

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58423/2786-6742/2022-1-93-100>
UDC 316.4.06

Marian AMBROZY

Assoc. prof. PhD. MBA

College of International Business ISM Slovakia in Prešov

SELECTED ECONOMIC AND ETHICAL ASPECTS OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC

Анотація: У дослідженні основну увагу приділено окремим етичним аспектам пандемії COVID-19. За свою історію людство пережило значну кількість пандемій різного типу. В останні століття зокрема це були: холера, іспанський грип, ГРВІ. Але протягом останніх двох років з'явилася нове, досі невідоме захворювання - COVID-19. Першопричина появи коронавірусу, що викликає Covid-19, не відома дотепер. Деякі стверджують, що захворювання виникло у людей після того, як вперше виникло у тварин. Інші вважають, що це вірус штучного походження. У 2019 році його вперше виявили в Китаї. Однак китайська епідеміологічна проблема до кінця зими 2020 року поширилася майже по всьому світу і набула масштабів глобальної пандемії. Можливо пандемія торкнулася і ізольованих острівних держав або деяких держав з авторитарним режимом, які закрили свої кордони. До кінця січня 2022 року ця пандемія забрала життя понад 5 з половиною мільйонів людей на планеті. Враховуючи ситуацію, якої не було у світі протягом багатьох десятиліть, вона означала більше, ніж просто множинну трагедію та значний економічний спад, а її необхідність етичного та економічного відображення багатьох поширених практик, які донині вважаються незмінними. Дослідження проблеми здійснено крізь призму соціальної філософії. В основному існують три підходи: а) негативне (ліберальне) сприйняття свободи, б) позитивне сприйняття свободи (Спіноза, Гегель та ін.), в) свобода як гра. Кожна з цих моделей свободи має своє бачення застосування діалектики свободи та відповідальності. Поєднання свободи та відповідальності є ключовим у ситуації, яка склалася. Уважаємо, що для виконання необхідних умов з метою запровадження відносно жорстких контрзаходів необхідно враховувати багато обставин.

Ключові слова: COVID-19, свобода, гра, права, охорона здоров'я.

JEL Classification: I12, I18.

Absztrakt. Tanulmányomban a Covid-19 világvárvány kiválasztott etikai aspektusaira összpontosítok. Az emberiség történelme során számos különböző típusú világvárványt élt át. Az elmúlt évszázadokban ez volt a kolera, a spanyol nátha, a SARS. Az elmúlt két évben egy új, eddig ismeretlen betegséget fedezett fel – a Covid-19-betegséget. Eredete nem teljesen ismert. Egyesek azt állítják, hogy a betegség az állatoknál fordult elő először. Mások szerint ez egy mesterséges eredetű vírus. 2019-ben észlelték először Kínában. Eredetileg azonban a kínai járványügyi probléma majdnem 2020 telének végére terjedt az egész világon, és globális világvárvány mértékére nőtt. Lehetséges, hogy a világvárvány érintett szigetországokat, vagy néhány autoriter rezsimű államot, amelyek lezárták határaikat. 2022. január végére ez a járvány több mint 5 és fél millió ember halálát okozta a bolygón. A világban hosszú évtizedek óta nem létező helyzet nem csupán többszörös tragédiát és jelentős gazdasági visszaesést jelentett, hanem etikailag és gazdaságilag is tükrözi azt a sok bevett gyakorlatot, amelyet napjainkig változatlanok tartanak. A problémát a társadalomfilozófia prizmáján keresztül nézzük. Alapvetően három megközelítés létezik: a) negatív (liberális) szabadságfelfogás, b) pozitív szabadságfelfogás (Spinoza, Hegel stb.), c) a szabadság mint játék. A szabadság ezen modelljei mindegyikének megvan a maga víziója a szabadság és a felelősség dialektikájának alkalmazásában. A szabadság és a felelősség kombinációja kulcsfontosságú a jelenlegi helyzetben. Úgy gondoljuk, hogy számos körülményt kell figyelembe venni ahhoz, hogy a viszonylag szigorú ellenintézkedések bevezetéséhez szükséges feltételek teljesüljenek.

Kulcsszavak: COVID-19, szabadság, játék, jogok, egészségvédelem.

Abstract. *In my study, I focus on selected ethical aspect of the covid-19 pandemic. Mankind has experienced considerable a number of pandemics of various types in its history. In recent centuries, it has been cholera, spanish influenza, SARS. Over the last two years, she discovered a new, hitherto unknown disease. Covid-19 disease has occurred. Its origin is not complete known. Some claim, that the disease occurred in humans after first occurred in animals. Others believe it is a virus of artificial origin. He was detected for the first time in 2019 in China. Originally however, the Chinese epidemiological problem spread to almost the end of winter 2020 around the world and has grown to the scale of a global pandemic. Maybe at least the pandemic affected island isolated states, or some states with an authoritarian regime, that closed the borders. By the end of January 2022 at this pandemic has killed more than 5 and a half million people on the planet. Given the situation, which has not been in the world for many decades, has meant more than just multiple tragedy and a significant economic downturn, but also the need ethically and economically reflect the many common practices considered to date days for invariant. We look at the problem through the prism of social philosophy. There are basically three approaches: a) negative (liberal) perception of freedom, b) positive perception of freedom (Spinoza, Hegel, etc.), c) freedom as a game. We believe that many circumstances need to be taken into account in order to meet the necessary conditions for the introduction of relatively strict countermeasures. We look at the problem through the prism of social philosophy. There are basically three approaches: a) negative (liberal) perception of freedom, b) positive perception of freedom (Spinoza, Hegel, etc.), c) freedom as a game. Each of these models of freedom has its own vision of the application of the dialectic of freedom and responsibility. The combination of freedom and responsibility is key in our situation. We believe that many circumstances need to be taken into account in order to meet the necessary conditions for the introduction of relatively strict countermeasures.*

Keywords: *COVID-19, freedom, game, rights, protection of health.*

Problem description. The role of the paper is to reflect on selected ethical aspects of the covid-19 pandemic. "The COVID-19 pandemic, which hit the world in March 2020, had a significant impact on every individual, citizen, municipality, city and states, ethics and morale shook to the ground and society got into situations ,where it is often not enough to reach the usual procedures, legal norms and laws, but ethics and morality have come to the fore." [2, p. 13].

A pandemic is an increased burden, that it does not just check individual morality, but there is also considerable pressure on the level of practical application social ethics. In many aspects, judgment means overwhelming most of the planet new pandemic situation priority of social interests over individual. In many cases, individual priorities must recede important local and global needs of society. We consider the issue to be important for practice because it is necessary to clarify the extent to which anti-epidemic measures are compatible with the area of human freedom and human rights.

Literature review. The philosophers Spinoza, Hegel and Marx have already commented on the issue of free will. The Czech philosopher Jan Sokol [10] brings another way of perceiving freedom. Certain aspects of the clash of ethics and measures against covid-19 are also addressed by the authors of the following publications: [2], [3], [5], [6], [9], [11], [12], [13].

Goals of the article. We can postulate the question, threatened by restrictive anti-epidemiological measures our freedom. We first try to analyze the concept of human freedom in terms of social philosophy. We try to apply different concepts of freedom



to the postmodern situation. We are trying to determine the conditions that should be met so that even strict restrictive measures against the pandemic can be put into practice.

Results and discussions. Freedom can be perceived in a negative sense, such as the possibility to opt for a certain option from several without restrictions and influencing, the ability to decide without mantinels. This is how we perceive freedom through the prism of the socio-philosophical direction of liberalism. The second perception freedom is Spinoza's perception. Baruch Spinoza defines freedom as understanding necessity. He is not with his position in the history of philosophy solitaire, in this line he is followed by such important philosophers as Georg W. F. Hegel and Karl H. Marx. So there are two perceptions of freedom. He doesn't have to go o necessarily complementary relationship between the two kinds of grasping the concept of freedom.

Their point of contact may be a holistic approach, that perceives as a whole value form of society in terms of state, nation, continent, or planet. Czech philosopher Jan Sokol comes up with yet another understanding of freedom. It is a perception metaphors of the game as a meeting of two freedoms, which are mutual moves of choice individual and restrictions by other moves of society or the other individual [10]. The metaphor is, that the game, if it wants to be functional, needs good rules. "It simply came to our notice then freedom is always limited, because it needs rules to follow all so that we can all exist freely and safely in society" [5, p. 44]. The presented Sokolov model is considered by Jedličková to be interesting. Of course, it cannot be considered a mirror image of real relationships of responsibility and freedom. As Andrášik says, no model ,that is supposed to simulate a certain possible situation of real components, no is his true description, but a virtual model ,that shows one from the possibilities of reality [1].

Situation regarding the pandemic covid-19 means creating a need for coordination of different directions and forces in society. Particular approach to human freedom, that does not respect the global or local situation, but would narrowly insisted on the free implementation of its own decisions without any restrictions, could disrupt coordinated action plans needed in combat with a pandemic.

As I mentioned above, the Czech philosopher Jan Sokol compared freedom to play between at least two participants. As participants would be in this case, the individual could participate in the game on the one hand and on the other company side. This would mean the need to set optimal rules so, that the game can be played and is effective for players. Maybe it would it could also be compared to how Jean-Francois Lyotard described the social rules.

Specific the situation in which humanity finds itself is a conglomerate of different, no immanent, not universally legitimized language games. The only thing here the so-called strokes of terror. This is a forced consensus, or simply removing the player from the language game.

Any terror interferes with free flow language game. This is how diversity is violated. Lyotard in this sense, it declares war on the general beliefs. Thanks to heterogeneity, there is simply a dissensus ,that ensures the difference between individuals language games.

Big stories, meta-stories can be given as a reason for grasping freedom positively, that is, as he perceived it Spinoza. Lyotard does not acknowledge their truthfulness.

Not does it recognize the philosophy of history as philosophical discipline. Many times culture is justified, legitimized big stories, meta-stories. They are different meta-stories as a struggle to the devil, the struggle to return surplus value to the worker, the creation of wealth, the struggle good against evil, dialectics of Hegel's world spirit etc., just stories history of the world enabling the creation of a philosophy of history. So whatever ,what it talks us about some progress of humanity or a direction somewhere in history, Marxism, Comte's positivism, Smith's economic theory, Manicheanism, Malthusianism and the like. But sometimes it's also about the political context meta-story, if it is said: the search for leadership moves us to universal freedom.

Liotard is very critical of such meta-stories. Big stories have not basis at all for legitimizing something. They are only the stories ,we tell to convince them of their truth, but we will only convince ourselves. He thinks they've lost the big stories persuasiveness. Any speculative philosophy in the existence of all skeptical philosophical counter-arguments has not none moral right to anything fundamentally legitimize. Definitely not in terms of universal standards.

Big stories, meta-stories receded small narratives that are more modest. These stories are limited validity in time and space. It basically goes about Wittgenstein's language games, as Lyotard uses this Wittgenstein technical term. These language games are not longer subordinate to one principle, but it is a matter of language pluralism. These are different types of statements, discourses. All this is possible only after talking, called *petit récit*.

It's a deontic type of speech, some standards - what's supposed to be and what's not. It is a culture, where something is determined, but it is not universal, it is immanent for a certain group of people, for a certain culture, for a certain type of person, e.g. Christians. Here it is legitimized by the right to do what it is supposed to do.

The meta-stories can be said critically several counter-arguments. In the first place, they often contradict each other, few can be true at the same time as another meta-story. It's already significant disqualifying element. Nevertheless, they claim full validity and on a global interpretation of history. If it existed throughout history philosophy only one meta-story, even that would be very difficult to verify. Lyotard's rejection of meta-stories and their replacement by small stories - he reminds Wittgenstein of his language plays of Popper's rejection of historicism. Historicism calls Popper such a philosophical belief, that he is possible to know the basic laws of historical development and from that then make some prognosis for future development. In history, the law decides dialectics, the will of God, the chosen race, etc., this is also what historicism is about. The typical representatives are Marx and Hegel, as well as Platon. Popper against it fights. Any effort to build a paradise on earth necessarily breeds great constraints at least some group of society and breeds violence. We would take this utopia we should give up and rather we should try to help those around to all humanity in the form of system reform. Popper is in this liberalist. He wants no one to be forced to do anything in terms of some ideology. An open society where everyone does everything unless it threatens someone else, it's the best way to keep the company going, in terms of struggling ideologies. It's not based basically on ideology and so it is a neutral basis for functioning company. I see several options to address individual freedom and society's needs. We have imagined several interrelationships, that come into relationship: positive freedom, negative freedom, freedom as a game, meta story (historicism).



The fundamental question is how these components relate to the covid-19 pandemic, respectively to the measures ,that have been put in place in this regard? We can ask the question, are the measures against the pandemic metaphores? They are not certainly a story, that coincides with the entire history of mankind. They are a story ,that is both verifiable and falsifiable. There is no pandemic story associated with metaphysics, is empirically clearly proven, by numbers of infected, percentage of mortality of patients in direct causal relationship with the disease.

We may ask, anti-pandemic measures are a metaphor for a kind of game between society and the individual, or it is necessary to favor the negative human freedom, so praised by liberalism? Another point of view may be the question of what extent the relevant labeling of the situation is appropriate for applying the Spinozic grip of freedom as an understanding of necessity. Is an anti-epidemiological measures are needed or necessary flagrant violation of the negativist, liberal understanding of freedom as free option to opt for any option from the slide empirically possible portfolio? Alternatively, they infringe the relevant anti-epidemiological measures seizure of freedom?

Jedličková is notes some ethical connotations regarding the covid-19 pandemic.

They concern the allocation of scarce resources. For scarce resources during a pandemic we can also consider other common means of therapeutic intervention, which is in different conditions enough.

The named author states four principles use of scarce resources, from which we have selected two that we consider most relevant: (a) the principle of effect maximization achieved by scarce resources (b) the principle of prioritizing assistance to the worst-performing patients health status. "Is in determining the priority of treatment of patients must be targered to prevent any discriminatory decision-making, including age discrimination and therapy must be conducted in accordance with the ethical principle of justice in connection with the severity of the patients' health condition" [6, p. 12]. There are specific recommendations in the area of rare resources allocation [7, p. 12],

Between the most widespread regulatory interventions in the introduction of changes to standards are non pharmacological interventions. Their implementation must meet several conditions. "The use must be scientifically justified in the protection of public health - it must be a clearly demonstrable threat of the uncontrolled spread of diseases,demonstrable risk of injury or death and demonstrable benefit uīse of non-pharmacological interventions "[9, p. 43]. Next one legality and transparency are necessary conditions. An ethical issue can be a matter of coercion in relation to measures. Coronavirus us for one on the one hand, separates each other but, on the other hand, promotes global cooperation and efforts to find the values on which we will build this cooperation [13]. The basic question is what nature they are given restrictions. If they are forced by empirical data on the disease, her danger, a high percentage of mortality, scientifically captured data may be considered justified. The eligibility criterion must be: their accuracy in a scientific sense and of course their truthfulness.

Pseudoscience, metaphysical claims, unsubstantiated assumptions, or even rumors ,that are based on journalistic articles of dubious value must not be a source or a factor ,that could play any role in their implementation. The principle must also apply, that the reasons for introducing or, conversely, for waiving specific measures must be

substantiated by scientific arguments must not be a decision, whose reasons are sovereignly political.

Only relevant reasons, which are supported by scientific arguments, must be reason for introducing measures, that restrict the free movement and will of citizens.

Measures justified in this way can also upset neoliberalism. One of the areas of her psychopolitics is the inner world of the neo-subject, who is an innovative entrepreneur, consumer, performer and wants to experience experiences, and the macrocosm of a supervisory society, which organizes, expects and excites online and offline [4].

Pandemic-related measures certainly cannot be linked to any meta-story, and certainly not to the philosophy of history. The meta stories Lyotard writes about are unverified and unverifiable in an empirical way. What they have in common with them is an existentialist throwing into a situation, which affects almost the whole world. However, unlike real meta-stories, these are not only verifiable, but also validated empirical data. The only resemblance to the meta-story is the relationship of the pandemic to all of humanity. An important difference is the verifiability, respectively falsification of pandemic covid-19 claims. So this is not a meta-story criticized by Lyotard, and after all, not some philosophy of history, which Popper is trying to attack.

We may ask if this is an implied concept that can be metaphorically likened to a game. This is partly true, because both the game and the restrictions are not without invariants, they have their own rules. Sokol speaks of two freedoms, which in our case could mean the freedom of the individual and the freedom of society. The freedom of the individual can currently be suppressed in favor of preserving himself as an individual, as well as in favor of preserving and eliminating health damage throughout society. To the detriment of analogy, he says, that there are some mutual moves that determine the way to restrict freedom. In this case, it is not a battle of moves within the game, but rather coordinated restrictions by the power elite, which have the task of acting primarily as prophylaxis before infecting a higher number of persons.

Rather, than the liberalist perception of individual freedom as a primary value, Spinoza's perception of freedom as an understanding of necessity seems relevant in the context of the covid-19 pandemic. Privileging the rights of individuals in this situation to the extent, that they are the highest value to which other values would be subordinated, would be an immense risk to the health and lives of society as a whole. Therefore, I consider it much more apt if, in a period of pandemic, one looks at freedom in the sense of Spinoza's view. Indeed, it is a matter of the need to introduce measures to prevent the increased number of sick and dead, which is to dominate the interpretation of freedom, that is carried in the spirit of many unlimited possibilities for decision-making. In such a case, the free behavior of the individual would most likely mean a very rapid increase in the disease through its spread through unprotected social intercourse, as man is by nature a zoon politician. The danger of favoring the perception of the priority of individual freedom in a liberalist interpretation during a pandemic would, of course, threaten to suppress the measures necessary to eliminate the spread of the pandemic. We can see a positive example in the Chinese way of dealing with a pandemic. In the first wave of the pandemic in some Chinese provinces, an extremely difficult situation broke out, but with the help of really strict measures, it was possible to manage this wave of pandemics in the provinces with an initially catastrophic situation to a state free from infected, sick and positive.



Implemented anti-epidemiological measures must be necessary for prophylaxis in order to prevent an increase in the sick and infected. Of course, unjustified anti-pandemic measures, that are taken out of line with scientific knowledge, forecasts and facts are irrelevant. Such measures cannot have the powers to be considered necessary. Unless measures in terms of materiality, compatibility with empirical data and scientific knowledge show not such predicates, they cannot be considered necessary.

Unless they are necessary, they do not meet the condition necessary for Spinoza's positive understanding of freedom. In such a case, such a perception of freedom cannot be applied and freedom must be grasped either as a game in the understanding of the Sokol or as a set of individual rights of the individual in the liberalist understanding. The measures must meet the necessary condition of necessity, otherwise there will be no situation for the appropriateness of exercising freedom in understanding Spinoza.

Application of inappropriate, unproductive measures, that are not even in line with scientific ones knowledge, nor with the facts, is inconsistent with the concept of freedom in any sense of the word, but on the contrary, it is a curtailment of freedom, since it is not it is a necessity and at the same time it orders or forbids something. For example vaccination is associated with several legal aspects [12]. Social distance is considered a relatively serious interference with the existing rights of individuals [11].

In some cases, they arise concerns by bringing together autocratic solutions and authoritarian governments, as they say some theorists [3]. It is necessary to communicate appropriately with citizens so that, in the event of genuinely justified measures, they have access to relevant information justifying the information used or intended measures. The statement of reasons must be given in such a language as to enable it even simple citizens without education understood. In this context, they also found views, that it could be used to transmit informations of this kind and music. The authors of the idea justify this by saying that music has the potential for fast and massive transfer of informations to a wide audience [8].

Conclusions and prospects for further research in the area. In the text, I have considered the question the relationship of freedom, its basic definition and restriction in accordance with measures with the covid-19 pandemic. I tried to outline three understandings freedoms: negative freedom in the sense of liberalism, positive freedom, sketched by Spinoza and later developed by Hegel and others and finally Sokolov's game metaphor, which we can compare to freedom. Not one of the concepts I did not favor. I also introduced Lyotard's rejection of the meta story and Popper's definition of the philosophy of history. I have shown, that measures against the pandemic they have nothing to do with meta-story or historicism, despite the fact, that they cover almost the entire planet. They can be associated with a positive perception freedom as an understanding of necessity according to Spinoza. But they have to be for that the conditions of necessity of the measures in terms of their compliance with the need are met prophylaxis before the situation worsens. Protection of health and lives in direct the causal link to the measure can be described as a necessity and a necessity its acceptance certainly fulfills the features of Spinoza's definition of freedom. In case, that the measures do not show such features, on the contrary, their implementation will become an infringement liberalist negative understanding of freedom. Sokolov's comparison to the game is only partially possible in this situation, several circumstances preclude it. Non-pharmacological interventions, embodied in the

form of orders and restrictions, must necessarily serve exclusively to stop, slow down and suppress the negative pandemic symptoms. Their covert political use for other purposes must be condemned as an attack on the freedom of the citizen, understood liberally.

Acknowledgement: *The article was written with the support of project VEGA 1/0595/21 – Public administration interventions at the time of COVID-19 and their impact on the quality of life of citizens of selected communities.*

References

1. Andrášik Ladislav. (2014). Využitie softbotov na kultiváciu ekonomických vedomostí. *Ekonomický časopis*. 2014. Vol. 62(8), Pp. 861-881
2. Bednáriková Nikoleta. (2021). Aplikovateľnosť etických teórií v prostredí správy vecí verejných a ich kľúčový význam v kontexte globalizačných procesov a pandémie Covid-19. *Publicy* 2021. II. Trnava: UCM, Pp. 6-22.
3. Beqaj Belul. (2020). Demokratska prava i građanske slobode za vreme pandemije Korona virusom Covid-19 Opasnost od autokratizacije na Kosovu nije prevazidena!. *Politički život*. 2020. Vol. 18, Pp. 71-79.
4. Domschitz Matyas. (2021). Knowledge-based human system. *Jel-Kép Kommunikáció, Közvelemény, Média*. 2021. 3, Pp. 1-23.
5. Jedličková Anetta. (2020a). Etické aspekty onemocnění covid-19 aneb Ohrožují protiepidemická restriktivní opatření naši svobodu? *Antropologia Integra* Vol. 11(2), Pp. 43-46.
6. Jedličková Anetta. (2020b). Etické konotace léčby onemocnění covid-19. *Vnitřní lékařství*. 2020. Vol. 66(7), Pp. 8-12.
7. Kopecký Ondřej. Matějek Jaromír. (2020). Doporučení o alokaci zdrojů v intenzivní medicíně v kontextu pandemie COVID-19. 2020. *Paliativní medicína* Vol. 1(1)
8. Lemaire, Elise, C. (2020). Extraordinary times call for extraordinary measures: the use of music to communicate public health recommendations against the spread of COVID-19. 2020. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 2020. Vol. 111, Pp. 477-479. <https://doi.org/10.17269/s41997-020-00379-2>
9. Littva Vladimír. (2020). Opatrenia a donucovacie prostriedky v čase pandémie COVID-19. *Zdravotnícke štúdie*. 2020. Vol. 12(1), Pp. 42-45.
10. Sokol Jan. (2001). Hra jako praktická výchova ke svobodě. *Acta Oeconomica Pragensia*. 2001. Vol. 9(6), Pp. 80-85.
11. Svoboda Manuela. (2021). Social Distancing v. Physical Distancing – Why is the Term Social Distancing Globally Accepted in Times of the COVID-19 Pandemic?. *European Journal of Language and Literature*. 2021. Vol. 7(1), Pp. 13-27. <https://doi.org/10.26417/819mez18s>
12. Svoboda Tomáš. (2021). Právní aspekty očkování proti covidu-19. *Časopis zdravotnického práva a bioetiky*. 2021. Vol. 11(2), Pp. 20-44
13. Trčka Michal. (2020). Otisk SARS-CoV-2 v etice klinického výzkumu. *Teorie vědy*. 2020. Vol. Current Health Crisis from the Perspective of Science Studies. <http://teorievedy.flu.cas.cz/index.php/tv/article/view/494/502>. (accessed: 16.03.2022)