

**РАЗДЕЛ III
НЕКОТОРЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ
ЗАПАДНОЙ ФИЛОСОФИИ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ**

**PART III. SOME QUESTIONS OF THE WESTERN PHILOSOPHY
OF EDUCATION**

DOI: 10.15372/PHE20170407

УДК 13+37.0+30

**ОСНОВНЫЕ ДОПУЩЕНИЯ МОДЕРНИЗМА
И СООТВЕТСТВУЮЩАЯ ШКОЛА**

Анжела Санти (Рио-Де-Жанейро, Бразилия)

***Аннотация.** В статье мы размышляем об образовании с точки зрения ее историко-философских истоков, выявляя тупиковые ситуации, с которыми сегодня сталкиваются школы. Она направлена на то, чтобы определить, что условия, которые позволили школе возникнуть в период модерна, те же, что сегодня ведут школу к упадку, ставя её под контроль. В то же время радикализация идеи самоопределения субъектов, присутствующая в проекте Иллюминатства, заканчивается тем, что они становятся субъектами потребления, людьми, имеющими полные права, которые не намереваются подчиняться ничему, кроме собственной воли. Это измерение потребления. Именно в этом контексте мы должны думать о том, какое образование и какая школа имеют смысл.*

***Ключевые слова:** образование, модернизм, потребительское общество, новые субъективности.*

THE ASSUMPTIONS OF THE MODERNITY AND THE SCHOOL IN QUESTION

Angela Santi (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)

***Abstract.** The article intends to think about education from its historical-philosophical origins, identifying the impasses to which schools and teaching are placed today. It aims to map out that the conditions of possibility that allowed the emergence of the school, in modernity, are the same that today decline, putting it in check. At the same time, the radicalization of the idea of self-determination of the subjects, present in the Illuminist project, ends up constituting them as a subject of consumption, as individuals full of rights, who intend to be subdued to nothing but their own will, it is the dimension of consumption. It is*

© Анжела Санти, 2017

Анжела Санти – профессор, доктор наук, Федеральный университет (Рио-де-Жанейро, Бразилия)

Angela Santi – Professor, PhD, Federal University (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil).

within this context that we need to think on which education and which school make sense.

Keywords: *education, modernity, Consumer society, new subjectivities.*

Thinking about the problem of education means thinking of education as a problem. As it was constructed, it represents a modern 'technology', developed to answer questions such as the incipient process of industrialization, the constitution of a nation-state, and the institutions that identify it, such as the state, a church and family, that are lined up with the school, with rules to institute rules, to constitute the subjects. Today, in «post-institutional (COREA, 2011)» times, the conditions of possibility of education, training and subjects are in question. To the matter that this set of conditions that define modernity, have disappeared, the school, thought in the traditional molds, also loses its base of support. The first challenge is to understand that the total set of elements that are identified to the education, as if it were natural, is actually its modern configuration, no longer possible today.

Kant is responsible for consolidating a certain understanding of what we can generally understand as being the «nature» of education, coupled with an understanding of the project of society that goes through «civilizing» men through school. In its context, the school becomes a central element in the consolidation of a certain kind of conception of the world and the man, which will need education to shape it so that it can fulfill its destination. In his book «On Pedagogy», Kant (2002) states that «man is the only creature that has to be educated». The greatest meaning of education is to transform «animality into humanity» (s.p). For him, education preserves man from diverting from his humanity and divides himself into two moments: a negative and a positive one: «discipline is merely negative, namely, the action by which the wild element is removed in man; Education is, on the contrary, the positive part. (s.p) «Man can only become man through education», is nothing more than what education makes him.

In this way, education in Kant, divided into two parts, has in the first its maximum force. It is the discipline that guarantees the control of the animality that can dominate the man, allowing him to show the maximum of his civilized condition, without which the second moment is null: «the neglect of the discipline is a greater evil than that of the culture, since this can be recovered later; The wild element, however, can not be removed, and a deception in the discipline can never be repaired (s.p)». The disciplinary character of education, allowing man to become what he is (his nature), demonstrates how education has placed behind the question of knowledge, a moralizing and normative element. The history of education, in addition to the emphasis on training for the mastery of contents and areas of knowledge, brings a di-

mension of understanding of what man should be and a process of construction of a certain type of subject, appropriate to this universe and a modern ideal of society, indicating that other possibilities will, little by little, be understood as nefarious, inadequate. Here we have a subject who must fight with the savagery that he recognizes in himself, through an "enlightened" reason, that from the work of the (coercive) educational system, turns it able to produce within itself the (self) control and discipline, corresponding to a civilized, cultivated state, which was aspired for the Illuminist project.

The education establishes itself as a place for the constitution of subjects capable of controlling within themselves the animality, first by coercion, perpetrated by the school, then by itself, by the capacity for self-regulation of educated, adult men. In this sense, Kant justifies the reason for bringing to school small children who would not be at the right time for instruction, justifying that they are placed there so that they can learn to be disciplined. They would be there «not yet with the intention of learning something, but to habituate them to remain calm and to fulfill in a timely manner what they were ordered» (s.p). In this sense, the school is born with the purpose of framing and training a certain type of man, in relation to which any other possibility would be deviation. According to Sibia (2012), education «as well as developing its (the Illuminists) modernizing and secularizing impulses, freeing the sovereign from the darkness of ignorance, also turned out to be a strong movement of cultural uniformization, capable of disqualifying and suffocating under its rationalistic hegemony, all the many manifestations considered inferior (p.21)». Thus, we can perceive the strong influence that this educational project has in the meaning of not only educating positively (for the mastery of certain abilities, as reading, writing, calculating), but of representing the structural pillar of a project of society that recognizes in schools the site of a formation that serves to level and standardize, and can represent the space for moral regulation of what is normality and deviation, punishing the second. Thus, if education can represent a process of freedom of the subjects, toward the best and the creator in each subject, we realize that this is only possible if we recognize the homogenizing and regulatory dimension of the school, surpassing it.

* * *

The Modernity represented the project of consolidation of an autonomous subject, capable of self-regulation by reason, free (since Descartes) of a God or an external order that determined it. Kant, in his text *What is enlightenment?* Will assert that «minority is the inability to use one's own understanding without the tutelage of another». Kant will propagate the need for a departure from the

minority and the identification of this accomplishment to an attitude or posture, where man acts without any guardians. In this text, Kant identifies the adulthood to the capacity to act on his own: «It is so convenient to be a minor. If I have a book that has understanding for me, a spiritual director who has conscience in my place, a doctor who decides about my regime, etc., I do not have to effort myself (s.p)». Although we know that this «self is referred to a public use of reason» or to the fulfillment of duty (acting for «love of the law»), Kant's text sets the tone by which freedom and autonomy should be required as the non-negotiable maximum values of modern man: «Enlightenment, however, requires nothing more than freedom; (...). But I hear from all around: do not reason! The officer says: do not reason, but do the exercise! The finance advisor: do not reason, but pay! The priest: do not reason, but believe (s.p)»!

Although in Kant the question of autonomy is subdued to a «public reason» and a claim to universal validity of every decision or position, Kant's formulations, among others, seem to correspond to the imperatives of the contemporary world and the society of consumption. The requirement of a majority that takes liberty as a reference and does not submit to any external, heteronomous will (always understood as negative, impeding the imperative of full freedom), such as the official, the priest, the counselor of finances, causes us to have something frighteningly close to the so-called pictures of «iconoclastic insubordination» of our students today. Barbara Kruger's statement, «Buy, therefore I exist», «crystallizes the connection between entrepreneurial consumption and Illuminist man» (DON SLATER, p. 45): «At first glance, the sentence simply suggests people have been reduced to a superficiality where the individual has only an identity when buying (...)». However, the reference to Descartes' cogito reveals the depth and superficiality of this image: 'I think, therefore I am' is the most powerful of all western formulations between individualism, reason and freedom.

Kruger's claim that Kant's (and Descartes') noblest and civilizing intentions, as Krysler's claim to be civilized, shows that rationalist pretension has shaped the modern subject as absolutely free from the moorings that impart it to any external element other than the potent and self-sufficient self. Of course, as we have already stated, in the context of modernity this self is subject to a collective dimension, to a public sense, but it is there that the subject of consumption is born and constituted - now totally liberated from its external ties, First and largest of them, the other (another me, another man, another consumer). Thus, we recognize that the radicalization of the project of self-determination of subjects in the modernity, constituted the contemporary subject as subject of consumption, which claims to be subdued to nothing but his own will, whose «full» exercise takes place in the dimension of consumption.



KRUGER, Bárbara. Buy, therefore I exist. 1987. Paper photo
(In: <[http://www.infopedia.pt/\\$barbara-kruger](http://www.infopedia.pt/$barbara-kruger), accessed on: 12 of AUG, 2014)

We are not here reducing the culture of consumption to the act of purchase, to where and when many can not effectively have access, but to their symbolical logic and meaning. In this sense, «we would be learning, from the centrality of consumption - and not only from the daily practice of selling and buying objects, but above all from the permanent experience of imparting values and feelings, pleasures and anguishes to all these practices – of talking, of dressing, of thinking about the smallest daily experiences, of apprehending and producing visual, sonic, tactile images (FISCHER, 2005, s.p)».

It remains that the contemporary subjects, our students, are less and less constituted by the values of tradition, religion, law, state and, rather, by the power of choice (GIDENS, apud SLATER, 86). The construction of identity is associated with the choice by which they seem to affirm an identity not defined by themselves, from themselves. And this subject who recognizes himself as the one who chooses, sees in the universe of consumption the site where it can be constituted in an unrestricted way. As far as we may question or criticize such a diagnosis of the contemporary, it helps us to understand the student we recognize as being present in classrooms, «stubborn» in not responding to a student ideal that, focused and interested, would be waiting for the teachers and their knowledge, legitimizing their craft. This situation coincides with the reading of contemporaneity, when it is characterized by the impossibility of establishing common foundations that represent and regulate subjects: «when neither religion nor ideologies nor politics nor the old community ties nor modern relations of society can provide a basis for identification or a sufficient foundation for values, there it is the market, a universal and free space, that gives us something to replace the disappeared gods (FISCHER, s.p)».

Considering this context, that engages the school in its time of origin and places it as an issue today, so we can define the challenges that we have and we will have to think about education in the contemporary world. As Corea states: the pedagogical subject, concentrated and interested, is a modern subject (COREA, p. 69), therefore, unfeasible now-a-days. Therefore, education needs to be based on other bases. From this sensitivity to what defines the contemporary, characterized by an «empty» subject of universal values, determined by institutions that constitute his identity, marked by accelerated and intensive times, whose great place is consumption, we must take up the challenges of this reflection, that in its limits can mean the end of the school and its institutionalized teaching.

Perhaps the aim is to rebuild the sense of educating today, in a world where young people have, as their first school, television, internet, games and social networks, or as Corea and Lewkowics say, we need to «think again», «Thinking from what we have» (p.13), understanding the changes that produce a society of information and consumption, linked to speed, excess, saturation. In this context, in this post-institutional time, where solidity, systematicity, are no longer possible, «exhausted the nation-state as a self-giving mechanism of meaning (LEWKOWICS, p. 19)» we must problematize on what basis education, or otherwise, «what kinds of subjectivity bodies would we like to forge today, thinking both in the present and in the future of our society» (SIBILIA, 2012, p. 11)? «The double game of immersion in the inexhaustible flow of the contemporary and the rescue/reinvention of the elements presented above, can, as a result of this alchemy, help us to glimpse new possibilities».

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Corea, C. Lewkowicz. *Pedagogy of the Abducted – Deprived schools, perplexed families*. 1st ed. 7th reprint, Buenos Aires, Paidós, 2011.

Kant, I. *About pedagogy*. 3^a ed. Piracicaba: UNIMEO, 2002.

Answer to the question: What is Enlightenment? Captured at. Available at: <http://bioetica.catedraunesco.unb.br/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Immanuel-Kant.-O-que-%C3%A9-esclarecimento.pdf> (accessed on 13 of March, 2017).

Sarlo, B. apud **Fischer, R.** «Identity, culture and the media: the complexity of new educational issues in the contemporary world» *Education and Research*, São Paulo, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 151–162, jan.jun. 2002. Captured at: <http://www.scielo.br/pdf/ep/v28n1/11662.pdf>.

Slater, D. *Culture of Consumption and Modernity*. São Paulo: Nobel 2002.

Принята редакцией: 07.09.2017