

# Responsible Development and Durable Development

## Rozwój odpowiedzialny i rozwój trwały

**Wiesław Sztumski**

*Silesian University, Katowice, Poland  
E-mail: ws34@op.pl*

---

### Abstract

In this article, it analyzes two contemporary models of social and economic development – responsible development and sustainable development. Reflections on responsibility in the present social and economic context precede reflections about the essence of the model of the responsible development. For various reasons irresponsibility increasingly prevails over responsibility, and responsibility becomes anonymous and fictitious. Thus, the tendency to behave and to act with impunity grows. One of the forms of responsible development is the so-called smart growth. Above all, people appropriately educated and wise should realize it. Unfortunately, the number of stupid people in the world constantly increases. The model of sustainable development raises doubts from the beginning. Almost all people criticize this model or refer to it in disbelief. Only optimists see it as the only chance for the survival of humanity. The choice between responsible and sustainable development is difficult, because each one is faulty. It would be good to create one model from these two models in a form of their synthesis. Certainly, that is a difficult challenge, but doable.

**Keywords:** responsible development, durable development, sustainable development, responsibility, durability, balance, asymmetry.

### Streszczenie

W artykule analizuje się dwa współczesne modele rozwoju społecznego i gospodarczego – rozwoju odpowiedzialnego i rozwoju trwałego. Rozważania o istocie modelu rozwoju odpowiedzialnego poprzedzone są refleksjami nad odpowiedzialnością w teraźniejszym kontekście społecznym i ekonomicznym. Z różnych przyczyn subiektywnych i obiektywnych nieodpowiedzialność coraz bardziej przeważa nad odpowiedzialnością, a odpowiedzialność staje się anonimowa i fikcyjna. Dlatego rośnie tendencja do zachowania się i działania bezkarnego. Jedną z form rozwoju odpowiedzialnego jest tzw. wzrost inteligentny. Przede wszystkim powinni go realizować ludzie odpowiednio wykształceni i mądrzy. Niestety, w świecie jest coraz więcej głupich. Model rozwoju trwałego budzi wątpliwości od początku. Prawie wszyscy krytykują go lub odnoszą się do niego z niedowierzaniem. Tylko optymiści widzą w nim jedyną szansę na przetrwanie ludzkości. Wybór między rozwojem odpowiedzialnym a trwałym jest trudny, ponieważ każdy z nich jest wadliwy. Być może, dobrze byłoby z tych dwóch modeli stworzyć jeden w postaci ich syntezy. Z pewnością jest to wyzwanie trudne, ale wykonalne.

**Słowa kluczowe:** rozwój odpowiedzialny, rozwój trwały, rozwój zrównoważony, odpowiedzialność, trwałość, równowaga, asymetria

---

### 1. Responsible development

#### 1.1. The matter of responsibility

Responsibility comes from the willingness to bear the consequences for what we do, especially for all harmful decisions, actions and negligence. The consciousness of the prohibitions and orders that rule in

a concrete place and time determines the sense of responsibility. Responsibility closely links to the dutifulness that is a prerequisite for it. In principle, irresponsibility, like non-fulfilling the obligation, entails moral, legal, political or other unpleasantness. However, most often the responsibility has a moral or legal dimension. The consequences of violation of

the legal norms, ethical standards, and religious orders ruling in the given society are penalties, remorse, penance, condemnation, ostracism, and loss of trust. Violation of law or regulation entails a mandate, a court order or an admonition. Unfortunately, more and more people are irresponsible despite the awareness of painful consequences. There are subjective causes for the increase in the number of irresponsible people. Firstly, because responsibility limits their freedom. Secondly, they live in liberal systems that guarantee the greatest freedom to individuals. However, in fact, this freedom is strongly limited; so, it is rather freedom declared than true. There are also objective reasons, inherent to the nature of neo-liberal democracy.

Until recently, people have been responsible for what has already happened to their fault, i.e. for actual and real effects. Now, they are more and more responsible for what may happen, i.e. for possible or hypothetical effects. Thus, beside the real responsibility, it is yet a potential responsibility. For some reasons it is good when people are responsible for what can happen with their fault in the distant future. However, such *forward-looking* responsibility makes sense only when it is possible to predict effects with a high degree of probability in the available time horizon. Nevertheless, in today's world where statistical laws, chaos, cases and bifurcations play an increasingly greater role, an accurate forecasting is impossible, even for the immediate future. Where it is highly developed democracy and cooperation, more and more people are involved in specific activities and in decision-making processes. As a result, the effects of people decisions and their activity are increasingly due by collective work and their authors are unknown. Therefore, the individual and concrete responsibility disappears progressively. Together with this, collective and anonymous responsibility increases. The more people make decisions, the more abstract and indirect responsibility replaces the concrete and immediate responsibility. And when it is unknown who specifically and really is responsible for something – so it is in the case of a *collective offender*, i.e. a collective, anonymous and abstract entity – then it is spreading irresponsibility and even impunity. The more people are co-responsible for something, the more their responsibility becomes fictitious and empty. Finally, this leads to the fact that no one is responsible for nothing, because everyone is responsible for everything. More and more often, people want to be free from their responsibility, guilt and punishment. They transfer their own guilt and responsibility to different things. Therefore, the subjective, i.e. human and personal responsibility transforms progressively in the objective responsibility. Things, of course, are not guilty and cannot bear any consequences. For example, it is said that the bad state of the protective devices (flood embankments, dams etc.) is responsible for the flood. However, in fact, they are the people,

who have wrongly built them and have not supervised them. Or another example: roadside trees are responsible for traffic accidents, and not the drivers which are badly trained or mindless. This is why one cuts out them massively, although it does not affect the number of accidents.

In our day, concrete responsibility transforms in abstract, individual in collective, real in illusory, and direct in indirect. Thus, responsibility transforms even in the impunity and the concept of responsibility progressively loses its meaning.

Together with this, irresponsibility becomes more and more a mass phenomenon. People are already used to it and they relate indifferent to it and generally, tolerate irresponsibility. They do not tolerate only irresponsibility at representatives of power, protected by various immunities that allow them to make decisions that harm society and to experiment on living organisms – institutions, organizations and people, which damage them. The higher is a position by someone in the hierarchy of power or management, the more his responsibility is anonymous, empty and unpunished (Sztumski 2012).

Awareness of impunity among people at high levels of society management allows them to make thoughtless and irresponsible decisions that often harm the common good and are risky. The rulers do not want to be responsible towards people. They prefer to be responsible towards the *God and History*, claiming that this is a higher degree of responsibility. Indeed, it is illusory responsibility and a fiction of responsibility, because it refers towards a fictional or abstract being. However, this aims at calming the conscience of rulers or to ordinarily cheating people. Only an individual acting in his own strictly local environment is personally, explicitly, directly and concrete responsible. However, such personal and limited in time and space responsibility is of no importance to the functioning of society as a whole, and especially – in the border case – of the world society.

### 1.2. The essence of responsible development

Responsible development means working to meet the growing needs of people, taking into account environmental, social, economic, health and safety factors when making decisions. Responsible development:

- Is consistent with the overall goals of the community.
- Satisfies economic, cultural and educational needs.
- Sets priorities for the development of services and products that are not currently available, and not for existing ones.
- Provides employment for as many people as possible and provides them with decent pay, which allows the worker and his family to meet essential living needs.
- Saves as much as possible fossil fuels, energy and water.

One of the forms of responsible development is the *smart growth*. For now, it applies in some areas of social life, for example in urban development and economy. In the first case, it is about such urban planning so as to give city residents the best possible conditions of recreation, transport, logistics of the administrative and service centers, health and so on. In the second case it is about economic development realized through progress of innovation and knowledge. In place of the former sentence *Money makes the world go round* now appeared another – *Knowledge makes the world go round* (Freund, 2017). Knowledge is the only natural resource, which not diminish, when it is consumed, but it grows. Probably, *smart growth* will soon spread rapidly to other spheres. Maybe, one day it will be fashionable such a sentence: *Wisdom makes the world go round*. Unfortunately, there is little hope for this, because it rapidly progresses the stupidity of the masses. C. M. Cippola (1987) stated based on research that in every community there are as many stupid people – on average 80%. Now, it is ca 5,6 billion stupid people in the world, an only ca 2,0 billion wise people. However, with the civilization progress, the proportion of stupid people to wise people will yet increase (Connor, 2012).

The necessary, but insufficient condition for the responsible development and *smart growth* is the maximal rationalization of economics and management. Therefore, since some time, the economics is mathematized rapidly. This make possible determining the parameters which describe the state of the economic systems, the creating mathematical models of the economy, the controlling economic processes, and the minimizing production costs through more accurate calculation of profits and losses.

Rationalization of the economy contributes to its improvement. It means the use of methods, techniques and means that provide the most favorable economic results (among other things, the biggest gains) through the minimal use of capital, work time, energy and raw materials. Rationalization of the economy has led to some paradox: it rationalizes the economy for maximizing profit, and simultaneously it irrationalizes intentionally the attitudes and behaviors of consumers. This paradox reflects one of many characteristic contradictions of nowadays economics. It is also a paradox typical by forming a knowledge society. Unfortunately, despite the increasing enrollment and the number of people with higher education, irrationalism still prevails over rationalism, and stupidity prevails over wisdom. (This is another example of social asymmetry). However, let us imagine that someday the tendency towards rationalization will prevail over the tendency to irrationalization, and that the economy as well as other spheres of life will fully rationalized. This could happen because of widespread robotization and of the maximal use of artificial intelligence. Many people, like Stanislaw Lem, Stephen Hawking, Bill Gates,

John McCarthy and Elon Musk warn of the potential risks connected with artificial intelligence. They claim, it is not only about reduction the demand for human labor (robots will work instead of people) and associated negative social effects; this is even a threat to human civilization and to the existence of the human species. Firstly, this can happen when, the artificial intelligence will be so developed that it will replace all functions of the human brain. For now, the problem is the expansion of artificial memory (it must match the memory of the natural brain) and miniaturization of the artificial brain (Rózanowski, 2007).

Secondly, when artificial intelligence will become a *Superintelligence*, much superior to human intelligence (Bostrom, 2014). This seems unlikely today, and if, so in the very distant future and – as the optimists say – we do not worry about it. However, this can happen in a shorter time, because on the one hand, the development of artificial intelligence occurs rapidly, and on the other hand, intelligence of the human population is decreases rapidly, perhaps, proportionally to the development of artificial intelligence. However, this can happen in a shorter time, because on the one hand, the development of artificial intelligence occurs rapidly, and on the other hand, intelligence of the human population is decreases rapidly, perhaps, proportionally to the development of artificial intelligence. However, already nowadays, artificial intelligence can turn out to be dangerous if it gets in the hands of cybercriminals, irresponsible people or madmen. The greatest threat to people is the progressive cyborgization that tends to the emergence *people 2.0*, when artificial intelligence will reach the level of the natural intelligence, and to the *people 3.0*, when in the age of the *Internet of Things* the human will become superfluous at all (Kurzweil, 2014).

Cyborgization progresses gradually, but noticeable, and it aims to decerebration of people, to the disappearing their creativity and critical sense, as well as to reduction their sensitivity and emotional sphere (Sowa, 2015). In this way, there will be less man in man. As it results from the foregoing considerations, full rationalization is not at all as good as it might seem.

## 2. Durable development

### 2.1. Remarks on durability

For a long time people are interested in durability, but not so as from the early seventies of the last century. Then the issue of durability became important from the point of view of ecological balance and it engages people on a mass scale. The word *durable* contains long-term action, many years' effects, stabilization, longevity, balance, and ability to create conditions favorable to something. Thanks to environmentalists, durability refers to social development (economic, civilization etc.) and it means balancing,

harmony as well as self-sustaining. Often, one uses the word *durable* as a substitute for *sustainable development*. Some authors state that this word functions in social communication like the German *Gummwort*, i.e. an *elastic word* with innumerable meanings (Wullenweber, 2000). Since 2009, *sustainable* also means what *satisfies grandchildren*, e.i. what the Germans call *enkelgerecht*<sup>1</sup>. The word *sustainable* has become a fashionable instrument for evaluating human activities in many areas of social life. Now, if someone does something, he ought to do this having in mind the chance of survival not only the present generation but also many future generations, and so he should act with thought about balance, harmony and long-term consequences. The object of concern of people, and above all specialists in various fields, is sustaining social systems, processes, and phenomena in equilibrium, i.e. in stable states. It adds the words *equilibrium* and *balanced* to the names of many existing social phenomena, and one wants to balance all new phenomena, often in a forced way and senselessly. Now, everything has to be balanced: transport, gardening, eating, clothing, leisure, teaching, studying, fun and so on.

Social systems differ from physical ones, but they have much common features. Therefore, in deliberations about the balance of social systems one uses increasing the knowledge about equilibrium in physics. Physicists distinguish two types of equilibrium – static and dynamic. Static equilibrium is when the resultant of all forces acting on the body equals zero. Then – according to the first principle of dynamics – the body remains at rest or it moves monotone in a straight line, and equilibrium means a physical state of the body. Dynamic equilibrium is when the body deviates from its initial position, oscillates around it, and then returns to it after some time. Then, equilibrium means a physical process.

Sustainable development is about maintaining social system in a state of durable and dynamic equilibrium, understood as a social process. It became widespread belief, that balance and harmony are beneficial for human life and social development. Unfortunately, this is another myth that functions in social masses. Another myth is the view that total elimination of stress from human life is something best for him, or that the creation of a classless society (as in communism) or homogeneous (as a result of globalization) by the elimination of contradictions and social inequalities ensures happiness to people and is the most favorable for the development of humanity. It does not take into account that the equilibrium of a social system can be good or bad, useful or harmful. That depends on the social, historical and spatial context, on the aims and interests of the people, and on the choice of the criterion of good, which is usually arbitrary and relative. For example, the balance

between good and evil is bad, because good should always prevail over evil.

Social pressure to maintain equilibrium, which appeared recently in Western civilization, has its source in the European cultural heritage. Initially, in the antiquity, in beliefs and philosophies of Greece and Rome. Later in Christian culture as well as in the classical natural sciences. Up to the twentieth century, Aristotle's thought dominated European philosophy, Christian theology, classical (bivalent) logic and Newtonian classical mechanics, even relativistic. It is characteristic for thinking derived from European tradition the supposition that opposites should be in balance. Therefore it postulates that it ought to exist some *golden mean* between them in the form of equilibrium. (This is contained in the dialectical principle of *unity of opposites* formulated by Hegel and Marx.) From here, it comes the desire, to balance social systems, human activity and psyche as well as to search a *golden mean* treated as some panacea.

Since centuries, people were convinced about the equilibrium and durability of natural and social systems. This myth has been preserved in the memory of many successive generations thanks to cultural heritage. Today it is difficult to fight with it, despite the fact that modern science, philosophy and life experience confirm its anachronism and groundlessness. Similarly, over the centuries, people believed in the symmetry in the world, also anachronistic and false from the point of view of present knowledge. Despite this, the principle of symmetry governs still for example in physics, where different important principles, such as the conservation of energy, of momentum, of angular momentum and so on, result from it. The principle of symmetry is a useful tool for idealizing the sensory world. With this principle, one can describe physical phenomena in a simple and easy way by the mathematical equations, especially in macroscopic physics (Asymmetric phenomena one described by inequalities. At least in the mass opinion, algebraic operations on inequalities are more complex and difficult than on equations). It is difficult to decide whether these two suppositions about balance and of symmetry, functioning as stereotypes in the thinking about the world and in descriptions, came from aesthetic preference, or the criterion of aesthetics comes from the knowledge of the world. For example, symmetry and balance, which are signs of beauty, are still criteria of value of physical formulas. About their correctness, testify among other things the appearance and the simplicity.

Now, we form a new image of our world. This world has changed firstly, because of natural and social evolution and secondly, because we have continuously a new knowledge and life experience. The

<sup>1</sup> See: *Nachhaltige Landwirtschaft: Staatssekretär Rabius sieht Schleswig Holstein auf Gutem Weg*, in:

'Hallo Hollstein', *Nachrichten und Themen von der Ostseeküste*, 29. Oktober 2010.

world changes radically since about fifty years very fast, one can said suddenly, if one compare this period with the age of our planet, estimated at about 4.55 billion years (Pieńkowski, 1998). These changes are at most because of human activities, which is more spontaneous and thoughtless than purposeful and reasonable. Mainly, due to human interference in homeostatic mechanisms that allow nature and social systems to return to equilibrium and to ensure durability. The spoiling of these mechanisms in consequence of irresponsible and thoughtless manipulation produces imbalance, resulting in numerous perturbations, particularly the destruction of order, instability and disorder of symmetry. I treat the destruction of the tendency to equilibrium in the natural and social systems on a wide scale as the turning point in the history of the world and humanity. Above all, asymmetry and imbalance reign in today's world. Previously they were perceived badly. Currently, one rates them positively and even especially exposes them. In connection with this, the aesthetic criterion has changed. Since some time, it promotes what is unsymmetrical and unbalanced as something beautiful. Asymmetry and instability define the style in fashion, art and architecture of our time. Probably, also in the future they will determine the good taste. However, the stereotype of balance functions still as if in spite of this and one maintains it in many spheres of social life. Especially, when people use it to the principle of justice. For example, in law, there is a question of the balance between guilt and punishment. Punishment should be strictly adequate to guilt, that is, it should balance the guilt. If this is not the case, then one judges such sentence as unjust. In economics, this applies to various balances, in particular between labor and wages, supply and demand, incomes and expenses, etc. The balance, i.e. some form of the equilibrium, is the most important problem in economic evaluations. However, the balance in economy is ideal states, not real. Wage must be less than the work of employee, because this guarantees a profit to employers. In a normal economy, supply must be greater than demand, because this contributes to the prosperity. In fact, the balance can be applicable only in accounting. It does not apply to the sensory world, but only to its mathematical description. In the real world nothing is in balance, as if that should result from the third principle of dynamics, which in a very simplified popular version states: *Action equals reaction*. In pedagogy, the students' assessment has to reflect accurately their knowledge, i.e. the amount of information, which they have. However, such a fair evaluation almost never exists, because it is not guarantee, even when one uses objective tests, because of the subjective factors. About such understood justice, one can dream at most. The reality is quite different: everywhere they are various degrees of injustice, inequality and unbalance.

Durability is important in our everyday life. On the one hand, we demand it, because we want to ensure our long-time existence in the memory of posterity. We live so long, until other people remember us. So, the worst curse of the Jews is, *Let no one remember you!* For this reason, one builds stable gravestones, *eternal* tombs, bronze monuments and pyramids. On the other hand, for austerity reasons, we want that our everyday items are durable as possible, that they do not spoil as long as possible. That is why we build durable buildings and create *indestructible* materials.

On the ground of our negative life experience, we fear changes, because they are often *changes for the worse*. Therefore, we want to preserve *status quo* of our life conditions and life milieu. Thus, we are conservatives to some degree. Conservatism and durability lie in human nature. However, one can ask whether our concern for durability, balance and symmetry are justified and meaningful. There are different opinions on this subject and different answers. Due to our ego, survival in various forms of memory is justified, reasonable and meaningful. It gives us a sense of satisfaction from our own life and ourselves. In addition, it contributes to the common good, because it promotes good deeds and enriches the cultural heritage. On the other hand, it raises doubts for other reasons. For example, it has not sense from the point of view of economic development, as it does not accelerate the economy. The driving force of economic progress is the rotation of products (goods) and money. The faster circulate goods and money in the markets, the higher is the profit. Moreover, profit motivates people for rational management, better economic activity, innovation, higher productivity, saving, etc. However, it does not have to affect the prosperity of individuals and their well-being. On the contrary, the effect economic growth is the progressive impoverishment of social masses and the growing disproportion between the masses of the poor and the castes of the rich. This evokes frustration and revolutionary sentiments that are negative social phenomena. But in economics, especially macroscopic and global, people do not count, at least for as long as they do not organize themselves in a political power that could change political system and the course of history. From the standpoint of the social masses, the economic growth, no matter how it is (slow, durable, balanced, sustainable or accelerated), is senseless, because in fact, it does not turn good for them. Symmetry in the economy, expressed in the form of balance, is also not useful, because it means stagnation. The saturation of the market with durable products, which can work in *infinitely long* time, is only apparently beneficial to people. Really, it causes a decline in production or at best its stagnation with all the negative consequences: liquidation of factories, increase of unemployment, slower trade dynamics, decreases the number of transactions and finally – economic crisis.

So, durability or slowdown of the dynamics of the economy are not conducive to economic and social development. Control of economic growth in consequence of its slowdown and its restriction to ecological and rationally justified needs (which are increasing anyway), while at the same time providing people with good economic conditions resembles the squiring of the circle. This is practically an unsolvable task, at least on ground of contemporary theory and philosophy of economics. Durable development limits creativity and innovation, because it allows them to develop only to such an extent that they do not disturb stability, that is, the stable balance. What is durable must be stable.

## 2.2. The question of durable development

It is impossible to define *durable development* in a simple way because there is no fully and accurately definition. One defines it by the sum of numerous partial definitions, which take into account various elements and aspects. Some of these elements and aspects repeat themselves and therefore one can consider them as particularly characteristic of sustainable development. In this way, it created such definition: *Durable development is such, which vouches for this, that future generations will satisfy their needs no worse, than generation that lives now* (Hauff, 1987). Hence, durable development is oriented both to the present and to the future. Herman Daly (former economist at the Department of the Environment at the World Bank) studied the most important elements of sustainable development and came to the following conclusions:

- The rate of degradation of renewable resources cannot exceed the rate of their regeneration.
- The emission level cannot be higher than the assimilation capacity.
- Consumption of non-renewable resources has to be compensated by the appropriate increase in stocks of renewable raw materials (Hardtke, Prehn, 2001).

There are different definitions of durable development depending on what aspect of this development is the subject of research of some scientific discipline. For example, according to the economic definition, *durable development means such development, which does not generate profits that flow then to the environmental and social projects, but such development, which manages profits that are already accepted for social and environmental reasons* (Pufé, 2014). In general, the system develops durably, if it is able to survive and to exist in a long time (Carnau, 2011). The expression *durable development* is synonymous with the terms *sustainable development*, *eco-development*, *sustainability* and

self-sustaining development. The purpose of this development is to maintain the quality of human life milieu, i.e. geobiosphere and anthroposphere, in an unchanging state despite significant human intervention. This pious goal is practically unattainable, because people live always at the cost of their environment and therefore, in spite of best wishes, they exploit and degrade them and deplete resources. Otherwise it cannot be. Really, the issue is that the interference of people in the environment should deteriorate its quality in less and less extent. This allows asymptotically target this end goal. The essence of the concept of durable development is that current generation should exploit its life milieu to such an extent that this will not deprive the possibility of survive future generations, even in the distant horizon of time. An illusion is the assurance to the next generations the same living conditions and opportunities for further development, which has present generation. It is impossible in the sensory world. Each successive generation lives in other conditions, rather worse than previous ones, and it must deal as it can. The will of survival forces each generation to make discoveries and inventions, innovations and advances in knowledge and technology, to adapt to other living conditions in the new environment.

The idea of durable development and of its realization has already own history. For a long time, many specialists have been dealing with this and there are many publications on this subject. Some authors present the pessimistic position. They treat the idea of sustainable development as something fantastic because one cannot realize them in the modern world, that is full of contradictory interests, diverse ideologies, and religions, and where is insufficiently developed concern for the common good in the historical and future dimensions. The others are the optimists. They see in the durable development the only way to survive the human race and they hope on its realization. Yet others present positions between pessimism and optimism and they refer really and critically to the concept of sustainable development.<sup>2</sup> They treat it as one possible escape from the ecological impasse of our time, perhaps not the best, or they treat it as some mythology generated by neo-liberalism or as a manifestation of opposition to consumerism (Sztumski, 2009). In durable development, it is important firstly, to not to live on credit taken at the expense of children, grandchildren and future generations, and secondly, to limit excessive consumption and not to consume the future already *now and here*. This is the biggest trouble for any current generation. In durable development, it ought to care for the natural environment, for economically managing its vital components such as water, energy, fossil row

<sup>2</sup> For example, Antony Path, a professor of climatology at the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, Zurich, argues that from the beginning one negates the sense of the idea

of such a development on the ground of neoclassical and evolutionary economics (see: Patt, 2013).

materials, etc., and to avoid pollution of air and water by soil toxins and radiation. All attention should focus on the protection the natural environment against thoughtless destruction and wasteful exploitation. Because the ideology of consumerism has transformed a frugal man (accustomed for centuries to saving) into a waste man, who is not able to consume what he buys and throws this into trash (Sztumski, 2013, 2015). It ignores or marginalizes the protection of the social environment that is equally important to people as natural environment. The social environment also degrades more and faster than the natural environment. The present generation still lives to a large extent on the cost of resources in both environments. It lives at the expense of future generations, because it takes loans under the pledge of future production growth. However, it is unknown whether next generations will be more productive than the present. That is uncertain because it is impossible to foresee precisely technical progress and economic prosperity. Public debt in the modern world grows continuously and rapidly. Today, each country is indebted. Even countries called *highly-developed* are indebted to their ears. For example, the United States public debt at the beginning of 2016 exceeded \$ 19 trillion, German debt it estimates at \$ 4.713 trillion, and Poland debt is \$ 286 trillion.<sup>3</sup> It is difficult to calculate how many generations will have to pay these debts. The indebting in the world grows rapidly and no one is worried because it is always possible to print empty money or debentures without real coverage. Nobody knows what could be effect of such spiral of indebting. Probably, this leads to nothing good – either to the next World War or to a global revolution that will change the current socio-economic system, which is already widely criticized.

Durable development should guarantee a balance between generations. It should assure a balance between ideas, thoughts, ethical values, moral norms and social orders recognized by older generations and those, which create new generations. This ensures the continuity of cultural tradition. Nevertheless, this balance is violated. Current generations live at the cost of the next generations. This cost has not only financial dimension but also a social dimension. One form of the social costs is the credit of trust between the generations. On the one hand, every future generation trusts a passing generation. For example, a child trusts parents because he is convinced that they will provide care, they will allow him to survive, and they will create the best conditions for survival and provide him the appropriate means, tools and skills. Currently, however, this credit for the passing generation is seriously

undermined. The young generation is becoming increasingly aware of the bad state of life milieu and life conditions that he inherited from the older generation. This is not about the ecological degradation but also about social and cultural degradation in broad sense. This credit is without coverage. On the other hand, the passing generation trusts the coming generation, that it will continue the old traditions, teachings, ideas, customs, ethical values, religions, etc. Durable development should preserve not only genetic but also the functional identity of social systems in the history of humankind. It manifests in this some conservatism. Older generations shape the world based on their system of values and their criterion of goodness. They are convinced that this new world will appeal to the new generation, which will also find it good. Now, nevertheless, new generations change the values, their hierarchy and the criteria of the goodness and even completely ethical systems much faster and more radical than before. This causes the reduction of the credit of trust to coming generation, of the trust in the preservation of tradition.

The question of maintaining a balance between continuity and discontinuity of social development is important because its violation leads to the collapse of the social order in general, and especially in the aspect of social ecology.

There is no continuity of the image or the model of human. Instead of people, which interact with nature, as before, there are exploiters of nature. Instead of people collaborating with others for survival and for the common good, there are individuals and exploiters of other people. Instead of empathetic people, there are egoists, which care above all for their own benefits and interests. It changes also the image of the society. Instead of elimination of social inequalities, there are growing social differentiations. Instead of striving for common global goals, in particular to the survival of humankind, there is the divergence of individual, local, corporate, etc goals. Instead of gradually eliminating national and state identities, what is natural consequence of globalization, one strengthens them. Instead of eliminating the borders between the states, one puts fences, walls and barbed wires. Instead of system of values, there is the system of anti-values. Instead of culture, there is anti-culture. Therefore, various kinds of asymmetries arise and they accumulate in the modern world and thus, the imbalance and impermanence grow. Development becomes unstable, if proportionally to the progress of capitalism the asymmetrical relations between people and nature and between humans in the social systems (in families, groups, workplaces, organizations, nations etc.) increase. With the increase of

<sup>3</sup> According to the Ministry of Finance, the indebting of Poland at the end of December 2015 was \$ 301.62 trillion

(that is ca \$ 8.1 thousand per capita) and it grew at a pace of about \$ 810 per second.

asymmetric interpersonal relations, the social contradictions appear, intensify and exacerbate. Asymmetry and contradiction form a positive feedback system: the increase of asymmetry implies the deepening of the contradiction and vice versa.

### Conclusion

In today's world, two concepts of social and economic development – responsible development and durable development – and two corresponding development models compete. Everyone has some advantages and disadvantages. It is difficult to evaluate which one is more useful if one applies different criteria. The implementation of just one of these models does not bode good effects. Therefore, it would be best to combine them into one model that would not be their sum but a synthesis. It is easy to think, but much more difficult to achieve. This does not mean, however, that this is a challenge that is impossible to realize. Its implementation requires only the greater efforts of theoreticians and practitioners in various fields and good will of the ruling elites.

When one creates a model of development, it is best not to be guided by rationality, ideology, and politics or some specialist knowledge, but by common sense and general knowledge. Moreover, generally speaking, in shaping future development models, it should count above all as far as possible with the welfare of individuals, local communities and all humanity, and with the interests of present and future generations.

### References

1. BOSTROM N., 2014, *Superintelligence: Path, Dangers, Strategies*, Oxford Univ. Press.
2. CARNAU P., 2011, *Nachhaltigkeitsethik – Normativer Gestaltungsansatz für eine global zukunftsfähige Entwicklung in Theorie und Praxis*, Rainer Hampe Verlag, München, p. 14.
3. CIPPOLA C. M., 1987, The Basic Laws Of Human Stupidity, in: *Whole Earth Review*, Spring.
4. CONNOR S., 2012, Human intelligence peaked thousands of years ago and we've been on an intellectual and emotional decline, in: *The Independent*, 12.11.2012.
5. FREUND R., 2017, Das Kapital in den Köpfen, in: working@office 04, p. 32-33.
6. HARDTKE A., PREHN M., 2001, *Perspektiven der Nachhaltigkeit – Vom Leitbild zur Erfolgsstrategie*, Gabler, Wiesbaden.
7. HAUFF V., 1987, *Unsere gemeinsame Zukunft – Der Brundtland-Bericht der Weltkommission für Umwelt und Entwicklung*, Eggenkamp, Greven.
8. KURZWEIL R., 2014, *Menschheit 2.0: Die Singularität naht*, Lola Books, Berlin.
9. Nachhaltige Landwirtschaft: Staatssekretär Rabius sieht Schleswig Holstein auf Gutem Weg, in: *Hallo 'Hollstein', Nachrichten und Themen von der Ostseeküste*, 29. Oktober 2010.
10. 10. PATT A., 2013, Der Sinn der Nachhaltigkeit, in: *ETH Sustainability Blog*, October.
11. 11. PIENKOWSKI A., 1998, Wiek Ziemi, in: *Wiedza i Życie*, No 4.
12. 112. PUFE I., 2014, *Was ist Nachhaltigkeit? Dimensionen und Chancen*, in: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung. Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte – Nachhaltigkeit, 64, p. 6.
13. 13. RÓŻANOWSKI K., 2007, Sztuczna inteligencja: Rozwój, szanse i zagrożenia, in: *Zeszyty Naukowe Wyższej Szkoły Informatyki w Warszawie*, z. 2.
14. 114. SOWA A., 2015, *Menschheit 3.0. Internet der Dinge. Oder: die Welt ohne Menschheit*, 06.06.2015, <https://wszystkoconajwazniejsze.pl/aleksandra-sowa-menschheit-3-0-internet-der-dinge-oder-die-welt-ohne-menschen> (06.06.2017).
15. 15. SZTUMSKI W., 2009, The Mythology of Sustainable Development, in: *Problemy Ekorozwoju/ Problems of Sustainable Development*, Vol. 4, No 2.
16. 16. SZTUMSKI W., 2012, Erozja odpowiedzialności, in: *Sprawy Nauki*, No. 2.
17. 17. SZTUMSKI W., 2013, Od homo rationalis do homo prodigus, in: *Sprawy Nauki*.
18. 18. SZTUMSKI W., 2015, Marnotrawstwo intelektualne, in: *Sprawy Nauki*, No 8-9.
19. 119. WULLEWEBER K., 2000, Was die Sprache über Nachhaltigkeit verrät, in: *Politische Ökologie*, No 63/64, Januar, p. 23.