

UDC 36

SOCIAL WELFARE SOCIETY VERSUS SOCIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY SOCIETY: PRO ET CONTRA

Igor B. Ardashkin,

Dr. Sc., National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, 30, Lenin avenue,
Tomsk, 634030, Russia. E-mail: ibardashkin@mail.ru

Alla A. Kornienko,

Dr. Sc., National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, 30, Lenin avenue,
Tomsk, 634030, Russia. E-mail: allaphil@tpu.ru

Anna V. Loginova,

National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, 30, Lenin avenue,
Tomsk, 634030, Russia. E-mail: loginovaav@tpu.ru

Today achieving prosperity in various spheres of human activity is just as important as it was before. But we can say that there is a sufficient number of factors that cast doubt on the preservation of the achieved level of well-being, its maintenance and development.

The main aim of the research is to assess the prospects of becoming of the society social well-being and to develop proposals to address the main problems encountered along the way.

Methods. The authors have used the method of explication to clarify a number of key concepts and processes that take place at formation of social well-being society and the method of comparative analysis to demonstrate different processes of social evolution.

Results. Globalization and modernization (information support) are the most significant challenges to the social welfare society. These processes undermine such important institutions as the state and society as the welfare fundamentals, and lead to the loss of uniqueness and self-sufficiency. They result in losing the familiar features of a man, society and the state. In particular, the state has been already unable to agree on a social compromise (collective solidarity) with employers and on the issue of full employment of people who do not possess the latest professional competencies (information) with trade unions. The authors conclude that today the society of social welfare, initially developed on the basis of establishment and development of human rights is possible only in the case of social evolution emphasis which is also based on responsibilities of a person to himself and to the society. This condition is essential to form the social welfare society in the modern world.

Key words:

Social welfare society, social irresponsibility society, globalization, responsibility, opportunity.

Introduction

The necessity to have an idea of an ideal society organization is an essential aspect of social theories. Since Plato, Thomas Moore, Tommaso Campanella and other utopians an idea of the social being organization that would be the most appropriate for the majority of people has been developed. In the modern world and modern science this topic is as relevant as ever.

The welfare achievement in various spheres is still important for humans today. It is worth mentioning that for a number of national and regional societies the status of welfare is the major achievement. But it is impossible to affirm that this status looks seamless even in these societies at a sufficiently high level of well-being in certain areas. It can be stated that there is a certain number of factors that put in question the keeping of the achieved level of well-being, its maintenance and development. There are some concerns that the welfare could be lost, at least, the social welfare. Therefore, the authors would like to draw attention to this issue in order to analyze the main challenges that exist today on the way to the social welfare society. The aim of this work is to assess the prospects of the social welfare society establishment and to develop some proposals for solving the main problems that appear on the way. The objectives of the research are: analysis of the basic concepts; apprehension of globalization and moderniza-

tion (information support) and evaluation of their role in establishment of social welfare society; search for solutions connected to overcoming the tendency of social irresponsibility society establishment and to defining possible ways to develop the social welfare society.

Method description

To implement the established goal the authors intend to use the explication method specifying some key concepts and processes that proceed in the context of the social welfare society establishment. The authors mean to have recourse to the comparative analysis method to demonstrate the multidirectional processes of social evolution.

Results

The social welfare society is a term that has a certain number of synonyms in academic literature. This is the society of welfare, the commonwealth state, the consumer society, happiness, bliss, wealth, prosperity, etc. However, all these designations of the desired state of the social structure are characterized by an individual freedom, democratic management, middle class presence, social security, welfare state, etc. One of the leading forces (tools) to achieve this society is the state if there is any mature civil society.

According to the authors, well-being is a concept that has a wider meaning than just happiness, prosperity, welfare state, social security and social protection. The welfare appears for a whole (integral) well style as a major social reference point of community development. The welfare (well receipt) comprises the whole range of components: financial and economic benefit, political and legal benefit and non-material benefits. However, only the unity of these measurements may allow individuals and the society to consider themselves safe. The achievement of only some individual welfare measurements will only indicate the selectivity of the society welfare, and not its well-being as a whole (social welfare).

There are several approaches to understand the organization of such society. The difference of approaches depends on evaluation of the role of public and private origins in society life. In particular, a well-known researcher G. Esping-Andersen identified three types of welfare states: neo-liberal (American), social-democratic (Scandinavian) and conservative-corporate (Franco-German) [1]. The state role in each type of society is different. In neoliberal type the role of the state is to regulate the market, in social democratic type – to provide the financial support, in conservative-corporate type it is a combination of the market regulation and a direct financial support. In other words, G. Esping-Andersen demonstrates that certain result commonness is achieved by different tools.

The idea of the welfare state that is a constitutional principle in most European countries nowadays plays an important role. The social state is considered as a type of the state with a developed mixed economy that is socially oriented and where the principle of social justice and a high security level of all citizens dominate. The problem of the social state model prospects in European countries as well as the concept of «the society of two-thirds» (the third of the citizens is marginalized, excluded from the social security system) are actively discussed in literature. The possibility of the welfare state to solve social problems by the previous methods of guardianship and social insurance benefits is restricted and the policy of the national income redistribution reveals the inefficiency of its mechanisms.

The paternalistic role of the state is exhausted and there is a necessity to form the fundamentals of the state that are «social investments» in human and social capital assets, – this refers to the advanced model of the welfare state, to the transfer from the strategy of «social expenditure» to the strategy of «social investments». The welfare state uses democratic institutions in the course of political decision-making, while the social agreement system of economic life participants is the basis of the institutional state. As for the «social security net» that is based on legal powers of the national service, it needs to be converted into the system that promotes the personal responsibility establishment. These days the activity of the state in its previous forms (of hierarchical cen-

tralism) reveals its inefficiency and new forms of this activity are formed in the context of globalization. In the society itself the new forms of self-regulation appear; they require the development of the initiative and responsibility [2]. The principle of «subsidiarity» comes from an idea of positive defense of citizen legal capacity on the part of the state institutions to provide the citizens with the same original base. K. Marx called these processes the «dissolution» of the state in society that acting as a consolidating idea will help establish a stable social system.

Today we face the situation where the state role changes considerably and it is no longer able to perform those functions (though in different amount) that G. Esping-Andersen wrote about. It is worth stating that the state loses its primary function – an underwriter function. Therefore, it loses the citizen confidence and the confidence of other social policy participants. The famous British sociologist N. Rose mentions that today in many developed countries (from Sweden to Australia) the belief in the commonwealth state is criticized, and the concept of this social institution is reexamined. It is caused by the processes of privatization of public goods, social security and by transfer of education, pension fund schemes, medical care, etc. to the private venture [3]. The essential loss, according to N. Rose, is that the commonwealth state was always built on the idea of sociality. Nevertheless, today this idea «dies out» that leads to the state crisis.

The similar ideas are expressed by other investigators L. Salamon, H. Anheier, who state the fact of government program discredit, the social budget reduction, and the need of people to seek an alternative to the state as a source of social care [4].

The state was traditionally seen as an institution that is the center of social organization of the society. It was believed that the state should maintain the absolute equality of rights for all segments of the population, secure the liberty and a minimal prosperity (nominally). This solidarity was achieved by a compromise between the principal participants of the social interaction such as «state, employers, trade unions, community societies and non-governmental organizations» [5. P. 82]. However, the primary responsibility for achievement and maintenance of the compromise is placed on the state. All agreement participants proceeded from the premise that they had to limit their interests for the sake of a more substantial welfare – a kind of respect for equality of opportunities for every member of society. According to T.Yu. Sidorina, a compromise is «a principle to achieve the solidarity of the state and other social spheres, in other words, an ability of all participants of the social contract to sacrifice some of their interests to achieve efficiently their basic part, and to achieve the public good that supposes the economic growth, the welfare improvement of all citizens, the social justice, the social involvement, a favorable moral atmosphere, the cultural and spiritual development, the maintenance of democratic and humanistic valu-

es, the development of human rights and freedoms. The state donates its omnipotence, as it deliberately takes the responsibility for the society formation and wishes to share the burden of responsibility with employers, trade unions and non-governmental organizations. Employers agree to support the principle of full employment if the trade unions reduce their claims for a permanent increase in pay. The trade unions ease this demand to achieve a full employment. The non-governmental organizations soften the criticism of the government and express their solidarity with its policies in order to achieve the public good. The state works closely with them to reduce the burden of its personal responsibility» [6. P. 173].

The key factor to achieve the social welfare was the welfare state that had a primary responsibility for the desired result. Even if there was a tendency to share this responsibility with all «players» of social processes, the state was the main respondent to the man and society. In fact, the idea of civil society and the experience of its operation showed that even if there is the most active public participation and control, the liability for social welfare is not waived from the state. There was an obvious idea of cooperation between the state and society (represented by employers, trade unions, non-governmental organizations). The welfare level and completeness of the general public depend on the principles of this cooperation.

This cooperation of the state and society acted as an element of stability in the historical development of the mankind. Therefore, everyone could imagine his mode of existence and mechanisms to achieve necessary results in life. Everyone was able to take decisions on his fate and on the fact whether everyone aims for his own well-being.

This afore mentioned situation was very clearly outlined by the French existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre. From his point of view, the man makes himself. This principle is the essential principle of existentialism. The man does not possess an initially predetermined fate; his nature does not specify the future outlines of life. No one but himself can determine it; no one can turn him into a human without his own desire. According to Sartre, only a man himself is responsible for his own fate, for whether he could become the person that he originally wanted to be [7].

In other words, the social welfare as it is represented by social theories and proceedings of different nation states is based on the mechanism of social safety nets and the responsibility for their execution. The responsibility is shared between the participants of the social cooperation: the man, the society and the state. The main liability rests with the state (nation state) as this institution is vested with the significant authority.

However, as it was aforementioned, nowadays in the world the processes that dramatically transform the role of the state, the society and the man are developing [8]. Moreover, the point at issue is that we are witnessing the process of «withering away» of the state (at least as a national form), of the society

as a social form, of the man as a full-fledged party of his own destiny. In addition, these processes raise automatically the question of the development prospects and the social well-being preservation, as the social welfare achievement, excluding the state, social and personal origin, is not possible. At least, what is meant here is the social well-being as an integral phenomenon that includes financial and economic, politico-legal and moral and integral studies. The main obstacle to the social well-being, in the authors' opinion, is the processes that lead to the development of the society of social irresponsibility. It is worth mentioning that naming of such social foundation by the society has a figurative nature, more specifically the aggregate of individuals that coexist in the same time line.

The authors understand the society of social irresponsibility as the way of people operation on the basis of which it is virtually impossible to identify the objectives, the mechanisms of cooperation, the systems of values, etc. of each member of the society. It is not clear as a result of what economic activity the worthy level of welfare can be achieved, what systems of values unite people, what regulations act to provide the clear and direct life-sustaining activity principles. We constantly face the contradictory and ambivalent situations that do not allow identifying the single point of responsibility for social processes. It is not clear who runs the process and there is no understanding that there is some control over the situation. When neither an individual nor the society and the state can control various processes of the life-sustaining activity, and have any possibility to carry out this kind of control [9].

Globalization and modernization (information support) processes are a source of threats to the social welfare society. These processes are interdependent and influence the modern society development. On the one hand, new production technologies, information technologies, the knowledge-based economy form the background for globalization, overcoming national, regional, religious and other boundaries. On the other hand, globalization contributes to a more active development of advanced technologies and their quick implementation and distribution. These processes lead to the loss of the familiar functions of a man, the society and the state. In particular, the state is already unable to reach a social compromise (a corporate solidarity) with employers and trade-unions on the issue of full employment of people who do not have the latest professional (information) competencies. It is worth understanding that the amount of people (paying attention to the science and technology development rate) that do not have the up-to-date competencies will grow.

The nation state is no longer able to act as a definite economic unit that allows protecting its own economic interests and the interests of its population. Business goes where it is more profitable, where the taxes are lower and where there are cheaper raw materials, labor, and manufacturing. It leads to a reduction of

the assessment basis on terms of which the social welfare development of this or that country is formed. Thus, there is the conversion of the social safety nets on the private basis and the welfare decline. A recent example of France showed that an intention to increase taxes at the cost of the tax revenue growth from very wealthy citizens led to the opposite result. These citizens accelerated the transfer of their assets in other countries and reduced the assessment basis that had already been declined. This is despite the fact that taxes were not increased [10, 11].

All that is caused by globalization when there is a feeling of the center, the motherland loss and everything is out of control. According to Z. Bauman, «the most profound meaning of globalization idea is the uncertain, uncontrollable and self-sufficient nature of everything that happens in the world; the absence of the center, the control panel, the board of directors or the head office. Globalization is just the other name of a new global disorder... This feature that is inseparable from the image of globalization completely distinguishes it from another idea that it co-called succeeded, the idea of «universalization» that once served as the debate core on world-wide affairs. But nowadays this idea is out of use and it is forgotten by everybody apart from philosophers» [12. P. 88].

As a result of globalization, the state in its national form ceases to exist or its functions are drastically reduced, they are restricted to the role of «a local policeman» that follows someone's (unknown) will. According to G.H. von Wright, «the driving forces of transnational nature are mostly anonymous, and therefore elusive. They do not form a unified system or procedure. This is the system agglomeration that is manipulated mostly by «invisible» characters. There is not any solidarity or a focused coordination of actions between the aforementioned forces» [13. P. 51]. Such state is unlikely to be social and to act as guarantor of the public welfare.

Globalization changes not only the status of the state (in its national form), it transforms fundamentally the society and the man. According to Z. Bauman, the modern society that he characterizes as a customized one has the following features: the loss of ability to control social processes; the understanding of exposure in terms of the loss of control over the social processes; as a consequence, the lack of opportunities and abilities for a long-term life planning. Nowadays, the man turns into an individual who does not have a desire to associate himself with other people and who lacks the responsibility to others and himself, and lives in the present [14]. After Z. Bauman, «As a result, there is an all-pervading feeling of «the loss of control over the present» that leads to the stroke of the political will; to the loss of faith in the fact that it is possible to achieve something significant collectively, and that the joint actions can make the drastic changes in human affairs. The current situation is more often taken for granted as the highest need where people can interfere only to the detri-

ment to themselves. We often hear that the only cure for the painful side effects of the severe competition is an even greater deregulation, the adjustability growth and a point-back refusal of any interference. If this does not convince someone, the last argument is an apparent lack of the institution that is powerful enough to implement the decisions that could appear in joint discussions and quest for a compromise. Even those who think they know how to act in this direction, strike flag when it is time to decide who – what effective institution – must do everything» [14. P. 67].

If earlier in relationship between man and society there was a certain order, even if it was a question of discrimination and exploitation, today there is a certain vacuum in this issue that actually has nothing to be filled with. Historically, any objection caused a reaction if you were dissatisfied and showed it when you were, for example, in a minority, the society did not fail to be moved even in case of the harsh crackdown of this rebellion. Nowadays you and your rebellion even in case of the most energetic expression can go unnoticed. Even if it is noticed, it will not cause any response (only the negligence). U. Beck uses this characteristic evaluating such social condition of public cooperation as an exception [15, 16]. People, the whole groups, communities are simply excluded from life; they dissolve in the basic mass [17]. It certainly does not mean that any kind of actions and declarations lost their social value (it might well be that they get necessary assessment and lead to the desired result), but the probability that the given community relief will be unnoticed is higher. To be more accurate, if it was noticed, it is necessary for someone (as a rule, for someone who has some resources).

A man loses firm ground today, it seems that he «stuck in mire» and does not know how to get out of it. It provokes threats and fears for the destiny, for the future, for the well-being. The fear penetrates from everywhere: from outside, from the society, from the street, from a neighbor, from the media, from our own uncertainty. P. Bourdieu said that the consciousness and the unconscious are had to the fear. To hit the heights, it is necessary to have feet on the ground, but today this ground is the most unstable and tends to be even more unstable. Hence there is the uncertainty that makes everything and the future, in particular, even more uncertain, and does not form any hope for the future that is important for a person to cheer up (including collectively) against this unacceptable present [18].

The weirdest thing is that the uncertainty and the imbalance of a human is a situation that does not depend on his decision, where almost nothing depends on him. According to U. Beck, today the risks happen to be absolutely independent of the man's choice; that is the structure of the social life-sustaining activity where everything is already selected on behalf of the person. And his goal is to accept this situation as soon as possible and try to survive in it. Even if something negative happens to a person, it is often im-

possible to deal with the reasons of the incident (and even if it seems possible, it is impossible to change anything in the future). Bauman believes that «the individualization is a fate and not a choice: the desire to avoid the individualization and the refusal to participate in this game are not clearly on the agenda, if you are on the premises of the individual freedom of choice. The fact that people don't have anybody to blame for their disappointments and troubles did not mean in the past and does not mean nowadays that they are able to protect themselves against such disappointments using their home remedies or to drag themselves off the mire of troubles just as Baron Munchausen dragged himself off the swamp with the help of his own braces» [14. P. 58].

The situation of social disorder, chaos and uncertainty leads to development of the social irresponsibility society when nobody is in charge of anything and anybody or vice versa everybody tries to shift responsibility to each other. In the society there is the loss of confidence that leads to the exacerbation of the expected risks perception and really compounds matters. Nobody strives to charge himself with the social administration that should move more or less in the optimum way. It is obvious that the processes that have been described above (the loss of the state functions of a social well-being guarantor, the loss of the society socio-executive function, the loss of the individual intention of solidarity, intention to be responsible for his own destiny, etc.) generate a trend where the achievement of the social well-being, the development of the society where there is the social welfare is a standard and not just an ideal. It is unlikely. However, unlikely does not mean impossible. These opportunities lie in a person's ability to resist those dangerous processes that break the principles of the state, the society and the individual as important fundamentals.

Here we draw some analogy. The American researcher Francis Fukuyama, referring to the study of modern biotechnologies, reveals a peculiar nature of mentality where the biotechnology appears for the process already independent from the man, from his ability to influence somehow their development. Such sentiments Fukuyama considers as irresponsible in terms of a human reluctance to believe that the desire to control the biotechnology development is well within his reach. Hence, by the way, there is the confidence that this process is controlled. According to Fukuyama, «the idea that it is impossible to stop the technological progress or to control it is simply wrong... We must avoid a defeatist attitude to technology at all hazards, i. e. the feeling that if we cannot do anything to stop or to switch the research that we do not like, it is not worth worrying. To create the regulatory that allows the society of different countries to monitor the human biotechnology is not an easy task» [19. P. 8]. Nevertheless, for Fukuyama this is «a completely open issue» [19. P. 8]. Moreover, the issue on the social welfare society and its development is also open.

Even if it is not possible to develop the social welfare society, it is incorrect to believe its impossibility. The situation of uncertainty, risk and lack of control is not a verdict nowadays, but only an obstacle that requires its surmounting. Indeed, we are witnessing the development of the social irresponsibility society, but it should only help us to make a search for actions to reform it. It appears obvious to the authors that the development of the responsible society (namely, this society set the reference point to the society of social welfare) was set up by means of protection and empowerment of human (individual) rights in his various guises (from the infancy to the elderly age, from person of the natural identity to the person of various gender-based identities, etc.). The consumer society and the community consumerization are the natural result of this process. As a result, all phenomena that occurred to the society aimed the consumption outreach (including globalization and modernization). However, there is a question of responsibility: Who is responsible for these processes and for the results they lead to? As practice shows, this question is still open. But this does not mean that it does not require an answer.

The authors believe that the crucial resource for a man to develop the society of social welfare is to make a search for the reasons to show responsibility for himself, for others, for the state as a whole. The ecological principle «think globally, act locally» can refer to the social processes and to confer their reforms. Of course, this is only the intention that is very difficult to translate into the society activities; today no one knows how to do it. However, the fact that such intention appeared and it can be used, is a positive thing. By the way, some researchers also have an opinion that the consolidation of the responsibility role can surmount the existing chaos and uncontrollability. Amongst others, M. Hyde, J. Dixon, M. Jayner think that it is important to consider the concepts of «opportunity» and «responsibility» together as it prepares people to be responsible for opportunities that are in front of them and that they are ready to use for their good. It will allow achieving the global welfare [20].

Conclusion

Thus, the modern society is at the crossroads. On the one hand, it is rapidly moving towards the further globalization and modernization that leads to the chaos, the uncertainty and the loss of the responsibility center for the society fate. This trend stems from the social need of an ideal society (at least the focus on it). Nevertheless, the development for the man's benefit leads to the fact that a man dissolves in the popular culture losing himself and an ability to monitor his life. All this is a consequence of the implementation of human rights and their needs satisfaction on a bigger and bigger scale. The result is the development of the social irresponsibility society. On the other hand, a man understands the danger of following this path. However, he realizes that if he

is going to change this social development thrust and is trying to develop the social welfare society, he will have to take the responsibility for the implementation of this ambition. This responsibility should be not only personal but also collective, global. Howe-

ver, it is unknown and obscure how to do this now. Therefore, there is a dilemma: the social irresponsibility society versus the social welfare society. It is hoped that the second type of the conflict will be selected as a reference point.

REFERENCES

1. Esping-Andersen G. Welfare State for the 21-st Century. Ed. by A. Giddens. *The Global Third Way Debate*. Oxford, Polity Press, 2001. pp. 134–156.
2. Anheier H.K. Institutional voids and the role of civil society: the case of global finance. *Global Policy*, February 2014, vol. 5, Iss. 1, pp. 23–35.
3. Rose N. The Death of the Social? Re-figuring the Territory of Government. *Economy and Society*, 1996, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 327–356.
4. Salamon L.M., Anheier H.K. Social Origin of Civil Society: Explaining the Nonprofit Sector Cross-nationally. *Voluntas*, 1998, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 213–248.
5. Fedotova V.G. Sotsialnoe gosudarstvo i rynek [Social state and market]. *Svobodnaya mysl – XXI*, 2002, no. 7, pp. 78–94.
6. Sidorina T.Yu. *Dva veka sotsialnoy politiki* [Two Centuries of Social Policy]. Moscow, RGSU Press, 2005. 442 p.
7. Sartre J.-P. Existentialism Is a Humanism. *Marxists Internet Archive*. 2014. Available at: <http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/Sartre/works/exist/sartre.htm> (accessed 26 February 2014).
8. Anheier H.K., Leat D. Philanthropic foundations: What rationales? *Social Research*, June 2013, vol. 80, Iss. 2, pp. 449–472.
9. Ardashkin I.B. Doverie v nauke i religii: k stanovleniyu kultury doveriya [Trust in science and religion: the question of the establishment of a culture of trust]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 2013, no. 370. pp. 56–60.
10. Bauman Z. Dividing time, or love's labour's lost... *Thesis Eleven*, October 2013, vol. 118, Iss. 1, pp. 3–6.
11. Bauman Z. Times of interregnum. *Ethics and Global Politics*, 2012, vol. 5, Iss. 1, pp. 49–56.
12. Bauman Z. *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. London, Columbia University Press, 1998. 136 p.
13. Wrigh von G.H. The Crisis of Social Science and the Withering Away of the Nation State. *Associations*, 1997, no. 1, pp. 49–52.
14. Bauman Z. *The Individualized Society*. Cambridge, Polity Press, 2001. 272 p.
15. Beck U. Why 'class' is too soft a category to capture the explosiveness of social inequality at the beginning of the twenty-first century. *British Journal of Sociology*, March 2013, vol. 64, Iss. 1, pp. 63–74.
16. Beck U., Cronin C. The European crisis in the context of cosmopolitization. *New Literary History*, September 2012, vol. 43, Iss. 4, pp. 641–663.
17. Beck U. *Risk Society – toward a New Modernity*. London, Sage Publications, 1992. 260 p.
18. Bourdieu P. *La precarite est aujourd'hui partout*. Paris, Raisons d'Agir, 1998. Cited by: Nice R. Acts of Resistance. Cambridge, Polity Press, 1998. pp. 96–97.
19. Fucuyama F. *Our Posthumam Future. Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution*. New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002. 256 p.
20. Hyde M., Dixon J., Joyner M. Beck U. Why 'class' is too: the United Kingdom's New Social Security Reform Agenda. *International Social Security Review*, 1999, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 69–86.

Received: 28 October 2014.

УДК 36

ОБЩЕСТВО СОЦИАЛЬНОГО БЛАГОПОЛУЧИЯ VERSUS ОБЩЕСТВО СОЦИАЛЬНОЙ БЕЗОТВЕТСТВЕННОСТИ: PRO ET CONTRA

Ардашкин Игорь Борисович,

д-р филос. наук, профессор кафедры философии Института социально-гуманитарных технологий ФГАОУ ВО «Национальный исследовательский Томский политехнический университет», Россия, 634030, г. Томск, пр. Ленина, 30. E-mail: ibardashkin@mail.ru

Корниенко Алла Александровна,

д-р филос. наук, заведующая кафедрой философии Института социально-гуманитарных технологий ФГАОУ ВО «Национальный исследовательский Томский политехнический университет», Россия, 634030, г. Томск, пр. Ленина, 30. E-mail: allaphil@tpu.ru

Логина Анна Владимировна,

ст. преподаватель кафедры иностранных языков Института кибернетики ФГАОУ ВО «Национальный исследовательский Томский политехнический университет», Россия, 634030, г. Томск, пр. Ленина, 30. E-mail: loginovaav@tpu.ru

Достижение процветания в различных сферах человеческой деятельности сегодня не менее важно, чем ранее. Но мы можем сказать, что есть достаточное количество факторов, которые ставят под сомнение достигнутый уровень благосостояния, его сохранение и развитие.

Цель: оценка перспектив становления социального благополучия общества и разработка предложений по решению основных проблем, с которыми сталкиваются на этом пути.

Методы. Используется метод экспликации, с чьей помощью уточняется ряд ключевых понятий и процессов, протекающих в условиях становления общества социального благополучия. Применяется метод сравнительного анализа с целью демонстрации разнонаправленных процессов развития социальной эволюции.

Результаты. Наиболее значимыми вызовами обществу социального благополучия являются процессы глобализации и модернизации (информатизации), подрывающие такие важные институты в качестве основ благополучия, как государство и общество, а также ведущие к утрате человеком его самобытности и самодостаточности. Эти процессы приводят к утрате тех привычных функций, которые играли человек, общество и государство. В частности, государство уже оказывается не в состоянии договориться о социальном компромиссе (о коллективной солидарности) с работодателями и с профсоюзами в вопросе о полной занятости людей, которые не владеют новейшими профессиональными компетенциями (информационными). Авторы делают вывод, что сегодня общество социального благополучия, которое изначально строилось на основе утверждения и развития прав человека, возможно только в случае акцентирования социальной эволюции также на основе обязанностей (ответственности) человека перед собой и обществом. Это обязательное условие формирования общества социального благополучия в современном мире.

Ключевые слова:

Общество социального благополучия, общество социальной безответственности, глобализация, ответственность, возможность.