

РАЗДЕЛ II
ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ СИСТЕМ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ ВОСТОКА И ЗАПАДА
Part II. STUDY OF THE EDUCATION SYSTEMS
OF THE EAST AND WEST

Философия образования. 2022. Т. 22, № 2
Philosophy of Education, 2022, vol. 22, no. 2

Научная статья

УДК 13+37.0

DOI: 10.15372/PNE20220205

Неопределенность в образовании

Анна Хогенова¹

¹Карлов университет, Прага, Чехия

Аннотация. *Введение.* Неопределенность – это часть и следствие геометрического мышления, которое является основой современной эпохи. Необходимо вернуться к самим вещам, предметному мышлению и жизни из собственного источника. Рационально обоснованное знание в образовании коренится не только в онтологической чрезвычайной ситуации, но и в дейктическом цифровом мышлении, имеющем номиналистическую основу, где решающую роль сегодня играют бренды, где истинное утверждение представлено единицей, а ложное утверждение представлено нулем. Таким скрытым образом правда становится брендом, в который можно добавить все, что претендует на власть. Отмечается опустошение сущности человеческой мысли, вызванное рациональным типом мыслительных операций и приемов. Целью исследования стал поиск основ достоверного (*certitudo*) мыслительного анализа, основанного на самих вещах, а не только на идее правильности (*orthotes*). *Методология* исследования истинности и ценности знаний в образовании опирается на научное и философское творчество М. Хайдеггера, Я. Пяточки, Т. Г. Масарика, Х. Арендт, разработавших принцип «Меры вещей», обусловленный феноменом «das Gestell». *Обсуждение.* Принцип «Меры вещей» в образовании является одновременно искусственным и добровольным, поскольку со времен Античности служит методологией для критики рационализма, связанного с внедрением в образование цифровых технологий, порождающих феномен «цифрового мышления», «плоского мышления», «геометрического мышления», «достоверности в образовании» и др. Обучение с использованием цифровых технологий полностью лишает учащихся и студентов возможности сконцентрироваться, потому что интенция восприятия информации фрагментируется. Таким образом мыслительные процессы возвращаются к компьютерной игре, которая в принципе является типичным детским восторгом. *Заключение.* Прогнозирование будущего образования осуществляется путем планирования с помощью чисел. Сегодня оно достигло своей кульминации благодаря огромной роли компьютерной философии в жизни общества.

Политики, чиновники и юристы должны осознать, что образование – это не прагматично-объективный процесс, его невозможно регулировать только рыночными целями и ценностями.

Ключевые слова: картезианское мышление, истина как несокрытость, цифровое мышление, плоское мышление, неопределенность в образовании, «мера вещей», цифровые технологии, рациональность

Для цитирования: Хогенова А. Неопределенность в образовании // Философия образования. 2022. Т. 22, № 2. С. 71–81. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15372/PHE20220205>

Scientific article

Uncertainty in education

Anna Hogenová¹

¹Charles University, Prague, Czech

Abstract. *Introduction.* Uncertainty is a part and a consequence of thinking *more geometrico*, which is the basis of the modern age. It is necessary to return to things themselves, to substantive thinking, and to life from one's own source. Reasonable knowledge in education is rooted not only in the ontological emergency, but also in deictic digital thinking, which has a nominalistic basis, where brands play a decisive role, where a true statement is represented by one, and a false statement is represented by zero. In this subtle way, the truth becomes a brand to which one can add everything that claims to power. The devastation of the essence of human thought, caused by the rational type of mental operations and techniques, is noted. The purpose of the study is to find the foundations of a reliable (*certitudo*) mental analysis based on the things themselves, and not just on the idea of correctness (*orthotes*). The *methodology* for studying uncertainty in education is based on the scientific and philosophical work of M. Heidegger, J. Pyatochka, T. G. Masaryk, H. Arendt, who developed the principle of "Measure of things", due to the phenomenon of "das Gestell". *Discussion.* The principle of "Measure of things" in education is both artificial and voluntary, since, starting with Antiquity, it has served as a methodology for criticizing rationalism associated with the introduction of digital technologies into education, generating the phenomenon of "digital thinking", "flat thinking", "geometric thinking", "uncertainty in education" and other fields. Learning with the use of digital technologies completely deprives pupils and students of the opportunity to concentrate, because the intention of perceiving information is fragmented. Thus, the thought processes return to the computer game, which in principle is a typical children's delight. *Conclusion.* Planning for the future of education is done by planning with numbers. Today it has reached its climax, thanks to the huge role of computer philosophy in the entire life of society. Politicians, officials and lawyers must realize that education is not a pragmatic-objective process, it cannot be regulated by market goals and values.

Keywords: Cartesian thinking, truth as unconcealedness, digital thinking, flat thinking, uncertainty in education, "measure of things", digital technologies, rationality

For citation: Hogenova A. Uncertainty in education. *Philosophy of Education*, 2022, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 71–81. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15372/PHE20220205>

Introduction. Uncertainty belongs to our lives, it is a necessary part of our existence. Why? Because the modern age brought with it this need as the greatest of all. That is why Descartes turned unconcealedness into *certitudo*, that is why mathematics belongs to the thinking of science (*more geometrico*). We plan everything by calculation based on recent experience, which is excessively called history. There is a “hunt” for the future, which politicians, lawyers, and economists hold in their hands. Everything changes into this style of thinking and living.

Calculating and planning this hunt for the future also involves calculating and planning in education. Everywhere there is a call for pragmatism, practicality, and everything must have a one-sided sense of immediate life, otherwise the funding from the grant will not be forthcoming. This is a great mistake, onto which not light will be shed until the next generation.

If the highest scientific sense is derived from the needs of the market and the need to make money, then the world of all things will not be determined by the four [Earth and Sky, Divinities, and Mortals] in its cosmic game, i.e., being itself, but everything will be determined by the “Will to Power”, penetrating a future calculated by economics, and everything, i.e., education, will be subject to this intention.

Methodology. If the measure of “things” is formed only from the Will to Power, then “things” do not become objectivity, i.e., there is no “worlding” of the world by the constant heating of the right place in the whole of the world. But what does that mean? The answer is simple, everything turns into objects which, as Heidegger says, lack distance; indistinguishability, called “die Anstandslosigkeit”, with which the true closeness of things such as home, warmth, friendship, compassion, and humanity is lost. There is rational coldness and anesthesia on Earth, which we encounter at every step. Digitality and its propagation only bring a deepening of this alienation, people become islands just for themselves; Hemingway and other artists and thinkers were most afraid of this. Everything turns into entrances and exits on the highways of this planet.

All this has its source in the loss of intimacy and closeness from the world. Why did this happen? Because the “things” constructed from the calculated plans gained their measure – essence from the Will to Power, and not from being. If everything is planned, then education and upbringing are also planned. The uniqueness of things must be “mirrored” from the world itself. Mirroring is the ancient name for “grasping”, which the ancient Greeks called “*chorus*.” Unlike “*topos*”, “*chorus*” has no edges. Both phenomena indicate a place. “*Topos*” has edges, it is *clare et distincte*, as required by Cartesius – Descartes. “*Topos*” rules in the thinking of “*more geometrico*” and there is space here for planning the future, which is actually what we mean by hunting.

Our common world is slowly transforming into systems whose logic is difficult to see and use simply, because these systems do not grow from the ordinary

horizon of significance, which is born of the pursuit of peace from the world, from the four, from being itself. Digital thinking is a nominalist way of learning about the world, and this way is voluntary, without the closeness that would be established from life itself. There are explanations for the demise of the old civilizations, which consist in the inability to establish an essential dialogue between the people above and the people below; *Ceram* in the description of the demise of the great empires on the American continent and others. This pressure of digitality, which spreads networks everywhere, does not respect the type of understanding of the people below and pushes its own voluntary horizon of meaning through computer speech – non-speech. Teaching using technology completely destroys the possibility for pupils and students to concentrate, because the intention to perceive the lectured content is fragmented in such a way that students return to a computer game, which is in principle only a typical children's rapture [Rausch], an escape from the present. The inclusion of technical inventions into teaching and education means a greater loss than a benefit. This view will certainly become more balanced, as it contradicts the will to do business in this field. Computers have to be sold and constantly improved to make a profit, because that is what "das Gestell" and "die Machenschaft" command us to do. Few notice the emptying of the essence of human thought and its immediate consequences. This is exactly what Hannah Arendt understood long ago when she considered the soul of Adolf Eichmann in his trial in Jerusalem, where she was sent as a correspondent for American newspapers. Banalization of this kind creates a new kind of cruelty that is not recognized as cruelty at all because it immediately becomes banal. It is the transformation of man into an object for systemic decision-making about the future. *"In the appearance of the purely present as proffered by the oppositional object, in the objective, there lies concealed the greed of representational calculation"* [1, p. 25].

The measure of "things" created by the "das Gestell" phenomenon is artificial, voluntary, as demonstrated by the worldwide production of advertising for products and services, in which people sometimes lie openly and people get used to it, which is very unfortunate for the overall character of society. Things are no longer around us at a distance, created by the measure established by a mirroring of the four, to which people belong. Everything becomes objectivity, even people with numbers tattooed on their forearms, or with numbers of other kinds, according to which they can be quickly found in various databases, which are constantly checked through the phenomenon of "die Machenschaft". Through their activities, people need to prepare a platform for life in the future in order to avoid possible disasters. This leads to the hunting for the future, which is about creating better conditions for conducting business, both from the point of view of the individual and from the point of view of governments and administrations. Hunting for the future is done by planning with numbers. According to Aristotle, time is a number of motion. In the thinking of *more ge-*

ometrico, a phenomenon will naturally and inevitably appear that is not visible by the naked eye, but can only be encountered through thought, which is possible only in philosophy, not in natural sciences or anthropology, which are essentially constituted from the content of natural sciences. This is also the case with other humanities, using the leading scientific methodologies of the day, which actually means that they are only aimed at sciences conducting the experiments.

If didactics also becomes a science whose essence will not be a measure born of the reflection of the four, then it will become the mechanics of education, a craft, a dead method of making people into true human beings. This uncertainty will accompany us throughout the digital age, because it is demonstrative, nominalistic thinking, with a formal, emptied essence, i.e., measures, which testifies to the voluntariness, which in our case must best serve the needs of the market, both concealed and known.

The greatest uncertainty is brought about by deictic, digital thinking, which has a nominalist basis, where brands play a decisive role, where a true statement is represented by a one, and a false statement is represented by a zero. In this inconspicuous way, the truth becomes a brand under which you can add anything that aspires to gain power, which we already see around us every day. The role of symbols, which began to be overused by neo-positivism of a language type (logistics, see the Viennese linguistic circle in the prolongation into the English style of analytical philosophy), has since grown and thoughtlessly multiplied, contributing to the inability to communicate, and has currently culminated in the huge role of computer philosophy in the whole life of society and individuals.

So far, few have noticed, and of course there is fear of the massive capital of computer companies in the world with their connections to politics and law, that little is said about how the thinking of today's young people has changed, that they lack insight into the whole without margo, and that their thinking is often said to be "flat". We can read about such thinking in Heidegger's great works.

If human thinking is controlled only by prescribed systems, then it is only a coherence with what someone has already invented and determined. If this coherence is commanded, then we will have what is called "correct thinking", which has developed very successfully in America, and transforms in a very unobservable way into a new dictatorship that may inflict incredible damage and horror. The way young children in kindergartens and schools are manipulated in an attempt to discover their sexual inclination is reminiscent of the ideological purges that followed the great revolutions.

Even didactics, as the art of learning how to "learn", in this way can turn into a craft that may ultimately harm both the student and the teacher. No mechanical system can save the ability of a teacher to open a student's thinking about

what is closest to human nature, and that is dialogue. Dialogue is dictated by the mood in the classroom, something that cannot be assumed, because only the situation has the mood in the classroom in its power, and no one person has it in their power, because to be "*in situ*" means to be in an open "system", and this is something that cannot be precisely calculated, which is what Heisenberg taught us. Not all theses, having a legitimate role, in some directive judgment, can be based on ontological, and thus gnoseological, assumptions that determine the whole process of thought. Comenius himself knew very well that *pansofia*, *pampaedia*, *panglottia*, *pannuthesia* and *panorthosia* must all be based on the basic premise of the housekeeper, which in his case is God, so he is not only a theologian, but also a philosopher. His didactics cannot be mechanically summarized in the rules of how videos are created as teaching aids, which is becoming the most important part of the state examination for teachers at Czech pedagogical faculties today. In this way, only "correct" practices for teaching others will emerge, and orders will function as the only conditions for good teaching. If there is an order for how to teach, then it is wrong! We must have educated teachers who will base their teaching on their last source, who will include not only love for the child's soul, as Comenius and Masaryk write, but also ontological, gnoseological, and ethical preconditions for didactics, which means first understanding being with and understanding of what is to be learned, and only then comes the question of how to learn it. Each of the four parts is reflected in its own way in the four. "*This mirroring is no presentation of an image. Lighting up each of the four, this mirroring appropriates the essence of each to the others in a simple bringing into ownership*" [1, p. 18]. The phenomenon of "mirroring" must be taken into account in our deliberations. Each student is reflected in everything and is encountered in everything else, and there are tens of thousands of these encounters, and this phenomenon of mirroring in the mirrors of others positions each individual in a "die Ereignung" of tens, maybe hundreds of ways, and all this also educates and prepares a young person for life. We can say that this applies to each of us, whether we are young or old. The phenomenon of mirroring is even more impressive in the case of children and young people, because it is more important to them how others see them, because young people do not and cannot know themselves well enough, and that is why they are "unripe figs". Only through self-knowledge, which has been the basis of philosophy since the time of Pythia in Delphi, Greece, do we know that the results of this mirroring must be recalled by their bearer and subjected to their own balance. Only then is a human personality born (not constructed) before us, as a rare fruit of upbringing and education. On this journey, the teacher must be a guide, not a guardian, and therefore children must bring the prerequisites for this education from home. If they despise the teacher because their parents also despise them, then all the effort is in vain, and the teacher will only look forward to the moment when they retire with their low wages.

Discussion. A pragmatic layout of the world, based only on making money, determines this process from the very beginning in an invisible way, completely unhappily and tragically. This gives rise to significant uncertainty in education. The phenomenon of mirroring is still poorly understood. Heidegger would add: *"This mirroring appropriates the essence of each to the others in a simple bringing into ownership. In this appropriating-lighting way, each of the four reflectively plays with each of the remaining others"* [1, p. 18–19]. Now the reader is no longer surprised when we write that we are all part of the cosmic game (*hieros gamos*), establishing the worlding of the world, and the thinging of the thing, and the self-knowledge of those who are the only ones in the whole living realm to mirror all of these things in simple thinking, which man is able at do, if he is brought up and educated, if he is guided by the intention *"ad Unum vertere!"*. Our politicians, officials, and lawyers should realize that education is not just a pragmatic, objective process that can be established in a market-based way, with market-based purposes. The so-called flat thinking is brought to us by digitality. We do not distinguish between the essential and the insignificant, which is already evident in everyday life. Although the whole of history before the modern age spoke of this preparation for death (*memento mori!*), the modern age seems to consider death as another curable disease. No ontological emergency has even taken place, not even after millions died in the first and second world wars. Belief in enlightened reason has survived unshaken through such "evidence" as the Holocaust, and it is still that way today. It is a belief in the constructability of everything around us, both the human body and the human soul. Everything can be made and constructed, and yet almost no one sees the transformation, "thinging of the thing", into an object made for the market. But if things do not become things from the four and their mirroring, which cannot be reduced to mere causality, then there is no worlding of the world to transform it into an object to capture its shape, which science does very successfully. Findings are vast, but they do not provide insight, only data that overwhelm us, because at the end of this constant measurement, we do not know what to do with them. That is world today – arrogant, forceful, cruel despite all the talk about freedom and democracy.

This, too, is an expression of the cruelty that Hannah Arendt saw as a result of thinking, where decision-making leads unscrupulous, conscientious people who believe in rationalism, just as people once believed and still believe in idols.

The transformation of the world into a system and the transformation of a thing into an object leads to the sameness of objects, i.e., to the desert. Objects do not have recollection, positionality, born from a mirroring of the four. That is why we need advertising, which very often lies to us in public and no one stops to ponder this lie. All this leads to anxiety that penetrates into every cell of our body, into every hidden fold of our soul. This is the root of Heidegger's *"die Furcht"* and *"die Flucht"*. Where does man run to escape this unnamed fear that

devours us from within? To rapture, but not to rapture from the birth of insight and creation, but to rapture that allows us to forget everything for a while, i.e., alcohol, drugs, great power over others.

Through the phenomena of “das Gestell” and “die Machenschaft”, man is positioned into “his life”, which has been multiplied with digitality. The plica that hides this essence is concealed to most, and therefore we seek salvation in what humanity takes from us. There is a complete lack of warmth, common human remorse, basic human judgment. A lack of simplicity! One of the manifestations of the Will to Power is the almost complete absence of the intention to simplicity, which appears as deep and very complex understanding and knowledge. The reader is afraid that they would reveal their ignorance, so they prefer to marvel at the depth of the presented text, which they do not understand at all and are afraid of being disgraced. That is what almost threatens us the most these days. Today’s man is positioned, and because it is the case with everyone, there are no significant differences between us, and we are all replaced immediately by another if we accidentally get lost or die. No one is exceptional, people have no distance from each other (“die Abstandslosigkeit” as Heidegger would say), they are replaceable objects, and therefore from time to time someone burns out and goes crazy. As in the last century where Sicilian women worked best on the treadmill because they were illiterate, today uneducated, and one-sided people work best in the state apparatus, because a creative person would burn out there quickly. The ideal of education, which prefers practice and pragmatism, adapts to this, it amplifies digital thinking, in which characters replace essence. The nominalist way of thinking, which is inherent in digitality, plays a completely decisive role here. Thinking *more geometrico* takes its toll, even though we are at the beginning of this flattening era of thought. “Positionality names the universal ordering, gathered of itself, of the complete orderability of what presences as a whole. The circuit of ordering takes place in positionality and as positionality” [1, p. 28]. “What does this mean? This means that if a cure for COVID-19 is discovered without positionality, then it will not be taken seriously and will be banned even if people die; it is a sign of current cruelty with a mask of democracy and freedom on its face.

Freedom, misunderstood, can become a violent correction of thought; “*The free is the ratio essendi for something empty*” [2, p. 19], says Heidegger in the “Zollikoner Lectures”. *Ratio essendi* is factual thinking, unlike *ratio cognoscendi*, which is only a method of thinking. The same difference is between “die Grundfrage” and “die Leitfrage”. The first question is acceptance, the second is supposition under some type of acceptance. There is often a problem here, for example, if a student does not know the difference between nominalism and realism, as the Middle Ages brought us, he or she cannot understand the difference between factual and non-factual thinking, and will argue without understanding that every supposition is derived from acceptance. Nominalism and

realism are just some of the manifestations of gigantomachia peri tes ousias, i.e., the battle over being, which flared up with full force in ancient Greek antiquity and continues unabated. It is difficult to agree sometimes with mathematicians if they continue to derive the essence only on a mathematical horizon, without the chance to reach beyond the horizon, into philosophy. That is why Patočka sometimes calls mathematicians ingenious technicians. For example, emptiness cannot be removed by completeness in a predetermined space, either real or spiritual, but it must be an accepted emptiness before the idea of original completeness, so it is possible to think of it only as being. *"Ontological phenomena are first in terms of rank [in the meaning of higher and lower rank], but in the possibility it is possible to see them as second"* [2, p. 7], That is why every second person thinks that ontology is something so obvious, something we don't even have to talk about, because it's clear. Most consider beings and their function to be the essence of being. They do not know that beings have to show themselves from something that cannot be seen on its own, i.e., being. Being can only be thought about, because if "it was not", then even the being around us would not arise. This is called the negative path. Imaginary thinking is not enough to understand being in this case, and this has been a big problem throughout the history of philosophy.

"The open, the free, that which is translucent, is not grounded on what is in space. It is the other way around: What is in space is grounded on the open and on the free" [2, p. 9], Likewise, *"Direct acceptance is not an absolute certainty"* [2, p. 11]. Absolute certainty must be inevitable, not just factual certainty, i.e., certainty from data, from a thesaurus of data, as is the case in political sciences and sociology with anthropology, etc. Necessity plays perhaps the most important role. An assertive statement does not have inevitability in itself; therefore, factual truth, to which data and their thesauruses belong, does not have an apodictic inevitability in itself. These are just trends, directions of development, etc. Today's world is based on data, it completely lacks any apodictic certainty; and it is considered correct and normal. Even this basic uncertainty penetrating today's "Abendland" is also the root of the uncertainty in education; and we even argue for uncertainty in education.

We need acceptance, not just supposition below the norms of political establishment, a person who is to have certainty must find it in himself, not just in coherence with the views of the powerful who govern this planet through the media. This is the reason for repeating Patočka's idea that we must live from our own source. *"The need for history is that human freedom must understand in its emptiness, i.e., in all the conditionality of its situation, so that our lives can fully find themselves. To overcome oppression is to overcome criticism in the critique of inanimate traditions and the life-stifling untruths left over from long-aged decisions and in the determined repetition of the possibilities once drawn. That is why history is inseparable from respect, love, hatred, and resistance; only because his-*

tory can be one of the most powerful factors in historical life; therefore, it cannot be a non-participating registrar and hypothetical interpreter of human events. All these things are essential for historical understanding, not only for its literary presentation. And if that is the case, then it follows that history bears witness to human freedom precisely by these peculiarities of its structure; the historian must, in Heidegger's words, want, argue, and honor" [3, p. 45–46].

Uncertainty in education does not have its roots only in an ontological emergency, such as a pandemic, about which it is said in ancient Greek myths that it is the result of Dionysus not being recognized by the people he came to visit. Then he called a pandemic on the people; this is proof that people in ancient times knew about the possibility of ontological emergency, even though they called it otherwise. Plato's tenth book, "Constitution," also discusses this, although in metaphors where souls returning from Hades must not drink too much from the River Lethe (the river of unmindfulness) because they would forget the possibility of ontological emergency in their next life. As soon as they drink a certain quantity, they would forget about *deinos*, the horror born of the ontological emergency, which these souls experienced in the field of Lethe pedion, where everything went into concealment and nothing came into being, i.e., where the essence of being "*physis*" disappeared.

Only we, people of the modern age, think that the ontological emergency with science and technology has disappeared irretrievably, and we can handle everything with our art, diligence, and technology. A big mistake, and we can say the biggest mistake people have ever made.

Conclusion. Today, ordinary people believe that our proud technology will always save us, it is just a manifestation of modern arrogance, nothing more! What drove us to this premise, penetrating our lives, as an obviousness that we never doubt? It is the truth as certainty (*certitudo*), which is based on a previously valid norm, the Cartesian norm, and this norm is a work of will and reason. The truth here is not an unconcealment that we give to ourselves, because we are based on things themselves, not just on the idea of correctness (*orthotes*), as is the case in the need for coherence and compatibility in thinking *more geometrico*. We need a little break in our flight to a brighter future, full of clever objects that will control even the remnants of humanity that still remain inside us.

REFERENCES

1. Heidegger M. *Bremer und Freiburger Vortraege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann Publ., 1994, 182 p.
2. Heidegger M. *Zollikoner Seminare*. Transl. by Medard Boss. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann Publ., 1987, 406 p.
3. Patočka J. *Péče o duši I*. Praha: Oikumene Publ., 1996, 105 p.

Информация об авторе

Анна Хогенова, доктор философских наук, профессор кафедры социальных наук и философии педагогического факультета, Карлов Университет, hogen@volny.cz, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6317-5292> (M. D. Rettigové 4, Прага 1).

Information about the author

Anna Hogenová, Doctor of Philosophical sciences, Professor of Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, Faculty of Education, Charles University, hogen@volny.cz, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6317-5292> (M. D. Rettigové 4, Prague 1).

Поступила: 06.04.2022

Received: April 06, 2022

Одобрена после рецензирования: 16.04.2022

Approved after review: April 16, 2022

Принята к публикации: 18.04.2022

Accepted for publication: April 18, 2022