

## KANTIAN UNDERSTANDING OF FREEDOM AND ITS MODERN PROSPECTS

Khanina N. V.

Scientific supervisor: associated prof. Artemenko Ya. I.

National University of Pharmacy, Kharkiv, Ukraine

sasha\_gorina\_97@mail.ru

Comprehension of freedom, on Immanuel Kant, is as contradictory as its essence. Coming from the terms of time, the talking about freedom is complicated, because there always is the preceding state in the sequence of events. Life of society and human existence are processes of endless changes, making realize their initial link is impossible.

However, the freedom named by Kant as "transcendental", so is universally-human, requires from an individual the autonomous effort. It shows up as self-determinism of man designing his own causal row of life. Such a self-determinism appears a self-creation: within the framework of person's behavior, individual relies on a moral law and turns his own freedom into a reason and a motive to the action. It, in turn, transforms an autonomy into self-equality, creates an individual as personality.

Ability to heed to the call of duty and to carry out binding regulations is a beginning of freedom. "Inlightening requires freedom only, ... namely freedom in all cases publicly to use own reason". This relation is logically convertible: freedom to offer your own persuasions publicly is equivalent to Inlightening that is needed for freedom, because it is the guarantor of understanding the essence of independence. Inlightening, on Kant, is the exceptional and individual phenomenon. A philosopher considers that Inlightening includes a sort of obligatory labour, it is a task necessary to implementation.

Freedom in Inlightening is endured, because its basement is a self-overcoming of an empiric individual. Speaking out his ideas and shared his mind publicly, an individual undertakes a social responsibility. The ideas of the talking enlightened human don't carry a new informative value qualitatively. The form of idea, devoid of individuality, converts it into universal form, attainable for all. Then a personal autonomy allows to create social freedom. "*Reason must be free in the public use, and inferior in the private use*". So I. Kant goes across from a question about possibility of freedom to the question about its measure.

In XX century the Kantian understanding of freedom was transformed, specified and deprived of its abstractly-rational ground. In relation to Kantian philosophy as its development, completion and opposing point of view, it is possible to mention existential interpretation of problem offered by Jean-Paul Sartre.

According to Sartre, freedom is a fundamental life principle. Therefore, any conversation about the measure of freedom is helpless: "man is always and wholly free – or is not». A choice, on Sartre, is empirically conditioned. It is an existential decision in a crucial determining situation. As a human experiences such situations certainly, he doesn't have a possibility not to choose. Therefore, a choice can't be substituted by calculation, – a human is "convicted" to be autonomous, and his freedom is absurd: circumstances determine sense of our actions, but do not give us any explanations.

While for Kant ambivalence of freedom is determined by the relation of free willing and duty, Sartre formulates the "paradox of freedom" in a new way. Freedom exists only in a situation, and a situation exists only through person's freedom. Every attempt to repeat a successful situation decision conduces to the loss of freedom because of automatism of action. Moreover, Sartre considers, every new choice is a choice "from the ground up", eliding all the preceding experience. A Kantian choice is similarly begun with a "zero" empiric mark. However, for the German classic, emancipation from empiric motivation does not deny the presence of more steady basis for the act - rationally substantiated morality. On Sartre's opinion, while we do not act, we do not know, what we actually are. Only behavior tells a human about his veritable internals. The "real freedom begins on the other side of despair", i.e., far from the verge of understanding.

A human in the choice inevitably runs into a social call. «Not what was made out of me is important but what I made out of what was made out of me». A human making his/her choice is lonely and isolated in the situation of taking decision; every situation is unique similarly as well as a decision. «A man is created by a climate and soil, race and class, language, history of collective part of that he makes, heredity, individual circumstances of the childhood, purchased habits and large and small events of his life», - all the enumerated is taken into account in a role of obstacles or "terminators" of freedom. Moreover: the obstacles as they are make our freedom obvious. To be free does not involve getting everything you want. It is rather an ability to possess exactly what is desirable: here a human "comes from himself". So it is possible to deduce the only philosophical definition of freedom as an autonomy of choice.