

NEW EDUCATIONAL PARADIGM: EXISTENTIALISM IS A HUMANISM

¹M. N. Dudina and ²V. I. Dolgova

The article reveals *some of the more* problematic issues and challenges which *fall within the scope of the country's* educational policy. Using the experience of pedagogical reflection based on diachronic and synchronic methods, the author outlines potential solutions of crisis in a new ethical and pedagogical paradigm.

Keywords: chronotope, upbringing, new educational paradigm, existentialism, humanism.

Current chronotope involves scientific and technological advances, innovative gadgets and devices, new kinds and means of human activities and communication; it shows dynamics of social and cultural life with upbringing being a part of it. Innovations require values, goals, content and techniques to be reconsidered. If we agree that our current civilization is more humane than the previous ones (Marx and Engels 1959) we will be right to select humanistic values as necessary criteria for analyzing traditions and innovations, their controversy and integrity, and to obtain a consensus in communicative act (Einstein 2006). To do so we have to address the issues of human existence based on freedom and responsibility, preventing alienation of generations, their creative interaction for obtaining the ethics of personal dignity. It was not common in the past, but now it might be a reliable way of meeting the crisis of upbringing since future is impossible without it.

While trying to ponder over the crisis of upbringing which is innate to post-communist chronotope and the potential solutions lying ahead, we will use diachronic and synchronic methods gluing together the historical genesis – the past, the way “through centuries and countries”, and the present, “here and now”, i.e. the unity of history and modernity, their mutual interdependence and interaction.

The notion of ‘chronotope’ unites time and space (Gr. *chronos* – ‘time’, *topos* – ‘place’) and emphasizes their continuum, integrity and uniformity in humanities as well as in science; their inseparability is also implied overtly and covertly in pedagogy (Hegel 2000; Einstein 2006; Ukhtomsky 1996; Vernadsky 2006; Bakhtin 1975; Gurevich 2009; etc.).

As M. Bakhtin (Bakhtin 1975) puts it, “it is possible to come into the sphere of meaning through chronotope”, so we will therefore use this gate to contemplate

¹ Ural Federal University named after the first President of Russia B.N. Yeltsin, 620137, Russia, Ekaterinburg, Lenin Avenue, 51.

² South Ural State Humanitarian Pedagogical University, 454080, Russia, Chelyabinsk, Lenin Avenue, 69.

upbringing as a process of communication and interaction between children and adults.

It always took place in the exact time and space which affected the set of values and implications of upbringing and education, their goals, content and techniques, both conscious and unconscious pragmatic and spiritual potential.

We assume that unraveling the methodological, theoretical and methodical potential of chronotope in pedagogy and education might be useful for understanding social and cultural transformations leading directly to bifurcation points, destructive lifestyles and distorted system of values, the supremacy of chaos over order, - all of those things which in mundane language might be referred to as 'the lost time' and 'the lost generation'.

In philosophy the concepts of time and space are rudimentary; hence, in pedagogy they are also fundamental (if we consider it to be the 'applied philosophy' (Hessen 1913).

These concepts unify being, consciousness, the ways of communication and various activities, creativity and, of course, values, goals, content, techniques, and the criteria of efficiency of education and upbringing.

In this article we will not deal with ambiguous interpretations of the notions 'time' and 'space', but we will have to take into account that in the West and in the East at some point space was considered to be the form of human existence (co-existence), the process of life changing in time, which was viewed in a linear as well as in a cyclic form, as a spiral, a circle and even as a sinusoid; what mattered most was not the form, but the feeling of appreciation people always had for it.

The development of civilization comes hand in hand with acceleration which allows linking the presence of free time with society's effective development (Marx and Engels 1959), and implies the dependence of social time on social structures (Dudina, 1998) as well as space-time compression (Harvey 2007).

In any case, social and personal time is thus a resource which should be rationally consumed and wisely spread.

This idea was a part of upbringing of young generations of any chronotope.

Our analysis has shown that humanistic educational paradigm (*Gr. paradeigma* – 'pattern', 'example') is potentially compatible with the current chronotope.

It promotes a person with a strong will stimulated by constructive goals, who understands and accepts the hardships of life and possesses necessary skills for overcoming them feeling satisfied for achieving everything himself.

Only freedom evokes responsibility as a feature of person's character growing up during the phases of childhood, adolescence and youth.

Thus it forms the foundation for the feeling of pride that is essential for effective socialization and self-identification.

Then the values of upbringing should be different: they are not innate, for they are socially created; they change *over* time, especially when the era ends, and are interiorized by a person *in* his or her early childhood.

They are responsible for personal development as well as for deformation.

Our children's natural wish to be successful learners, to realize their individual needs and interests is limited by obsolete ineffective techniques of teacher-centered learning and equal requirements to all learners that enhance the sources of personal destruction and children's alienation from educational process.

Obsolete paradigm, criteria of teacher and system efficiency (still calculated quantitatively by the number of medals for *exceptional* academic performance, written reports and scientific projects, students who entered universities, preferably on a state-funded basis) prevent a new educational paradigm from establishing and hinder the development of children as well as of the educational system in general.

Accepting freedom as a responsible choice, modern education and upbringing supported by a legal system defending rights, freedoms and dignity of children ought to demonstrate conformity to freedom themselves.

That requires turning a *regulative function of ethics* with its forced norms and values (which are stimulated externally and imposed using manipulative pedagogical tools) into a *moral* one which can create conditions for acquiring norms and values internally through creative activities with peers and teachers.

It can be obtained by cooperation and interaction with a child in mutual creative quest for mastering skills and gaining experience of previous generations.

We therefore have unraveled a problematic field of pedagogy which can be viewed from two angles.

The first one understands pedagogical system as stable, mechanical and well-balanced where a growing person is perceived as an object, and relationships are based on traditional pedagogy (sociocratic, authoritarian, imperative, assimilative) with its regulative ethics.

As a result, civil rights and freedoms of a person are either neglected or explicitly and implicitly violated.

The second one understands pedagogical system as unstable, non-balanced, where a growing person is considered to be a subject and interacts with adults; the relationships are based on principles of humanism and moral ethics. In this case children's rights, freedoms and dignity are defended.

It should be also stressed that norms, rules and morals imposed externally during the process of upbringing have to be constantly reinforced by a system of punishments and rare rewards, that's why they are not interiorized by the person and are often neglected.

Ethical component conveys axiological aspect of pedagogy and raises a question of what (who) is the goal and what (who) is the means.

This position highlights new methodology, theory and practice which are centered on a growing person who will later gain his or her life experience and freedom to make existential choices and be responsible for them.

Modern scholars tend to link this position with humanization of personality and society through changing moral images of subjects of educational process.

Thus we can talk about *the change of paradigm*.

This notion has fairly recently entered the scientific body of pedagogy, but it is now widely used in terms of defining the set of methodological, theoretical and axiological aspects accepted by scientific communities as a model for solving theoretical and practical tasks.

Paradigm approach in pedagogy has proven its efficiency in academic search of theoretical and methodological foundations and practices of humanism.

According to I. Kant's imperative, a man is a goal and cannot be therefore used as a tool (Kant 1994).

In existentialism humanism is closely connected with freedom ("man is condemned to be free", as Sartre claimed (Sartre 2012) which at the same time denotes total responsibility.

These ideas are reflected in violence-free philosophy, ethics and pedagogy which fight against violence on physical, mental and moral levels.

Talking about humanistic paradigm as an ethical one, we draw attention to violence-free pedagogy.

Ethical and moral aspects of relationships have been thoroughly thought over; for example, take a categorical imperative by I. Kant: "Act considering mankind to be a goal, and never treat people as means" (Kant 1994).

Humanistic ethical component promotes the value of life where the very significance of a child, his rights and freedoms are appreciated. It is realized in framework of categories and concepts of ethical and humanistic pedagogy.

It has *set, proven by life and thought notions* gaining new contents; *notions* of pedagogical theory and practice *once lost and now coming back*; *notions integrated by pedagogy* from other branches; *new notions* of modern pedagogy (Dolgova 2014; Dolgova 2014; Dudina 1998; Dudina 2009; Dudina 2008).

Considerable transformations in framework of categories and concepts of pedagogy actualized such rudimentary for upbringing concepts as life, death, freedom, responsibility, conscience, nonviolence, love, identity, education, interaction, defense and support.

We assume that they form the basis for true pedagogy and upbringing 'by spirit, not by blood' (Hesse 2010). This is the solution for the crisis that reflects not only the current chronotope, but people themselves who are able to appreciate the opportunities of interaction between children and adults based on accepting personal rights, freedoms and dignity.

Considering upbringing to be a unique social institution that can realize one's potential in socially significant ideals and viewpoints and provide future development, we admit its relative independence in reaching results that are sometimes dreadful and sad.

The crisis of development is sometimes mistakenly connected with the not well performed social mandate in a certain chronotope. Its origins lie in the very meaning and purpose of education.

K. Jaspers who studied the meaning of history concluded: "A man always knows more than he knows about himself. He is never the same, he is the path; not only his existence, but the freedom he has makes him believe that he exists" (Jaspers 1994).

This idea is still neglected in upbringing, and the child is treated as a *tabula rasa*. We assume that the crisis of upbringing can be analyzed from the positions of existentialism (*Lat. existentia – 'existence'*).

Existencia implies the existence of the individual as an individual; it is connected with experiencing the meaning of life and in this context experiencing oneself and others, especially in critical situations of individual and social nature which demand transcending, going beyond oneself (Jaspers 1994; Heidegger and Gegel 2015; Sartre 2012; Kamus 1988).

The world around a person is often hostile, even from the very first moments of his or her conception. The disagreement between a person and the world enhances the mystery of human beings. N. Berdyaev wrote that a man "who might be the greatest mystery in the world is not mysterious as an animal, a social being, a part of nature and society, but as a personality with his or her unique destiny" (Berdyaev 1995).

Following the laws of synergy, we can say that the process of self-organization as a sequence of bifurcations has moved the system of upbringing from its initial state, and due to its interaction with new environment it has come to an attractor – the limit state from which it will not return to the initial one.

This limit state is the state of maximum stability in fixed conditions of environment which has the tendencies for humanization and democratization of life.

The idea of personal rights, freedoms and dignity has existential and anthropological origins as *Anthropos* - despite its biological nature – is able to create the world, culture and its own self.

The man is 'set free', 'deprived of specialization', 'unfinished', unpredictable for others and himself, but he is able to transcend. *Anthropos* as an 'open opportunity' is the subject matter of upbringing, and it implies the program of upbringing in freedom, in physical, mental and social non-violence.

In the current chronotope there is a real opportunity for the young to interact with the previous generations and to find the ways out of crisis of upbringing

reconsidering traditions and accepting innovations for changing mentality and therefore the system of values connected with the sacred nature of life and understanding its significance.

It is possible because the functions of generations are now spread in a different way. E. Erikson stated that “taking into consideration a longer lifespan and new gender roles at all stages, when the choice of identity will become a common value and will be guaranteed to any child anywhere, future ethics will be more concerned about the relationships between people, not between generations” (Erikson 1996).

Let us now turn to the notion of identity. E. Erikson defined it as equivalence to one’s own self recognized by others. Every man possesses not only his own past, but the past of those around who, in turn, possess the past of those who are around them, etc.

Every separate man and every generation in general live through the experiences of previous generations (Erikson 1996).. Older generations feeling responsible for newer ones will either find the way to cooperate with the young, or will hinder everybody’s development.

The point is that adults’ ids are stable and generative; the ids of the young are on the contrary still being formed – in a different chronotope, that’s why *a new ethic is* required. “Until a new ethic reaches progress, there is a danger that the limits of technological expansion and national manifestation” will be defined by obsolete ethical implications and outdated ids (Erikson 1996).

Only the interaction between generations creates favorable conditions for successful socialization, identification and future realization of an individual. To interact better, we need to create and preserve *facilitating conditions* (Rogers 1994) as a constructive factor for implementing personal rights, freedoms and dignity.

Psychological and pedagogical support *prevents alienation from the educational process* with its potentially destructive elements (fear, anxiety, anger, aggression, frustration) which might ruin self-confidence and lead to inferiority complex, and *provides means for self-realization* for teachers and students. *The pedagogy of interaction between generations* is promising.

Ergo, current chronotope involves scientific and technological advances, innovative gadgets and devices, new kinds and means of human activities and communication; it shows dynamics of social and cultural life with upbringing being a part of it. Innovations require values, goals, content and techniques to be reconsidered. If we agree that our current civilization is more humane than the previous ones (Toffler 2008), we will be right to select humanistic values as necessary criteria for analyzing traditions and innovations, their controversy and integrity, and to obtain a consensus in communicative act (Habermas 1981).

To do so we have to address the issues of human existence based on freedom and responsibility, preventing alienation of generations, their creative interaction for obtaining the ethics of personal dignity. It was not common in the past, but

now it might be a reliable way of meeting the crisis of upbringing since future is impossible without it.

References

- Bakhtin, M.M. (1975). *Voprosy literatury i jestetiki* [The issues of literature and aesthetics]. Moscow: «Hudozh. lit.».
- Berdyayev, N.I. (1995). *O rabstve i svobode. Opyt personalisticheskoy filosofii* [On slavery and freedom. The experience of personalized philosophy]. M.: Respublika Publ. House.
- Dolgova, V.I. (2014). *Aspekti emotsionalnoy stabilnosti volonterov programmi gerontologii. Dostizheniya v oblasti gerontologii* [Aspects of emotional stability in volunteers of gerontology programs]. *Advances in Gerontology*, 4(4): 278-282.
- Dolgova, V.I. (2014). *Impact of the arch suburb on the state of health, activity and mood of a person. Biosciences Biotechnology Research Asia*, 11: 307-311.
- Dudina, M.N. (1998). *Pedagogika: dolgij put' k gumanisticheskoy jetike* [Pedagogy: a long way to humanistic ethics]. Ekaterinburg: Ural branch.
- Dudina, M.N. (2009). *Razvitie gumanisticheskoy pedagogiki v problemnom prostranstve jekzistencializma* [The development of humanistic pedagogy in the problematic field of existentialism]. *News Ural State Uni-versity. Series 1. The problems of education, science and culture*, 1/2(62): 21-30.
- Dudina, M.N. (2008). *Istorija pedagogiki: dialog paradigm* [The history of pedagogy: the dialogue of paradigms]. Ekaterinburg: Publishing house Ural.un-ta.
- Einstein, A. (2006). *Their dignity and freedom*. M., Jerusalem: Bridges of Culture. Gesharim.
- Erikson, E. (1996). *Identichnost': junost' i krizis* [Identity: youth and crisis]. Moscow: «Progress».
- Gurevich, A. (2009). *Izbranniye trudi. Norvezhskoye obshestvo*. [Selected works. Norwegian Society.]. Moscow: Tradition.
- Habermas, J. (1981). *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns: Bd. II. Zur Kritik der funktionalistischen Vernunft*. Frankfurt.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *Kratkaya istoriya neoliberalizma* [A Brief History of Neoliberalism.]. Moscow: Pokoleniye.
- Hegel, G. (2000). *Fenomenologiya dukha*. [Phenomenology of Spirit.]. Moscow: Science.
- Heidegger and M. Gegel. (2015). *Tr.A.P. Shurbeleva. S. Pererburge : Vladimir Dal*.
- Hesse, H. (2010). *Krisis*. Moscow: Publisher Text.
- Hessen, V. (1913). *Problema narodnogo suvereniteta v politicheskoy doktrine XVI veka* [The problem of popular sovereignty in the political doctrine of the XVI century]. S. Pererburge: Typo-lit E. Schreder.
- Jaspers, K. (1994). *Smysl i naznachenie istorii* [The meaning of history]. Moscow: Respublika Publ. House.
- Kamus, A. (1988). *Isbrannoye: Sbornik* [Selected works: Collection]. Compiled and prefaced by S.Velikovsky. Moscow: Raduga.
- Kant, I. (1994). *Kritika Chistogo razuma*. [Critique of Pure Reason.]. Moscow: Mysl.
- Marx, K., Engels F. (1959). *K Kritike Politicheskoy ekonomii*. [A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy]. *Col.works*, ed. 2, vol. 13. Moscow: Politizdat.

- Rogers, C. (1994). Vzglyad na psihoterapiju: Stanovlenie cheloveka [Psychotherapy: the development of a man]. Moscow: Progress.
- Sartre, J-P. (2012). Transtsedentsiya Ego [The Transcendence of the Ego] Moscow: Modern.
- Toffler, E. (2008). Shok budushego [Future Shock]. Moscow: AST.
- Ukhtomsky, A.A. (1996). Intuitsiya sovesti. [Intuition conscience] S. Pererburge: Peterburgskiy pisatel.
- Vernadsky, V. (2006). Dnevnik 1935–1941 v dvukh knigakh. Kniga 2, 1939–1941 [Diaries 1935–1941 in two volumes]. Vol. 2, 1939–1941], Moscow: Science.