

того, щоб мати простір вирішувати ті чи інші проблеми залежно від ситуації, а той чи інший інститут міг діяти на власний розсуд, самостійно трактуючи закони та Конституцію.

**Список літератури:** 1. Фисун А. Постсоветские неопатримониальные режимы: генезис, особенности, типология. 2. Павленко Р. Парламентська відповідальність уряду: світовий та український досвід. – К.: КМ Академія, 2002. – с. 208. 3. Мартинюк Р. Парламентська відповідальність Уряду в Україні: особливості нормативного регулювання // Право України. – 2008. – № 9. – С. 19–25.

*Moroz M.V., Laamanen R.V.  
Varkaus, Finland*

## **SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE ELDERLY: CONCEPTUAL SUMMARIZING OF THE ISSUE AND ITS CONTRADICTIONS**

The issue of social responsibility in the system of value orientations of modern society is extremely important and significant for the development of the individual and in the context of social development at the state level. Given the diversity of manifestations of complex content, some areas of development found its immediate expression within several branches of scientific knowledge. Sustainability as a socio-political phenomenon, studied mainly within sociological scientific thought, while social responsibility as a category of socio-economic knowledge gained its development primarily within the competence of Economics. However, in our opinion, the greatest impetus for the development of categorical content of the social responsibility issue was done within the borders of psychological and pedagogical sciences, because within the competence of these areas of scientific knowledge manifestation, the most typical questions position the systems and social norms of society's and personal responses to their violation. Furthermore, among the main areas of manifestation of contents of objects and subjects of psychological and pedagogical knowledge, the issue of forming social norms and rules, as well as issues of identity formation as a subject of practical implementation and their social intentions is one of the backbone elements of an appropriate system of scientific knowledge.

The issues of social responsibility in the system of value orientations of modern society are constantly within range of scientific interests of researchers. Among the latest scientific-communicative activities, the topics of which were aimed at finding effective mechanisms of cooperation

(development of the dialectic relationship) between the individual and society in the context of forming of mutual rights and obligations there should be notated: First International Scientific Conference «Development of Students Social Responsibility in Higher Technical Education» (18.10. 2013, Kyiv – The National Technical University of Ukraine «Kyiv Polytechnic Institute» and Wroclaw University of Technology (Poland)); 2 st International scientific-practical conference «Business administration and corporate social responsibility» (30.04. 2014 – 02.05. 2014, Baku – Azerbaijan State Economic University); International conference «The Future of Social Relations: Rethinking Prejudice and Togetherness in Times of Crisis» (21.05. 2014 – 25.05. 2014, Sheffield – University of Sheffield). During the opening of the latest scientific-communicative activity Professor Gill Valentine drew attention to the importance of critical debate about the future of social relations. In the context of legislation on equality, a scientist noticed that argue that there is a need to rediscover a broader framework of social solidarity, recognizing that the insecurities of the risk society demand an 'ethic of care' for those unlike ourselves. Yet, while there is increasing evidence that the growing proximity of difference is producing positive encounters which have been celebrated as cosmopolitanism, the question of how such everyday interactions can be scaled up to achieve a truly inclusive society remains [1, p. 3]. The question of inclusive society in the context of manifestation of the issues of social responsibility in the system of value orientations of modern society, was chosen by us as the object of study. *The subject of the study was defined as issues of social responsibility of the elderly for the decision concerning the prospects of socio-economic and socio-political development of the state.*

Traditionally, the question of social responsibility is violated in the context of the obligations of one part of society to another (social obligations of business to society, social responsibility of employed working people to those who are not able to work, social responsibility of young people to the elderly, etc.). However, relevant scientific research activities are focused primarily on the issues of moral quintessence or illegal and legal responsibility of a stronger social object to less protected, which is the reason for the distortion of the content of the relevant phenomena. *Social responsibility is based on the adoption of socially important interests by all the parties of social communication without an exception and their ability to not cause any damage to society by their activities.* Often, the social responsibility commitment is seen through some social object. Of course, the status of these objects is not necessarily the same as the level of the hierarchy of social positioning and the power of possible effects. In scientific discussions there is prevailing an opinion

on liability (performance obligations) of more powerful and successful social object (participant of the socio-economic relations) to the less secure one. However, when we consider the responsibility, including social one, remember that in the context of the content of theory of norms, this category is usually viewed through the prism of the institute of rights and duties of the participant of the correspondent process, and therefore it is all about mutual responsibility. Thus, *we can rephrase the term social responsibility into the term «social mutual responsibility»*. *We believe this formulation of the definition is more relevant to the content that is put into it*, because we can not talk about the social responsibility of business to society without taking into account the responsibility of society by favorable institutional environment for business or emphasize the social responsibility of society to elderly age without regard to its responsibility to society. In the context of the content of the latter thesis, we will try to flesh out our point of view on the affected issues.

Firstly, social responsibility should not be considered in the light of the subject-object relations. This is due to the fact that as part of social responsibility, or as we noted above – social mutual responsibility, *the same party of social communication may be considered at the same time as the status of the subject and the object of social responsibility*. It is clear that in this case the responsibility is gaining signs of mutual responsibility.

Secondly, *the problem of mutual responsibility between the main actors of social dialogue is closely related to the level of freedom* (political, economic, and freedom of conscience), because when it comes to «mutual», the subject is losing a part of their freedom, i.e. refuses to it in favor of the freedom of others. This action requires a balance of costs and benefits that characterize the relationship between stakeholders. Here it is not only the trust of each other (trust to pay), but rather for a specific result (give to get).

Thirdly, the issue of social mutual responsibility between members of social dialogue with dialectical relationship with questions of mutual obligations, that in some way affect the contents of the respective categories. Under the definition of mutual obligation we usually mean the compliance by the parties (entities that enter into an agreement or agree) of obligations with respect to one another. That is, an agreement that has certain responsibilities which must ensure compliance with the relevant agreement. When we understand the mutual special kind of interpersonal (intersubjective) relationship, the essence of which is revealed in the context of the content of the principle of collective responsibility. So, the results of the development of society as a whole and its major subsystems (political, economic, spiritual, social) directly, jointly and severally liable ones are all the members of social communications without an exception.

Fourthly, in the context of the subject of our attention, the elderly have the same social responsibility as the youth and the youth before them. This is due to the fact that young people are consuming the results of implementation of management decisions that were made by the authorities, legitimization of which was a result of the implementation of the will of the people who took part in the election process. According to the research of Yuriychuk E.P. relatively high proportion of elderly people among those who wish to take part in elections can be explained by «prolonged political socialization during the existence of Soviet power. Since this age group are women aged over 55 years, and men – aged 60 years, at the time of the formation of an independent state with the youngest current pensioners were under 38–43 years. Therefore, their political behavior formed generally in the USSR, when participation in the elections was the constitutional duty» [2, p. 82]. Taking into account the trend towards «aging process» (in the UN report «Development in the aging world. Summary» it was determined that in the twenty-first century aging of population will cause a significant impact on society and will require that policymakers should pay this process more attention. Experts estimate the share of the elderly in 1950 was 8 % while in 2000 their number increased to 10 %. Due to the projected demographic development, in 2050 the corresponding figure will be 21 % [3, P. 6–7]) it can be stated that the issue of participation of older people in social and political activities of the country is relevant, because taking part in the electoral process today, an elderly man identifies directions for future transformation of society. The question is how an elderly person can assess the risk to the prospects of the analysis offered the choice of alternatives. Of course, there are exceptions, i.e. the elder may be not only an active member of the socio-political and socio-economic processes, but a real object of the learning process) and their number is small enough to talk about the existence of systemic effects. In general, older people are not sufficiently aware of the content of the proposed candidates and political parties programs, the presentation of which is within the electoral process and implementation mechanisms. In addition, making a choice, a person uses the knowledge and experience that he/she has at the present moment, but an elderly person's process of intensive updating of knowledge and experience ended decades ago, and thus the knowledge lost not only relevance, but also got significantly out of date. It should draw attention to the fact that knowledge is updated each year by 15 % and this process is accelerated [4], so those members of society who are on the outside of ongoing education in any kind of multi-vector manifestation, lose their ability to make informed and effective decisions, which in turn is a threat directly to most individuals with relevant stratification groups and society as a

whole. So, we can ask the question «Can an elderly person be responsible for the descendants of the decisions taken with his/her participation, and whether we can count on mutual responsibility for such decisions?» The answer is not simple, because maybe it goes over the limit of the «mutual», i.e. an elderly person who decides today, eventually will not be present anymore, and hence its responsibility to society loses all the sense. In our opinion, it should initiate discussion about the possibility of (appropriate) limitation the rights of older persons in the political life of society. We do not aim to answer questions on a specific age from which it would be reasonable to limit human involvement in the political process, but at the same time, we want to draw attention to the existence of age limits in which a person acquires the right to such participation. In the context of the content of this fact, our proposal does not appear that transcends social norms. An elderly person deserves respect and sympathy from society but predicting the consequences of policy decisions, and therefore the formation of domestic and foreign policy of the country is the responsibility of those who have the latest knowledge and can make an informed and deliberate choice. Among the expected in scientific-communicative measurements, the thematic focus of which is correlated with the above mentioned issues, we should note the 3rd International Conference «Social Responsibility, Ethics and Sustainable Business» (09.10. 2014–10.10. 2014, Barcelona – Universitate Ramon Llull). We hope that the issues that were raised within the international scientific-practical conference «Spiritual and moral foundations and individual responsibility in the fate of human civilization» (05.11. 2014–06.11. 2014, Kharkiv – National Technical University «Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute») would be reflected not only in the practical activities of public-management activities, but also would gain development and become subject for new areas of research.

**Reference:** 1. Gill V. Welcome and Introduction [electronic resource] / Gill Valentine // International conference on The Future of Social Relations: Rethinking Prejudice and Togetherness in Times of Crisis. – Sheffield: Press of University of Sheffield? 2014. – 82 p. – Mode of access: [http://livedifference.group.shef.ac.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2013/10/Booklet\\_29.05.20141.pdf](http://livedifference.group.shef.ac.uk/wpcontent/uploads/2013/10/Booklet_29.05.20141.pdf). 2. Yuriychuk E.P. Electoral participation of older people as part of the mechanism of legitimation of power in Ukraine / E.P. Yuriychuk // Bulletin of the Central Election Commission. – 2009. – № 1 (15). – P. 81–89. 3. Development in an Ageing World: World Economic and Social Survey [electronic resource] / (auth. Text Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations). – New York [BI], 2008 – 265 p. – Mode of access:

[http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wess/wess\\_archive/2007wess\\_ru.pdf](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/wess/wess_archive/2007wess_ru.pdf). 4. Malitkov E. Tools for human resource development in the modern forms of education [electronic resource] / E. Malitkov // Statement by the Chairman of Interstate Committee of the Commonwealth of Independent States at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg, 30.08.2002). – Mode of access: <http://www.un.org/events/wssd/statements/cisR.htm>.

*Поступной А.Н.  
г. Харьков, Украина*

## **ОТВЕТСТВЕННОСТЬ ОБЩЕСТВОВЕДОВ ЗА СУДЬБУ СТРАНЫ**

Развал Советского Союза произошел легко и быстро, в том числе и потому, что значительную, если не большую часть общества убедили: для того, чтобы жить по-европейски, необходимо всего лишь вернуться к частной собственности, как естественной основе преуспевающего рыночного общества. Причем для достижения европейского уровня жизни понадобится всего лишь несколько лет. И что для многих было особенно приятным – населению пообещали, что ему-то, собственно, и делать особо ничего не нужно. Поскольку с этой задачей справится «невидимая рука рынка», о которой с восторгом и умилением говорили все – юристы и экономисты, эксперты и журналисты, писатели и вообще все те, кто знал, как это устроено «там» и как непременно и уже скоро будет «здесь».

Вспоминая то уже далекое время и свои попытки убедить хотя бы кого-то из поверивших в эту перспективу, что это невозможно, что называется «по определению», не припоминаю, чтобы кто ни будь отказался от таких приятных грез. Не принимали довод о том, что немногочисленной группе стран Юго-Восточной Азии, сумевших совершить такой по сути цивилизационный рывок, понадобилось для этого не менее двух десятков лет. А главное, видимо в еще большей мере отталкивали слова о том, что эти два десятка лет (и это в лучшем случае) – это период невероятного напряжения усилий всего общества по переводу страны на иную модель развития. Желających так долго напрягать свои силы, чтобы лишь после этого вкусить радость победы – не находилось. Хотелось всего и сразу. А главное «На halyavи». После чего говорить о самом механизме такого перехода, достаточно сложного, требующего системных преобразований, говорить уже не имело смысла.

В результате «маємо те, що маємо»: ни через несколько лет, как было обещано, ни уже на двадцать четвертом году движения по избранному пути, Украина этой цели не достигла. Нет у нее такой перспективы и в обозримом будущем. О чем приходится с грустью констатировать, читая программы тех политиков, партий и блоков, которые прошли в