

SUBJECT-OBJECT PARADIGM IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION: POTENTIAL AND BOUNDARIES OF APPLICABILITY

Lyubov Vorobyova

National State Tax Service University of Ukraine

Annotations:

Воробйова Любов. Суб'єкт-об'єктна парадигма у філософії освіти: потенціал і межі застосування

Проаналізовано переваги й недоліки суб'єкт-об'єктної парадигми на прикладах її втілення у теорії пізнання та теорії соціальної дії – на прикладі порівняння з теорією пізнання, яка базується на філософських концепціях комунікації. Виявлено можливості подолання протиставлення теорій суб'єктивності та теорій інтерсуб'єктивності на прикладі взаємообумовленості діяльності суб'єктів і соціальної комунікації у освітньому процесі. Розрізнено традиційну суб'єкт-об'єктну та новітню комунікативну парадигми у філософії освіти: новітня парадигма суб'єктивності реалізується завдяки аналізу взаємного розкриття суб'єктивності усіх учасників освітнього процесу як комунікативного за своєю сутністю. Тим самим потенціал суб'єктивності розкривається залежно від типу комунікації.

Воробьева Любовь. Субъект-объектная парадигма в философии образования: потенциал и пределы применения

Проанализированы преимущества и недостатки субъект-объектной парадигмы на примерах ее воплощения в теории познания и теории социального действия – на примере сравнения с теорией познания, которая базируется на философских концепциях коммуникации. Выявлены возможности преодоления противопоставления теорий субъективности и теорий интерсубъективности на примере взаимообусловленности деятельности субъектов и социальной коммуникации в образовательном процессе. Разграничены традиционная субъект-объектная и новейшая коммуникативная парадигмы в философии образования: новейшая парадигма субъективности реализуется благодаря анализу взаимного раскрытия субъективности всех участников образовательного процесса как коммуникативного по своей сущности. Тем самым потенциал субъективности раскрывается в зависимости от типа коммуникации

Vorobyova Lyubov. Subject-object paradigm in the philosophy of education: potential and boundaries of applicability

The article offers the analysis of advantages and disadvantages of the subject-object paradigm on the examples of its embodiment in the theory of knowledge and theory of social action – on the example of its comparison with the theory of knowledge which is based on the philosophical conceptions of communication. The author has detected possibilities of overcoming oppositions of the subjectivity theories and inter-subjectivity theories on the example of interdependence of the subjects' activity and social communication in the educational process. There have been distinguished the traditional subject-object and newest communicative paradigms in the philosophy of education: the newest subjectivity paradigm is realized owing to the analysis of mutual elucidation of subjectivity among all the participants of the educational process as a communicative one in its essence. Thus, the subjectivity potential is revealed depending on the type of communication.

Key words:

теорія пізнання, теорія соціальної дії, суб'єкт-об'єктна парадигма, інтерсуб'єктивність, комунікація, освітній процес

теория познания, теория социального действия, субъект-объектная парадигма, интерсубъективность, коммуникация, образовательный процесс

epistemology, theory of social action, the subject-object paradigm, intersubjectivity, communication, educational process

Education, by definition of V. Andrushchenko and I. Predbors'ka is a "public process (activity, institution) and the development of self-identity associated with the possession of socially significant experience embodied in the knowledge, skills, creativity skills, sensory-value form of spiritual – practical development of the world. Education – is, firstly, the process of subject-teacher interaction (teacher) and student (student) for the transfer (learning) of knowledge, development of skills, nurturing a culture of thinking and feeling, capacity for independent learning and life-giving activities" [8, p. 8]. In this definition for us it is crucial to address the concept of experience as fundamental – we will try to prove that the multiplicity of experience makes multidimensionality offering education.

Education thesis acquires special weight and credibility in the era of globalization. On the one hand, there are obvious expectations of unification of all human culture and, in particular, educational values based on the unanimous recognition of universal rationality and usefulness of certain knowledge and skills. On the other hand, every

culture, every national system of education, each school and educational tradition demonstrate different ways to these universal knowledge, values and skills. It is our deep conviction that this is due to a fact of unique socio-historical experience of each society and to a certain extent – of every social group and even each individual. Every time experience combines in a special way (to some extent individually) integrity that is recognized by its components, and it is somewhat even universal.

How reliance on such individual experiences and gaining a personal experience does not lead to a situation of "Tower of Babel", i.e. the total mutual misunderstanding? In our opinion, the answer lies in communication, and in our case – educational communication. In education experience is acquired by people not in isolation from each other, but by communication. This communication primarily corrects this experience and enriches it. Focusing on the analysis of global communication framework as special condition of disclosure of individual subjectivity – including an analysis of global educational space – we are convinced that the possibility of a clear distinction between these

different (traditional and modern) paradigm provides the best approach to understanding the theme of subjectivity: the world appears as somewhat constructed subject, more or less subservient to him (Nietzsche, Heidegger), or as a valuable common world of communicative interaction, life world in which subjectivity is one of the manifestations of communicativity (Habermas, Apel).

Therefore, the aim within this paper is to analyze the achievements and problems of subject-object paradigm in the theory of knowledge in its methodology applied to educational issues and identify prospects for its further development.

As for criticism of the traditional understanding of the subject-object approach to the philosophy of education, we support the position that is outlined in the publications by M. Boychenko [2; 3]. In particular, it is a rethinking of the paradigm, which in national philosophy is called subject-subject, as such, essentially expresses the new communicative interpretation of subject-object approach – consistently different from traditionalist. However, we believe that we should not just talk about the transition from theory to action theory of communication and the transition from one version of the subject-object approach to the philosophy of education to another. Indeed, the notion of the subject has not lost importance in modern philosophy of education; one cannot deny its fundamental rethinking of modern philosophy influenced by communication theory. We will consider the specifics of our positions, compared with the idea proposed by M. Boychenko, more.

Philosophy appears not only as a methodology for social change, and change the understanding of social change itself. As M. Boychenko says, representatives of practical philosophy believe that social reality is the only reality of the people who directly interact with each other, and the rest goes on to postulate the superiority of society over the individual, but not the substance of society- as it saw representatives of classical philosophy, and society as a variable and too difficult lesion produced by the same people, though perhaps without their will and consciousness. One of the versions of the study of the first position is the theory of action, and the second – the theory of communication, and each of them claims to limit study of social theory, creating a fundamentally different concept of a systematic approach to social cognition. In our opinion, it is a subject-object approach to the philosophy of education; it is a common platform for removable rigid opposition of theories of action and theories of communication and the emerging semantic field for their approval. A person is subject not only in their actions, but also in communication with others – of course, it is subjectivity seen already in the space of intersubjectivity and its scope of limited actions of others.

M. Boychenko observes that social action theory was developed before the theory of social systems, but only in the works by T. Parsons it was presented as a program for the whole of his theory thesis "Effects of a system". But Parsons does not analyze this thesis in his writings specifically and he learns its significance from his students, particularly from N. Luhmann [6, p. 19]. Not all proponents of the theory of communication appeal to a systematic approach to social cognition, but one of the most famous among that who apply, is N. Luhmann, the author of the original theory of social systems. Advocates of actions often openly criticized the systematic approach, identifying it with holism in social cognition, and the systems themselves – with peculiar subjects of social action [4, p. 359-375], while a systematic approach to the theory of action takes usually hidden application as a principle of consistency in cognition and behavior. This theory of action appears in the writings of Habermas. We believe that the theory of communicative action by Habermas should be included as an addition to the theory of social systems – it promotes the development of his theory of communicative readiness of the subject to the system of interaction with other actors. Although Habermas considers this interaction confined to instrumental rationality, but also communicative action should be considered as part of the system of communication in the society.

In the book "Social System" Luhmann, including outlining the opposition's own theory and the theory of his teacher T. Parsons, explains the difference in understanding of the theory of social systems standpoint of the theory of action (Parsons) and from the standpoint of communication theory (Luhmann). According to Luhmann, rethinking social action theory of Max Weber, Parsons concludes that "social system based on the type of action or in its aspect, and the subject enters the system through the action" [7, p. 193], that is supposedly "connected" to the system. Luhmann himself defends the position, according to which "sociality is not a special case of action, and the action is constituted in social systems through communication and attribution as a reduction of complexity as necessary self simplification of the system" [ibid]. Luhmann interprets theory of action as psycho-logistic that is, given phenomenological terminology applied by Luhmann, sounds like a new version of the classic phenomenological critique of psychological. In our opinion, Luhmann slightly reduces the importance of theory of Parsons – of course, in the interests of better coverage of its own concept of social systems. However, it is impossible to reduce the effect of communication – even in the interests of the interpretation of the functioning of social systems – as the motivation for individual participation in this operation cannot be reduced to psychological aspects, it is systemic. Thus, Luhmann does not solve, but actually hides the need to rethink

the notion of the subject from the standpoint of the theory of social systems.

However, the path to the subject of communication that Habermas offers does not appear to us in all satisfactory. This is a way to recognize the subject in Inter-communication space "between sub world transcendental position of "I" and position inside the world of empirical "I" cannot have any mediation. This alternative eliminates as soon as it acquires the significance of language created intersubjectivity" [4, p. 290]. However, intersubjectivity for Habermas is correlated with communication, not as the latest social reality, but from an intermediary for the special action that creates communication – communicative action. Perhaps as M. Boychenko suggests, Habermas instead of the term "communication" often uses the term "interaction", which emphasizes that communication as interaction decomposed into components "action" – actions that are authentic and original elements of communication and social reality in general [2, p. 12].

In "The Theory of Communicative Action" Habermas analyzes in detail as follows justification, and quoted us a later work "Philosophical discourse of modernism" it actually reduces communicative action to further action that creates discourse – so he reinterprets performative actions that are directed participants communication to each other: "...participants guidance mediated interaction enables speech and other communications are subject to himself than the one that was in the guideline immediate objectification, which also takes viewer with respect to entities in the world" [4, p. 289–290]. Here Habermas reflects conceptual separation of all human actions to those that correspond to the ideal of communicative action aimed only at establishing communication with others, and those that meet the ideal tool actions focused on achieving his own figure, egocentric aspirations. Communicative action underlying structures produced by public and life-world, while instrumental – the basis of administrative structures and social systems are produced. As you can see, Habermas is narrowed understanding the subject-object relationship – in fact, only as a tool. Here he, in our opinion, loses understanding the nature of the subject-object communication.

Thus, Habermas, not hiding it, tries to make a social philosophy subordinated to the logic of ethics: social structures are the result of our own actions: moral behavior (motivated by our everyday world) produce public structures and immoral (motivated by social systems) – administrative structure. So, everything in society that is not directed at communication that is non-personal and super-personal in nature is evil. Although Habermas avoids formulating this conclusion, which is derived from the philosophy of Rousseau, but it is most logically

followed from its basic provisions. In order to "justify" social systems and products inspired by their instrumental action, Habermas recommends their subordinate entities of the public, and thus subordinate social life-world systems [5, p. 60–65].

According to M. Boychenko, ethics is a bad adviser in the methodology of social cognition [2, p. 13]. Ethical assessment of social theory and social reality is justified and extremely important, but it substitutes a rational methodology of social cognition of axiological constructs, even ethical, inappropriate. It should be added that what is called the ethics of Habermas and Apel – only one version of ethics. The methodology of social cognition of ethics is still needed – here we do not agree with M. Boychenko. But not in the role of communication offered by the founders of philosophy – ethics is not a substitute for such a methodology, and its part as a special type of subject-object interaction related to the concept of moral responsibility for their own actions. Especially convincing is demonstrating field of education, where the position of a teacher only has the potential to be morally higher and real moral authority yet to earn his actions that are not reduced to rules of communication, but only specify these rules, giving them meaning and power.

Following M. Boychenko, we focus more on ethical reasoning of representatives of communicative philosophy, which is more consistent and transparent in manner, in comparison with the works by Habermas, presented in the writings by K.-A. Apel. We will add to this analysts own philosophical and educational reflection, and critical reflection. Apel directly raises the question of the need to limit study of social cognition. Like Habermas, he tries to rationalize justification to criticize the methodology of social cognition [1, p. 26]. As we remarked above, in communication, especially education, limiting justification cannot be of any logical structure, and contextual and deeply subjective decision – this is due to the uniqueness of existential frontier of communication, which is located at the base of each communicative act, although not always explicitly .

However, Apel is also talking about some special communication and communication is fundamentally ethical, then, as remarked by M. Boychenko can really talk about different ways to limit justification – ethical communication can be based on the decisions or individual, or current practice behavior [2, p. 13]. The first position in his time is defended by Kant, the second by Hegel. And communication principles of ethical behavior do not exclude the possibility of adopting a moral person on duty. Another thing – what impact this decision will have on communication, which has general public – or rather global. These effects, of course, are much more tangible through modern mass communication, but not talking about the dependence

of the communication and mechanisms of functioning of individual decisions.

Yet for Apel responsibility of the individual, and thus the ethical justification of its position are crucial. It should be noted that the responsibility still has not only an ethical dimension – this, in our opinion, is not the main error of Apel. After all, only on ethical grounds it is possible, in his opinion, interpretation and legitimation of social systems: "It is through your own life and practical knowledge necessary system making and preservation of systems and through publication of theoretical knowledge transcends the scope of purely functionally explicable: it actualizes itself inevitably to audience the question of responsibility carried by system making, and with it the question of interpretation and legitimation of the system" [1, p. 28]. As M. Boychenko rightly observes about Apel wishful thinking – the system does not need to be theoretically interpreted and theoretically legitimated [2, p. 13]. As observed by Apel, system making and preservation system is vital practically necessary, but as a detailed analysis of Luhmann [7], they are made by self identification, but not at the expense of itself. Even L. Wittgenstein in analyzing language games noted that there may be both verbal and non-verbal ways of translation. Yes, sometimes even educational communication behavior of a teacher could confirm or deny his theoretical calculations.

Yes, and Apel criticizes the theory of social systems and he is much more cautious than trying to portray them. "We cannot agree that the goals of human action and even knowledge, as knowing of sense, if they are subject to be viable, functional requirements of system making; cannot agree with that definition of legitimate prerequisites as conditions – according to these theorists – and spiritual life system making of social functions and, accordingly, should be considered as system preserving conditions sufficient to explain all human intentions, including claims knowledge of the truth" [1, p. 27]. As M. Boychenko says, Apel does not deny the fact that social reality is basically a reality of functioning of social systems; it only quite gently seeks to protect the identity of a personality [2, p. 14]. It even gives legitimacy he had at the mercy of the theory of social systems, reserving obviously some human intention – as yet not all such intentions and explains the functions of system making and system preserving. This can be answered, firstly, that all did this. And, secondly, we note that Apel fighting with the enemy, which is designed in his own imagination. In the theory of social systems of Luhmann, according to M. Boychenko, a person has both autopoetical system which has much more autonomy and freedom than Habermas and Apel "give" him, including personality in problem solving systemic rationality.

The solution to this dilemma of personality and social systems as different autopoetical forms, in our opinion, should still look for ways to fundamental subjectivity of social systems – these systems do not operate independently from man, they cannot function on another "substrate" – animals or computers do not replace the person in communication. This is particularly evident in education.

Overall our opinion coincides with position of M. Boychenko. In his opinion, a person is not only an autonomous system, but he is a member of social communication, he is the bearer of consciousness – consciousness is involved in the implementation of communication (with personality), no less than in some of the "autonomous" individual [2, p. 14]. It should be noted that the bearer of consciousness is the same person as the subject. This fact is "not noticed" by Habermas and Apel. They removed human subjectivity, dissolving it in pseudo universal characteristics of intersubjective world. Long-term effects of this are to create an abstract image of man as a member of globalization. Personality becomes clean (empty) to participate in the globalization process, whereas in reality it is the specific subject of these processes with their own concrete historical outlook, his certainty to valuation, and therefore with quite original motivation for participating in communication and solving its problems from local to global scales. Habermas, Apel, and Luhmann refer to the schematic globalization, which is inevitably detached from the concrete life of the subject.

They are part of the individual in communication system on the basis of automatic means of enslavement of the individual, including the loss of his needs to "free" ethical choice of autonomy. This corresponds to M. Boychenko as follows [2, p. 15]. First, Luhmann himself in the "Community" pays attention to the central theme of introspection system through a person involved in its operation – this final section is devoted to this work. Secondly, ethical behavior tied to "free" choice of the individual; Habermas and Apel make problematic system of justification of responsibility. If he makes an ethical choice in his conscious he will be justified only by his conscious. How adequate this solipsychal ethics is – the question, in our opinion, is rhetorical. And there is no "mantra" for "free" discourse, which still cannot overcome and surpass the court of conscience of the individual, the case is not solved. This discourse will be at best "advisory vote". So the problem cannot be solved with people. And even more – with the problems of society. So you can only achieve "self" recognition and not recognized, which Habermas appeals actively in the same mode of "mantras". This criticism should be added that M. Boychenko somewhat idealized position of Luhmann. It does not overcome the solipsism of the individual, but rather, in our opinion, it replaces

solipsism of social and systemic rationality. Since the decision to communicate within a system does not mean anything for other systems. Only concrete social life of the subject systems are in fact interrelated in unique way.

For M. Boychenko when it comes to the choice of basis for limiting study of social theory and explanation of possibilities and limits of a systematic approach, two opposite strategies are outlined: one is represented by the theory of action that protects, in particular, Habermas and Karl-Alexander Apel, the second – the theory of communication, perhaps the most consistently developed by N. Luhmann [2, p. 15]. The difference between them lies primarily in the fact that the first is spreading in rationality of action as to the scope of the individual and to the field of social systems, while Luhmann fundamentally separates rationality of action and systemic rationality. We think that a third alternative should be offered – the reconciliation of social action theory and the theory of social systems in the new paradigm of subject-object interaction. After all, only the subject can link together the various meanings of social systems – but the subject as a member of social communication, not only as a carrier of identity (following Hegel model). Therefore, we agree in general only with the opinion of M. Boychenko that rational action is related (in our opinion, deeply) with the philosophy of the subject. This philosophy today is received fundamental criticism and scope of meaningful use severely restricted after the works of M. Heidegger, particularly after his criticism of European nihilism in the classical work "Nietzsche" [9, p. 27–224]. Although Habermas appeals to communicative reason [4, p. 287-318] and Apel appeals to moral principles by post [1, p. 91-135] declare they overcome the philosophy of the subject, his irrational defense of the theory of action are, according to M. Boychenko actually refuted by these declarations [2, p. 16]. Apel even more consistently and openly returned to transcendentalism (albeit modified) of subject philosophy of Immanuel Kant.

Universalism according to Apel and Habermas is universalism based on the philosophy of the subject and the logic of social action, and not the philosophy of communication. It seems that the philosophy of the subject is not so incompatible with the philosophy of communication – such difference shows only the traditional philosophy of the subject, which is also criticized by Heidegger. Modern philosophy just needs to find common ground between philosophy and the philosophy of the subject of communication, and can serve as a guide to existential philosophy of Karl Jaspers's communication. Only in this perspective we appeal to M. Boychenko with the rationality of the system and it is the only adequate expression of the rationality of social communication. Only

on the basis of systemic rationality of personality not only in his thoughts, and indeed almost every moment of rationality involved in the communication. This rationality is not subject to court action rationality, it is not entirely clear to the mind, as it appears in the case of rational action. Rationality communication involves not only knowledge about opportunities to participate in communication, but also knowledge about the extent of such participation that cannot rationally justify and should just accept it. Rationality action should not be seen as the last human subjects reality – its basis should be recognized by rational worldview that expresses the fullness of the experience, as opposed to fragmentation and presents the experience in action.

That is why the theory of action as justification for limiting systemic approach to social cognition produces in the history of philosophy more or less explicit utopia – tend to appeal to morality, under cover of which can justify failure and theoretical explanations and practical abuses under the guise of protecting individual freedom. That is why the concept of freedom was one of those which depart from social theory in its system-theoretical versions. Ability to select from among the available alternatives is not identical to the complete arbitrariness of action as well as other actions, claiming the status of social creativity (defending the supporters of the theory of action). In order to become a social action works, it must meet the conditions of communication – how many "brilliant" discoveries remained unknown to mankind, or even their authors have been brought in institutions for the mentally ill people. These conditions of communication should be sought not only in social systems, and above all – the philosophical basis of a person's behavior. World Vision also should be investigated not from the standpoint of the philosophy of consciousness, as it constructs and philosophy from the standpoint of communication, such as characterizing a person as a party to the living world, which is a common world of a communicative community.

Therefore, we analyzed the advantages and disadvantages of the subject-object paradigm on examples of its application to the theory of knowledge and theory of social action – for example, comparison of the theory of knowledge, which is based on the philosophical concepts of communication. The possibilities of overcoming opposing theories of subjectivity and intersubjectivity theory as an example of interdependence of social and communication in education. Disparate traditional subject-object and new communicative paradigm in philosophy of education is: if the traditional way focuses on the subjectivity of teaches or students, the modern paradigm of subjectivity is realized by analyzing

the mutual disclosure of subjectivity of all participants in the educational process as communicative in nature. Thus, the potential subjectivity depends on the type of communication. Globalization is presented as meeting of various projects of subjectivity, which is their mutual valuable coordination. Education is a specific communicative area, which is a prerequisite for other types of communication.

References

1. Apel, K.-O. (2009). *Discourse and responsibility : Problem of transition to the post-conventional morality*. Kyiv : Dukh and Litera [in Ukrainian]
2. Boychenko, M. I. (2010). Theory of action and theory of communication as borderline grounding of the system approach in the social knowledge. *Practical philosophy*, 1 (35), 11—16. [in Ukrainian].
3. Boychenko, M. I. (2009). Philosophical grounds of the system approach applicability in the educational sphere. *Politological reporter*, 45, 95—107 [in Ukrainian].
4. Habermas, J. (2001). *The philosophical discourse of modernity*. Kyiv : Chetverta khvylya [in Ukrainian].
5. Yermolenko, A.N. (1994). *Ethics of responsibility and social existence of man*. Kiev : Naukova dumka [in Russian].
6. Luhmann, N. (2007). *Introduction into the system theory*. Moscow : Logos [in Russian].
7. Luhmann, N. (2007). *Social systems. The outline of the general theory*. St.-Petersburg: Nauka [in Russian].
8. *Philosophy of education : study guide* (2009). (Andrushchenko, V. and Predbors'ka, I., Ed.). Kyiv : M. P. Drahomanov National Pedagogical University Press [in Ukrainian]
9. Heidegger, M. (2006). *Nietzsche. In 2 volumes*. Vol. 2. Moscow : Vladimir Dal' [in Russian].

Information about the author:

Vorobyova Lyubov Serhiivna

lubava_61@mail.ru

National State Tax Service University of Ukraine,

31 Karl Marx Street, Irpin',

08201, Ukraine.

doi:10.7905/vers.v0i2.575

Received at the editors' office: 20.05.2013.

Accepted for publishing: 13.06.2013

Translation: Iryna Barantsova

