

From individual to the Human being. On Dignity and Love in the vision of Constantin Micu Stavila **

Abstract: The claim of philosophical thinking to tackle the problem of human dignity and, in general, of human instilling in the order and harmony with itself, with the world and with the divine is a nucleus question for the present reflection, too. In the globalizing context with its obvious crisis of identity and self, no less with the loss of moral reference, there is a valuable content to be emphasized by reading the work of the Romanian philosopher Constantin Micu Stavila. Developing his career especially in France, this author of the 20th century offers a pathway to overcoming the moral deadlock and to move on toward the self-accomplishment: the real discovering of the personal life, finally. Starting from the human condition's diagnosis like „internal emptiness”, „negation spectrum”, and „mental ruin”, Constantin Micu Stavila realizes a critique of the contemporary technical civilization and of the humanity crisis, which facilitated a sort of renunciation to the metaphysical value of reason. In this paper I try to expose and to argue the point of view of Micu Stavila upon dignity, by an analysis of the relation between individuality and love that marks the noncontradictory identity and the development of the person. Love represents the key access to the affirmation of dignity, and to the dynamics of personal life within the intersection of faith élan and metaphysics” passion.

Keywords: Constantin Micu Stavila, Self-Conscience, Dignity, Faith, Love, Individual and Collective, Freedom

The pretence of philosophical thinking regarding the possibility to render the dignity of the human being, man's instauration in order, in harmony to himself, the world and divinity remains the core of current issues. The circumstances which led to the identity crisis and self-defining, the loss of traces regarding life phenomena and moral deeds are the premises of this study which brings to attention the reflections of Constantin Micu Stavila¹.

* PhD Candidate Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, email: fragizaha@yahoo.com

** **Acknowledgement:** This work was cofinanced from the European Social Fund through Sectoral Operational Programme Human Resources Development 2007-2013, project number POSDRU/159/1.5/S/140863, *Competitive Researchers in Europe in the Field of Humanities and Socio-Economic Sciences. A Multi-regional Research Network*.

¹ Constantin Micu Stavila (1914, Moinești – 2003, București), *Magna cum laude* PhD in philosophy (București, 1942), was educated in the spirit of German thinking and accomplished himself in the French, always reporting to Orthodox Christianity. He published by 1945:

The Romanian-French philosopher reveals a way of overcoming the moral deterrent towards self-accomplishment in dignity – the genuine discovery of personal life. *Man's dignity lies in the exercise of freedom, which guarantees his disengagement from the conditioning of the environment and necessities* (Micu Stavila 1943, 14).

We will try to depict and defend for Constantin Micu Stavila's view on dignity in an analysis of the relationship between individuality and the love which highlights *the non-contradictory identity and the person's evolution*. The most complex act of knowledge and existence, love gives access to *the irreducible dynamics of personal life whose description intersects the zeal of faith to the passion for metaphysics* (Micu Stavila 2006, 111). Without love, namely the wish for goodness, truth, beauty – ultimate essence of it, God's mere power of being and creating would be completely worthless. The Christian meaning of the concept of love will make clear the character of dignity, written in the positive area of human feature.

1. Faith and Science

The phenomenological research on personal life undertaken by Constantin Micu Stavila has brought to our attention the fact that love is above any other manifestation. By its special quality of including all the possible ways of expressing the original ability to transcend and feel devotion, it unveils the human being able to assert himself in the very unit of consciousness, as a principle of relating and harmony, as consciousness of the world. The whole beauty and perfection of the climactic phenomenon of universal existence, love derives from the materialization of personal life. Indissolubly related to the human fate, it helps the human being to find his plenitude and

Sosirea Lavelor and Psyche (poems), *Die Relativität der Erkenntnis und das Suchen des Absoluten* și *Bibliographie der rumänischen Philosophie* (Leipzig), *Finalitatea ideală a existenței umane* (PhD thesis), *Homo ludens sau funcținea ideală a jocului și rolul lui în nașterea culturii*, *Problema umanității din punct de vedere al spiritualității românești*, *Relația om-natură în concepția românească asupra lumii*, *Concepția poporului român despre dragoste*, *Originea creștină a problematicei filosofice moderne*, *Existența și adevăr*, *Valoarea ontologică a cunoașterii*. The university career stops at the position of lecturer (Faculty of Philosophy and Theology – București), as he was arrested. Between 1970 – 1975, cultural advisor for Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, he gives the lecture on General and Apologetic Philosophy at Faculté de Théologie Protestante (Paris); he organizes conferences at Centre Culturel Américain, together with: Paul Ricoeur, Gabriel Marcel, Jean Brun, André Dumas, Octavian Vuia, Pierre Emmanuel, Jacques Ellul, Hans-Georg Gadamer. He is a member of the Philosophy Committee at Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (1975-1980) and he publishes: *La Crise de l'idéologie industrielle de la Science*, *L'Appel Libérateur de l'Espace*, *La Revolté contre la nouvelle trahison des Ceres du XX-e siècle*, *Trente ans après Yalta*, *Un coup de théâtre philosophique*, *Le droit à la différence*, *Vers un nouvel art de penser et de vivre*, *Le Manifeste Poétique de l'Humanisme Roumain*, *L'avenir de la Roumanie à l'avant-garde de l'histoire* (Paris), *Descoperirea vieții personale* (posthumous, București).

accomplishment where the consciousness of individual uniqueness relishes in infinite appreciation. The acknowledgement of the accordance between individuality and love depends on the fact that we can only speak about love where we are able to create the most lively and genuine relationship, from one person to another, from soul to soul. Shown towards the self and the other humans, towards God and nature; physical, platonical, profane or divine is the love for something personal and alive which turns like that under the influence of love. Just like God-as-sum, impersonal or proven in a more-geometrical way cannot become an object of love, so humanity generally speaking – a collective, abstract and dead – opposes love.

The fundamental rapport of love, supposed to be present where this synthesizing power of existence is the Me – You relationship. The clue to the artificial character of situations, mechanisms, phenomena and general concepts in the economy of life is the inability to inspire love, as the ability to favour it shows the guarantee of a huge reserve of existential value. For example: the immense role played in the spiritual and mental life of the human being, the lively and personal relationship initiated by the changes in the metaphysical, religious, artistical sensitivity in comparison to the very feeble emotional response induced by the scientific discoveries. The former truths form roots and engage the soul in whatever it has more profound and intimate and they might turn into a long-lasting relationship, unlike the latter who remain at the periphery of spiritual life, keeping, as fatality, the punishment of not bearing fruit to any durable feeling. The zeal of great devotion and passion inspired by the beliefs and convictions coming from the soul is due to the fact that the heart is more personal than reason and the genuine personal emotion is almost all the time accompanied by sympathy and love. We do not refer to objective laws and phenomena, subject to quantitative and numerical grounds in the life attitude of that person who is aspiring towards beauty, philosophical wisdom or God, but to a subjective feeling, sensitive to the unique case. If the scientific world ignores the emotional and personal character of love, the philosophers, the enlightened ones in religious experience, the poets refer to it as “the main event of existence and the central planet of the world”. Real life sends us directly to deeds, individual cases and situations in which the importance of love increases – a sort of acknowledgement of the fact that it is an “attribute of the personal life, a part of it, a privilege of its free choice and consciousness” (Micu Stavila 2006, 143). It applies only to living creatures able to find an attraction and exclusive value in sharing it by the most profound and sincere devotion and sympathy. As a first law of love, it is possible only when life ascends to the consciousness of its individual value. The moment we love, we are suddenly filled by an infinite personal, absolute and exclusive significance whereas losing it, felt as irremediable, shows the universal and infallible character of this law. In other words, the

main characteristic of love is treating the loved one with the whole attention and care, as if that person had a secret which enthral and subdues by exclusiveness and singularity. Consequently, love will never risk to lose its reason of being in order to change into a feeling of indifference and apathy, a state of collective leveling: concoction and confusion without awareness and decision. An intuition which calls for the individual, whose contrary is the situation described above, hatred excluded. The particular features of love are the ones which allow the exclusion of impersonal interpretations of love: the exclusiveness of the feeling and the uniqueness of the subject. Its origin cannot be an impersonally collective one as it develops only under conditions of individual choice and selection, repudiating repetition, generality and uniformity. All the attempts to give it an impersonal-collective function have proved to be absurd based on the metaphysical, sociological or biological considerations.

2. Against the biological theory of love

Constantin Micu Stavila brings at least two arguments to prove the falsity of the biological theory of love which searches to find in the general interest of the species which guides the individual and imposes the whole attitude towards life by the sexual instinct the origin of all the acts of enthusiasm and attachment in love. Firstly, as the genetical function does not seem to be closely related, is neither an exclusive appanage nor a servitude of the species which could not be carried out by the individual on his own. Secondly, the sexual behaviour represents only an inferior feature of love which does not deplete its true essence whose optimum expression takes the form of passion and spiritual life. This last fundamental error of confusing love in itself and sexual love would be enough to dismiss the idea of biological origin. Leaving aside the fact that love takes form in the supra-biological field and that the sexual instincts cannot determine its direction and reason, we nevertheless notice that its very form is not purely biological, reduced to the mechanism of an anonymous and impersonal function. The nuptial ceremonies represent different ways of showing to the individual off to his advantage in the most important moment of his life and monogamy illustrates in an excellent manner the independence of a person from the impersonal manners of the sexual instinct. The crucial role played by the biological manifestation of love is enhanced by the importance of the individual responsibility held in the reproduction act. The care and solicitude shown by the animals towards their offspring are like a measuring device for the increased manifestations of the genetical instinct seen in the act of individual responsibility. The great spiritual power of creation and devotion shown by love proves that the role played by the individual is not secondary and subsidiary, but a central role which includes both the choice

and preference, as well as responsibility and compliance. The people mostly endowed with concentration power and will, sagacity, detached from the system of collective relationships stand out due to their attachment and sacrifice abilities present in greater measure than for the ones with a regular behaviour. The creature of most individualised form, the man has proved to be the one mostly preoccupied with the huge responsibility of procreation which he has changed “out of momentary act of the individual into one that engages him for the rest of his life.”

A number of conditions as well as means by which the individual exteriorizes responsibility towards his offspring, such as family, property or education determines the creation of moral values together with the metamorphosis of the physical act of procreation into a “spiritual act of love and devotion” (Micu Stavila 2006, 148). Exerting the genetical function depending on man’s willingness and will highlights the role of the individual decision. Unlike the other necessary biological functions, it is not compulsory, it belongs to another category which is closer to duty than constraint. As procreation conveys a personal mission, it can be considered that it generates feelings related to love, in contradiction to the mission and function of the species which forces the individual to renounce grace, beauty, intelligence. In the chapter entitled “Metaphysics of love”, Schopenhauer argues in defence of the inutility and absurdity of tender feelings, denying any trace of decision, choice and responsibility in the satisfying of the instinct for procreation. The denial of personal value postulated by the thesis of impersonalism simultaneously leads to the denial of love and all the values of human existence. The most serious error in the supposition of the biological origin is giving love an impersonal origin and finality and confusing it for sexuality. The pretence of an exhaustive identification is not justified: although it might be said that both postulate the Me-You rapport as a condition of their accomplishment, from one person to another. If the erotic attention depends on the physical attraction, then “love is an homage to the person loved as a whole, regardless of age and sex” (Micu Stavila 2006, 150-151). Totally free and costless, love differs from the limited and subordinate sexuality. The relationship of attachment and exclusiveness, which is not based on an act of possession, as in sexuality, reflects the purity of the homage brought by love to the person and it eliminates the risk of any relationship of reciprocal domination and subjugation, incompatible with “the dignity of a free personality”. Its purpose being “the moral certainty of devotion” (Micu Stavila 2006, 151), not the illusion of material possessions, love will not be threatened by the loss of one self in the other. What ensures its independence from sexuality is the possibility to precede as well as to subsist sexuality and the inhibition of the latter underlines the free character of the former and it explains why the love free of jealousy and selfishness is the basis of sociability.

3. Against the social theory of love

As long as society constrains on collective and impartial relationships, love will not demand the individual to previously consent to any general and objective condition. The intelligence, merit, virtue, beauty, values which require it are its effects rather than its causes. As the value of the beloved object is forged by the lover in the very act of loving, this confirms that the love relationship is not conditioned by something objective or subjective. Being an independent and free act, a love relationship is more and more clear than a social one – a long conflict between the social mentality and the purity of the purposes of love is the history of the latter. In opposition to society, which reduces the meaning of free personality almost all the time, the drama of love comes from the persistent request for the absolute value of the appreciated person. Society rarely succeeds in “widening the social consciousness”, “agreeing to love and ascending to the height of its purposes”. It always seems that whatever is good and noble in a unitary group of people is only the consequence of gradual contamination with the spirit of love. Due to the fact that it engages the whole being, love scrutinizes deeper than society. Love is something “which is added by a sort of luxury and refinement to the social life and which does not take form necessarily from its essence” (Micu Stavila 2006, 153), since love precedes or springs from a more genuine and lively relationship than social life. To put it differently, the first addresses the individual, discovered in the plenitude of his personal life, the second aims at a disfigured individual, deprived of many features of his personal dignity. A love conceived by the needs or evolution of the social life would be one of the individual generally speaking, impersonal, abstract, hence social life owes to it all its great progress.

4. Opposition to the metaphysical impersonalism

Understanding the personal essence of love proves unable as well for the metaphysical impersonal theories. They see it as “a phenomenon which dissolves personality in the anonymity of a collective substance” (Micu Stavila 2006, 154). A drawback found in religion, too, in the Asian doctrines which gave “the most popular and depressing expression of lack of reality and value to the individual existence” (Micu Stavila 2006, 154-155). A fatal ignorance which goes even to claiming that the whole world, the total knowledge, even our own self are only deceit and illusion. A sort of blindness which places us in an “eternal state of enmity and struggle, effort and desire, fear and hope”, a source of despair, pain and humility. The individual personality is practically left aside, as separate and of its own, drowned in the nothingness of collective irresponsibility, refusing even the

slightest shade of human dignity. A gloomy accordance to the mentality of the adept of materialism and modern economical determinism, which is unable to accomplish himself as a free being and be responsible for his own deeds, to deepen the virtue and increase personal merit, to assume the risks of independent and creative life but is content to comply with the collective social conditions. An abusive, tiring, oppressive, exploiting and leveling system will make the decisions and think for him. Schopenhauer plays a decisive role in replacing the Christian individuality with the Buddhist impersonal manner. In *The World as Will and Representation* he reprimands the efforts made by Christianity to put the basis of “a moral of universal love and sympathy” on the principle of individuality, engaged in “overcoming the moral solipsism and acknowledging the value of the personality of the other as basis for his own personality” (Micu Stavila 2006, 155). Asked to fraternize in love as free, different people, with a real private life, the love lesson coming from Christianity in *You shall love your neighbour as yourself* relies on the personal differentiation between beings. Christianity does not diminish individuality, but it confirms it as the source of generous feelings and it plays a central part in the course of love. It postulates, in the name of personal value, the love for the other, but not in a principle of identity and confusion. “All the humans in the world, coexisting or successive (...), are nevertheless one and the same being which takes form in each of them and is identical everywhere” (Schopenhauer 1879, 185), it is Schopenhauer’s denial of the role of individuality as a decisive and self-reliant factor in the world which continues in stating that error and evil originate in the act of individual diversity. As a consequence, the ego can be recognized in a non-differentiated entity, it is discovered as identical to another and it might be capable of a moral life only if the effect of sympathy destroys any “form of consciousness left as personal independence” (Micu Stavila 2006, 157). If the sacrifice of freedom and own existence is the condition for the accomplishment of the moral ideal, then the principle of differentiation and individual variation is compromised for good, at the same time with undermining the personal basis of Christian civilization. Eduard von Hartmann, Wundt, Bourgeois, Secrétan, André Lalande², Emile Lasbax³ are only a few thinkers who have been quoted here and who do not see any other source of the moral life than the instincts of association and imitation, being seriously influenced by the Buddhist and Schopenhauer’s error.

Once the common feature of the impersonalist theories on love is known, we will study how they fall apart from the real understanding of

² The author states that the ultimate purpose of moral life is the path to identity and uniformity, by casting aside and denying individuality.

³ In *Le problème du mal*, Paris, 1919, declares that individuality is a source of the struggle, discord, evil and suffering in the world.

love and what is their common drawback. As long as the individual is deprived of reality and autonomy, as all the impersonalist theories on love (biological, sociological or falsely metaphysical) state, love cannot grow and sustain itself. As previously mentioned, it is a matter of “choice and preference”, “an homage brought to the person”, not a blind or indifferent act addressed to an impersonal, abstract being, generally “personified by the vague and anonymous notion of species, social group or metaphysical substance” (Micu Stavila 2006, 160). True love is veiled by a mystery of freedom, of personal will which gives charm to its surprising preferences, an impossible mystery should it be enlivened by the anonymous power of the species, of the society or of the law of identity or collective unity. Love draws force from variety and diversity. It is fulfilled in close connection to the development of the feelings of the exceptional, uniqueness, individual singularity and it no longer plays a role in the acts led by contamination and imitation. The rebellion of the masses, the anger, the wrath will not alternate with love, but only with cowardly servitude and fear. The crowd will be carried on by identity and confusion; it will become complacent in disarray and promiscuity, never in intimacy and trust, communion and sympathy. The regression of the individual to the herd state makes his pride grow, pluming itself with the vanity of a borrowed power to the detriment of being capable of showing esteem and sympathy for the other. As a means of relating from one person to another, love does not subsist where this oath is eluded by the decadence of consciousness to the stage of collective irresponsibility. The incompatibility of love to the phenomenon of alteration and diminishing of the personality under the influence of the specific ideas of mass psychology is propagated in any system of reduction to processes of collective identity and confusion. In a completely depersonalised pattern, we will meet it in a psychopath or selfish person who “lost the notion of personal dignity for all things” (Micu Stavila 2006, 161). The hidden vice and the extreme risk which threaten the monistic-collectivist systems dwell in the confusion between selfishness and love. The disguised selfishness could never be overcome by sympathy, but it will be generalised to a fatal limit of the being. Hence, this type of individual will never be able to love his neighbour. It is the same as the one who does not have a reality of its own and will confound the neighbour for an illusion, the one identical to another will be condemned to love only himself, without any possibility of escaping beyond himself. Therefore, if the essence of love lay in the accomplishment of an absolute identity, “it would change selfishness from an exception and fatality into a rule and an ideal” (Micu Stavila 2006, 162).

5. The Christian vision – a way of rendering the human dignity

Annulling the individuality as a consequence of mystical union, monism and pantheism were suspected at the beginning of Christianity as immoral since they suppressed the minimum distance between the creation and the Creator, and lacking this distance, the transcending required by the true love would no longer be possible. “A God who would love his creation only if it was mistaken for it, who would refuse the possibility and right of being something else than Himself, to exist as a distinct reality, to contradict the idea of divine goodness, that would be a selfish God” (Micu Stavila 2006, 163). As the value of individuality cannot be nullified or diminished without destroying the basis of any love or creation, it becomes obvious how their conditions become similar. The possibility to surmount selfishness by discovering the supreme value of individuality not by suppressing it denotes the sinister character of collective selfishness, which could be compared to the individual one. Since Christianity has not made use of an abstract entity to lay the groundwork of love, it has not used the Good, but the love for the living being, “the individual and the personal God of poets and prophets”, this means that it foresaw the danger of the collective selfishness. Solemnly announced by the Christian paradigm, love “agrees to have limits and be specific”, always in contact with whatever is more profound, singular and unique in life, it “postulates preference and choice”, never the passivity and indifference of an affection which does not address anyone in the end. “Something more” can also be understood from the words said by Jesus to Saint Peter in Gethsemane to question his faith, to see if he loved Him more than the other apostles. The clearest proof that what Jesus intended does not represent a levelling and egalitarian feeling, but one which should “particularise and individualise at maximum, involving preference and choice” (Micu Stavila 2006, 163-164). The Christian love for the neighbour, remaining individual, succeeds in moving to the universal at the same time and bearing all the spiritual values.

All the virtues – love, respect for faith and property, politeness – are spirited by the respect given by Christianity to the sanctity of the individual being. The ensemble of interpersonal relationship will remain under the veil of coldness, hostility, violence where at the dawn of existence, the principle of individual life is refused. “Deprived by the dignity of its subjectivity by treating things in blocks, as a line of products, as a moment in a collective period, the individual suddenly stops inspiring love and being capable of love, being wrecked in a state of spiritual freezing, apathy and indifference towards the self and the others, when he does not risk to change into a rapacious and selfish beast” (Micu Stavila 2006, 165). The life experience of the mistakes made by the impersonal formula confirms the evilness of love, generally speaking, and abstract, of humanity. The materialism repressing

the authority and the political power has proven how the replacement of Christian love for the neighbour, by the ideas of collective love and happiness have changed the real, living being into a public good, stealing at the same time his dignity, holiness, the very miracle of his existence. Starting from the suppression of spiritual freedom and ending with the loss of physical freedom, of trust in the mission of personal life, these are the terrifying effects of the practice of materialist mentality – a real work of spiritual depersonalization, crimes against freedom and life under the pretext of mutual love and happiness. Suffocated, the man defends himself wearing a permanent mask of artificial equity: he locks and deprives his own spiritual life. Unable to love, he ends up with nothing to give and all his deeds lack personality and originality and they will show the total defeat of human dignity. The greatest enemy of love and dignity is the “automatic pseudo-individuality”, unable a humiliated, in a “collective struggle of repulsion and fear” (Micu Stavila 2006, 169) where everyone is estranged from the others, a picture of an unhuman humanity. We can conclude once again that the origin of love lies in existence, not in the negation of personal life and the same existence leaves place for the understanding of Immanuel Kant’s conceited pretense of making the criterion of truth out of something objective and generally applied. The subjectivity of love preferences discovers the error which is present where logical thinking operates with abstract ideas and notions, not the uniqueness, the personal value of the loved one which follows and is born out of its abundance, he does not precede it, as a condition. Jaspers and Scheller have the merit of noticing and stating that we love someone as they are (Jaspers 1919, 170).

The unconditioning of love grounded in the mystery of individual uniqueness makes it similar to grace and free of any rational and causal finding. This phenomenon shows the asymmetry between the sum of values belonging to the beloved person and the love for her; there is always an “unnoticeable rest”, “an unexplainable plus”, “an impenetrable something” (Micu Stavila 2006, 171-172). The basis of the evangelical notion of love is the very homage brought to the person as individual. Jesus does no task Mary Magdalene to promise that she will not sin any more, but he gives her first the proof of love and forgiveness; he does not condition Peter to become someone else, but he loves him as he is. The amazing freedom and spontaneity of fatherly love is the one which miraculously frees the source of his son’s repentance; the appearance of the latter is not the cause and condition of forgiveness and the special welcome from his father. In Christianity, perfection is not inspired by it, but it derives from the power of love. And should a merit be required as a condition of love, Jesus “would have never succeeded in loving anyone, as where could he have met the perfect being?” (Kierkegaard 1952, 190).

The person loved as an individual, as a unique being, as what is more personal is ennobled with an infinite self-esteem. It makes him aware of the value and responsibility of his life, of his mission in the world. In a word, of his real personal dignity which once discovered by love will no longer allow any humiliation and disgrace. Thus taken into consideration as a person, the individual is placed in a rapport of familiarity and trust and he is helped to discover whatever is most noble in him, namely his spiritual being, the ultimate essence of his individuality and dignity. To directly accede to the individual's heart, to support him in finding a real knowledge on the excellence of his personal life, it is the amazing power of love to bring change. "As soon as I know I am loved, it seems I value more" (Goethe 1960, 29). There is no other way, a more appropriate way to know someone as a person and another way to the deepest mystery of a human being apart from this surplus of overflowing value given by it. Brought closer by love, the person will gain depth and transparency without altering his identity in any way, due to attention, to the intention to individualize and make unique, the loved person holds "the whole universe of the spirit" (Micu Stavila 2006, 174).

By its power to individualize, the only genuine knowledge of reality inspired by love is the divine and Christian knowledge. Instead of reducing the mystery of existence, the individualizing knowledge increases it, as "the awareness of the mystery" does not represent the feeling of resignation, indifference to understanding, but its highest form. A science based on the respect for individuality as the creative power for everything that exists, "would give back the self-esteem" at the same time with "the love for the neighbour". Replacing the gravity of science – from the general to the individual – it would produce a radical renewal of the whole issue; consequently, the person conceived as a unique being, would enjoy more sympathy and solicitude. Modern humanity, subdued by the technical and material civilization, "hostile to life and personality, to spiritual freedom", not only that it appointed a radical opposition between knowledge and love, but it deprived the man of "living the inner life" and of "its consciousness and nostalgia" (Micu Stavila 2006, 176). In order to stop the mental ruin, to give back the dignity received by the individual, he should go back to the sources of Christian spirituality and find "new ways for holiness and love, together with new ways of interiorisation and personal feeling" (Micu Stavila 2006, 176). To the extent it takes us further away from nature, the objective and the general takes us further away from God. In the religious experience, that relationship from one person to another which implies the liveliest, the real presence, the knowledge of general laws and concepts becomes insufficient and it demands its abandonment in favour of love. The most limited sphere of the action of love is seen in the relationship of the soul with God. Nowhere else is the relationship of love more

profoundly and fully personal and real than in the presence of a being. God, the Person by excellence is the origin “of love by excellence and he demands to be known by love”, namely the only knowledge coming from the nature of individuality in agreement with the personal essence of the divine nature. The discursive and conceptual means change God from a living being into an abstract entity; approaching Him as an object of demonstration and rational deduction and not by an act of personal living – faith and prayer – we miss the presence and getting closer to Him. In agreement with Gabriel Marcel’s thoughts, Constantin Micu Stavilă ponders: “If we can say about the world that it exists, we could never refer to God in an impersonal way, but only if we saw him in front of our eyes and we had a personal and lively relationship with Him, could we say: «God, you exist! »” (Micu Stavila 2006,178). Stating that the world itself will perish, apart from love, Apostle Paul expressed a preference, he made a hierarchy of values. A vocation of the personal life, love is “the lever of the upper regions of the whole existence and its metaphysical axis” (Micu Stavila 2006, 179). The indestructible relationship between the destiny of personal life and love pleads for the hope for immortality, hence its major significance.

6. Final considerations or from the individual to the Human Being

The analysis of the relationship between individuality and love has introduced us into the field of accomplishing humanity, in other words, of redefining the individual as a person placed in his dignity as a Human Being. Part of humanity, dignity appears as a manifestation of individual consciousness under double relationship of three parts: on one side, awareness of the self, of the other and of God and on another part as an inner part, activity and creative freedom. The inner part gives the unique character, what is personal to the individual and the creative activity allows him to continuously discover and accomplish the self. Freedom – in a moment of decision and engagement – by the paradox of being infinite and limited at the same time, introduces us in the sphere of the mystery of life. The reflection of the Romanian-French philosopher conceives the following ideas in order to explain the concept of dignity. The discovery of the self takes place in a leap or in a projection beyond itself, and it is only the condition, not the fact of the given or of the existence. This gap between the possible and the real, the systematic non-coincidence between the human being and thought, an act and power of the inner part of consciousness is not a weakness, but a trait of efficiency and value. The lively, dynamic, fundamental relationship of self awareness highlights the fact that nature and the function of thinking and of the being is their dignity and value. It is an existential oath of coexistence and simultaneity which allows modelling and enriching the individual.

Is it possible for the individual being to ensure and motivate its existence staying outside the world of values? Can it aspire to the rank of dignity without depleting the possibility to accomplish the goodness and the love and to be the source of any value? The indispensable conditions for personal life, the inner part, the creative activity and freedom changed into value under the effect of love represent the personal essence and at the same time universal essence of Beauty, Truth and Goodness. The mere fact of being does not complete the notion of value. Spontaneity and originary ascendancy, namely the victory of good over evil, together with the appeal to the moral of “I can” as opposed to “You must”, not only that bring the individual in agreement with himself, but do not require anything fake, forced, only what the awareness of dignity and responsibility indicates for the accomplishment of Goodness.

References

- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von. 1960. *Suferințele tânărului Werther*. București: E.S.P.L.A.
- Jaspers, Karl. 1919. *Psychologie der Weltanschauungen*. Berlin: Verlag von Julius Springer.
- Kierkegaard, Søren. 1952. *Vie et Règne de l'Amour*. Traducteur Pierre Villadsen. Paris: Aubier-Montaigne.
- Lasbax, Emile. 1919. *Le problème du mal*. Paris: F. Alcan.
- Micu Stavila, Constantin. 2006. *Descoperirea vieții personale*. București: Paideia.
- Micu Stavila, Constantin. 1943. *Problema umanismului din punct de vedere al spiritualității românești*. București: Tiparul Universitar.
- Schopenhauer. 1879. *Le fondement de la morale*. Traducteur Auguste Burdeau. Paris: Baillière.