economic order, according to the German researchers of economic ethics of B. Sutor and K. Homan, is capable to use most effectively knowledge for a society growth in prosperity since only he is capable to install the mechanism of distribution of this knowledge as which they consider the market and the competition [18, c. 23].

If in centrally operated economy the priority is given to observance of collective interests, in market economy – to interests of the individual, economic freedom and a personal responsibility, thereby market economy, it is possible to tell, receives the status egoistical, and the centralized economy – altruistic system. Own interests, personal responsibility, economic freedom have to be estimated on the basis of a sootnositelnost and should not be equated to egoism manifestations. These values can degenerate and be reduced to egoism if they are torn off from opposite values, interests of all members of society, that is if the called values are erected in the absolute. Both egoism, and opposite quality the altruism sacrificing own interests, represent distortion of the humanistic beginning inherent in the person. Behind each of fundamental economic systems there are certain values.

The market economy is based on freedom, responsibility and personal interest of economic subjects. The centralized economy – on a social duty, solidarity and common interests of the people who are engaged in economic activity. In both cases it is a question of indisputable values which can be considered originally humane only on condition of their correlation with each other that excludes absolutization both those, and others. Opposite values of two main economic systems can be ethically justified only when their relativity is realized. From such «relative» understanding of the valuable preconditions standing behind each of systems, follows that the principles both market, and a state planned economy can be perceived only in correlation to a valuable complex of opposite system. Opposition of a free and state planned economy not quite correctly: neither absolutely free market, nor the centralized economy in pure form does not exist.

The decentralized planning conducts finally to instability in macroeconomic, to social injustice and serious consequences for environment that calls into question into existence of the most market system and dictates need of frame planning and management of economic processes. Total central planning, according to one of authoritative researchers of ethical economy of P. Kozlowski, conducts to inefficient, inapplicable managing at the microlevel, promoting social, economic crises and shocks that causes of correction by means of market elements [10, c. 231]. The adjustable market economy which is guided by criteria of the general benefit meets requirements of humanity. The economy organized in this way sets as the purpose human life service in the broadest sense of the word: the social market economy does not allow neither unilateral prevalence of interests of the capital, nor formation of structures of the power over the market therefore, contrary to the uncontrolled capitalist market, this system makes the demand of its regulation. Improvement of the humanity put in it has to become the most important problem of further development of social market economy.

Part of economic ethics are enterprise ethics. If subject of moral requirements in economic ethics are mainly the state institutes, in enterprise – the separate enterprises, businessmen and managers [20, c. 70-78]. Enterprise ethics staticize the morals and profit relations in management of the enterprises and deal with an issue, what moral standards and the principles can be realized in the conditions of modern production. Problem of enterprise ethics is acquaintance of the enterprises with alternative options of activity on the basis of which they can realize lawful moral requirements in the conditions of competitive economy. A peculiar option of the «individualistic» direction of enterprise ethics are ethics of business which are understood as the discipline studying application of ethical principles to business situations. Ethics of business represent studying of compliance of moral standards of activity of the commercial enterprise [7, c. 64]. It represents the tool of the analysis and the solution of moral tasks which arise at the

person who is engaged in business. In ethics of business the problems characterizing valuable discrepancy of interaction of traditional morals and modern economy are especially sharply shown. Questions of relationship between universal and corporate ethics, about the annex of the general ethical principles to concrete situations of adoption of economic decisions, and also questions of social and moral responsibility of business, etc. are the most actual. Acquaintance to economic ethics not only will help businessmen, managers more freely to be guided in the complex problems arising at adoption of important decisions, but also will help to create certain «ethical infrastructure» which would promote development and improvement of market economy and the market relations.

References:

1. Habermas J. Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns / J. Habermas.- Frankfurt, 1981.- Bd. 2.- S. 304.
2. Habermas, J. Moral consciousness and communicative action / J. Habermas. – Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990. – 225 p.
3. Shionoya Y. Schmoller and modern economic sociology / Y. Shionoya // Schmollers Jahrbuch.- B., 2006.- Jg. 126, H. 2.- P. 177-196.
4. Steele G. Understanding economic man: Psychology, rationality and values / G. Steele // The Amer. J. of economics and sociology.- N. Y., 2005.-Vol. 63.- № 5.- P. 1021-1055.
5. Tawney P. H. Religion and the Rise of Capitalism / P. H. Tawney.- N. Y. : Penguin books, 1990.- P. 112.
6. Weber M. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism / M. Weber.- Taylor and Francis Group, 2005.- 314 p.
7. Бляхер Л. Моральная экономика и моральная политика, или Игра в перепрятушки доходов / Л. Бляхер // Политические исследования.- 2001.- № 1.- С. 64-72.
8. Бюшер М. Этика и методология экономической науки / М. Бюшер // Общественные науки и современность. – 1996.- №2.- С. 123-126.
9. Зомбарт В. Буржуа: этюды по истории духовного развития современного экономического человека / В. Зомбарт.- М. : Наука, 1994. – 442 с
10. Козловски П. Принципы этической экономики / П. Козловски ; пер. с нем. и ред. В. С. Автономова. – СПб: Экономическая школа, 1999.- 341 с.
11. Мандевиль Б. Исследование о происхождении моральной добродетели [электронный ресурс] / Б. Мандевиль. – Режим доступа: <http://bernardmandevil.narod.ru/isled.htm>
12. Омельченко Н. В. Онтологическое основание морали / Н. В. Омельченко // Рефлексии. Журнал по философской антропологии.- 2010.- № 2.- С. 73–84.
13. Разин А. С. Экономическая этика в структуре этического знания / А. С. Разин, Ж. В. Рослякова // Философия социальных коммуникаций. – 2011.-№4, – С. 78-87.
14. Разин А. С. Истоки хозяйства (ритуал, обряд, традиция) / А. С. Разин // Гуманитарные и социально-экономические науки. – 2006.- №12.- С. 105-110.
15. Рих А. Хозяйственная этика / Артур Рих. – М. : Посев, 1996. – 810 с.
16. Смит А. Теория нравственных чувств / Смит А.; Вступ. ст. Б. В. Мееровского ; Подгот. текста, коммент. А. Ф. Грязнова.- М. : Республика, 1997.- 351 с.
17. Сутор Б. Политическая этика / Б. Сутор // Полис. – 1993.- №1.- С. 61-71
18. Сутор Б. Политическая и экономическая этика / Б. Сутор, К. Хоман, Ф. Бломе-Дрез.- М. : Фаир-Пресс, 2001. – 368 с.
19. Аквинский Фома Сумма против Язычников / Фома Аквинский ; вступл. статья Т. Ю. Борадай. – М. : Вестком, 2000. – кн. 1. – 463 с.
20. Фредерик Р. Деловая этика и философский прагматизм / Р. Фредерик, Э. Петри // Вопросы философии.- 1996.- № 3.- С. 70 – 78.
21. Фритцше Д. Дж. Этика бизнеса: глобальная и управленческая перспектива / Д. Дж. Фритцше ; [пер. с англ. А. Калинин].- М. : Олимп-Бизнес : Тройка-Диалог, 2002.- 327 с.
22. Фукуяма Ф. Социальный капитал / Ф. Фукуяма // Культура имеет значение. Каким образом ценности способствуют общественному прогрессу / под ред. Л. Харрисона, С. Хантингтона.- М., 2002.- с. 129.
23. Шмоллер Г. Народное хозяйство, наука о народном хозяйстве и ее методы / Г. Шмоллер. – М. : Директмедиа Паблишинг, 2007 г.-115 с.

Разин О. С. Економічна етика: епістемологічний статус і зміст.

Під економічною етикою розуміють сукупність правил, норм, принципів поведінки господарюючих суб'єктів, імперативи і вимоги, що пред'являються суспільством до характеру дій і відносин між ними. За ступенем значущості і діапазону проблем господарська етика є однією з найважливішою і складною складовою економічної етики. Господарська етика насамперед ставить питання про справедливість і про доцільний устрій життя людини, що обумовлені економічними і соціальними чинниками. Предметом дослідження господарської етики є поведінка людини, соціальних груп, різних об'єднань в рамках економічних структур і по відношенню до цих структур. Досліджуючи проблему організації економіки, господарська етика не займається пошуками абсолютно гуманного економічного порядку, заперечуючи всі існуючі і можливі форми організації економіки як не відповідні ідеалу. Головною, фундаментальною метою економіки є корисність для життя, служіння йому, оскільки господарська діяльність орієнтується на потреби людини. Економіка може бути засобом, але не метою, в іншому випадку, неминуха криза, викликана спотворенням сенсу економіки.

Одним з важливих завдань господарської етики є дослідження умов, що сприяють створенню більш гуманного, в порівнянні з існуючим, економічного порядку в суспільстві. Господарська етика проводить чітке розмежування між примусом, викликаним економічною необхідністю, і примусом, обумовленим структурами, створеними людиною. У відношенні цих «примусових обставин» вона приходить до висновку: те, що суперечить гуманному не може бути справді доцільним і конструктивним. Облік підлягають як раціональне, так і моральне, гуманне начало, при цьому жодна з цих цінностей не

повинна витіснити іншу. У міркуваннях про моральне можна випускати з поля зору раціональний аспект економіки і, з іншого боку, в економічній аргументації, не слід ігнорувати аспект гуманності. Проблема співвідносного поєднання актуальна в додатку не тільки до раціонального та гуманного, але і до інших цінностей. Важливими з економічної точки зору є насамперед такі цінності, як особиста відповідальність та особисті інтереси, солідарність і колективізм. Можна оцінити як антигуманні ті економічні системи і порядки, які абсолютизують одну з цих цінностей.

Ключові слова: економічна етика, ділова етика, соціальна етика, культура, соціальний капітал, підприємницька етика, інституційна етика, соціальна відповідальність.

Разин А. С. Экономическая этика: эпистемологический статус и содержание.

Под экономической этикой понимают совокупность правил, норм, принципов поведения хозяйствующих субъектов, императивы и требования, предъявляемые обществом к характеру действий и отношений между ними. По степени значимости и диапазону проблем хозяйственная этика является одной из самой важной и сложной составляющей экономической этики. Хозяйственная этика прежде всего ставит вопрос о справедливости и о целесообразном устройстве жизни человека, обусловливаемых экономическими и социальными факторами. Предметом исследования хозяйственной этики является поведение человека, социальных групп, различных объединений в рамках экономических структур и по отношению к этим структурам. Исследуя проблему организации экономики, хозяйственная этика не занимается поисками абсолютно гуманного экономического порядка, отрицая все существующие и возможные формы организации экономики как не соответствующие идеалу. Главной, фундаментальной целью экономики является полезность для жизни, служение ей, поскольку хозяйственная деятельность ориентируется на потребности человека. Экономика может быть средством, но не целью, в противном случае, неизбежен кризис, вызванный искажением смысла экономики.

Одной из важных задач хозяйственной этики является исследование условий, способствующих созданию более гуманного, по сравнению с существующим, экономического порядка в обществе. Хозяйственная этика проводит четкое различие между принуждением, вызванным экономической необходимостью, и принуждением, обусловленным структурами, созданными человеком. В отношении этих «принудительных обстоятельств» она приходит к выводу о том, что противоречащее гуманному не может быть подлинно целесообразным и конструктивным. Учету подлежат как рациональное, так и

нравственное, гуманное начало, при этом ни одна из этих ценностей не должна вытеснять другую. В рассуждениях о нравственном нельзя упускать из поля зрения рациональный аспект экономики и, с другой стороны, в экономической аргументации не следует игнорировать аспект гуманности. Проблема соотносительного сочетания актуальна в приложении не только к рациональному и гуманному, но и к другим ценностям. Важными с экономической точки зрения являются прежде всего такие ценности, как личная ответственность и личные интересы, солидарность и коллективизм. Можно оценить как антигуманные те экономические системы и порядки, которые абсолютизируют одну из этих ценностей.

Ключевые слова: экономическая этика, деловая этика, социальная этика, культура, социальный капитал, предпринимательская этика, институциональная этика, социальная ответственность.

Надійшла до редколегії 28.02.2013 р.

УДК 1 (09)

К. В. Райхерт

Одесский национальный университет имени И. И. Мечникова

АНТРОПОЛОГИЧЕСКАЯ ФИЛОСОФИЯ ЛЮДВИГА ФОН БЕРТАЛАНФИ

В центре антропологической философии Л. фон Берталанфи стоит человек как символическое животное. Человек в отличие от других животных способен создавать вселенную символов, которая замещает мир «вещей», превращая тем самым природу в культуру. Антропологическая философия Л. фон Берталанфи выполняет функцию критики культуры.

Ключевые слова: философская антропология, критика культуры, общая теория систем.

В 1937 году австрийский биолог и философ Людвиг фон Берталанфи (1901-1972) впервые говорит о создании так называемой «общей теории систем» (allgemeine Systemlehre). Во второй половине 1940-х годов он начинает разработку общей теории систем как «логико-математической теории», которая должна была привести к унификации всех наук. Однако, несмотря на то, что Берталанфи ставит задачу создать общую теорию систем как «логико-математическую концепцию», он предостерегает от чрезмерного использования математического моделирования и аксиоматических построений в системном подходе, потому что они «не отсылают ни к какой реальности», «не ведут в действительности ни к каким открытиям» и «путают понятия с вещами» в частности и могут превратить общую теорию систем в «форму современной схоластики» в целом [10, p. 192-193]. Такая точка зрения Берталанфи была вызвана тем, что параллельно с разработкой общей теории систем во второй половине 1940-х годов он начал разрабатывать свою философскую антропологию, которую он сам называл «антропологическая философия». Собственно, общая теория систем является частью и инструментом познания антропологической философии Берталанфи.

«Антропологическая философия» Берталанфи является почти неизученной