

Tiurina Tamara Georgiyivna – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, PhD, Associate Professor of the Department of Sociology and Social Work Department Lviv Polytechnic National University (Lviv, Ukraine). E-mail: tamaratyurina@yandex.ru

Тюріна Тамара Георгіївна – кандидат педагогічних наук, доктор філософії, доцент кафедри соціології та соціальної роботи НУ «Львівська політехніка» (Львів, Україна). E-mail: tamaratyurina@yandex.ru

UDC 378.032

MAN OF CULTURE IN THE ASPECT OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONCEPTS: A RETROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS

A. S. Ushakov

The article is dedicated to the analysis of anthropological conceptions of man of culture. It is pointed that a man of culture is the person, that lays the beginning or the principle of his essence, not relying herein neither on nature, nor on any other external factor. The problem of self-expression is considered as the main problem of man of culture. This problem is directly related to the simulation of reality problem. Intense activity of man of culture expressed in his creativity is only expected to eliminate this problem. It brings to the focus a man-creator, man of culture. Only all-round research of man of culture phenomenon is able to help us understand the way mankind moves.

Keywords: *Man of culture, anthropological conception, cultural paradigm.*

General problem statement and its connection with the important scientific and practical tasks. The level of historical development of culture reflects the level of historical development of mankind. People live in a particular environment of culture, are formed in it. Accordingly, the change and transformation experienced by the culture, are reflected in each individual person, to whom this culture applied. They are connected primarily with the fact that we are living in a time of the next change of cultural paradigm, the essence of which is that the inclusion of a person to

the culture should be not only on the level of acquired characteristics, but also on the level of its nature.

It is not limited to changes in technology, communication or any other changes. In the XXI century, changes in technology will no longer play such an important role, as it was in XX century, something else takes and will take their place, something that is less determined in terms of the familiar materiality. Hence the man must become the other – such that in recent years has increasingly been called the “man of culture”. This concept, despite the fact that it is not new for the Humanities, only in the past twenty years has started acquiring special importance and attracting a growing number of researchers.

Analysis of recent researches and publications which initiated solving this problem and are relied upon by the author. The last stage of the development of the concept of “man of culture” begins with a series of short but meaningful comments that V. S. Bibler makes regarding the inevitable turn of external determinants of human existence into internal – as into the only source of the originality and universality of “man of culture” of the XXth century. [5, p. 369, p. 377] This means that the “man of culture” himself lays a beginning or principle of his essence, without relying neither on nature nor on any other external factor. Understanding this greatly extends the range of our sources – at the expense of researchers who, although did not use the term “man of culture” in their writings, but, in fact, made a significant contribution to the development of this concept, laying the theoretical basis for the analysis of the current state of the problem decision in the study of human culture from the anthropological viewpoint. They are D. L. Andrieiev, M. M. Bakhtin, W. Benjamin, G. Baudrillard, G. Deleuze, V. Y. Davydovych, V. E. Ilyenkov, I. A. Ilyin, M. S. Kagan, O. F. Losiev, M. McLuhan, M. K. Mamardashvili, E. S. Markarian, V. M. Mezhujev, J.-P. Sartre, I. Franko, M. Foucault, O. Spengler, C. Jaspers, etc.

The selection of the unsolved parts of the general problem outlined in this article. The novelty of this research consists in comparative analysis of various anthropological concepts of human culture, both those that point directly to this issue, and those that require applying the in-depth contextual analysis method.

The formulation of the aim of the article. The aim of the article: by means of the retrospective analysis of the anthropological concepts of the man of culture, to develop a proper understanding, definitions and coverage of this concept, which would give the possibility to effectively use it in practice.

To achieve this goal it is required to fulfill the following **tasks**:

1) to analyse the tangents of the concept of man of culture;

2) to detect the path to the appropriate understanding, definition, and perceiving of this concept, which would enable its productive use in pedagogical research.

The main material of the research with full justification of the scientific findings. Every concept arises, exists and manifests itself in a particular context. Unfortunately, we have to paraphrase M. K. Mamardashvili and say that those things that seek to be expressed, never fully realize their intention to be expressed because the meaning of the expression must be placed in the appropriate form, but in this form there always something has been already placed, and this something does not allow to place really relevant content there. Mamardashvili calls this problem “the problem of self-expression.” [13, p. 7] It helps us to understand why the *content of the concept* of man of culture is not always well correlated with the *notion* of man of culture as a *form* in the following understanding: the concept of man of culture is fundamentally connected with the human need of *self-expression*. Therefore, we can formulate *the main problem of human culture*: the form, in which the concept of human culture accordingly has to be expressed, *has been already occupied* by some other concept, which behaves like *a simulacrum*. Accordingly, for the concept of man of culture to take its proper place, without which the existence and implementation of man of culture is fully impossible, it is necessary first to eliminate this simulacrum. This challenging task refers us directly to the concepts of J. Baudrillard and Zh. Deleuze, which should help us to understand the essence of the simulacrum.

Baudrillard distinguishes “three orders of simulacra: *counterfeit ... production ... simulation*.” “The first order simulacrum operates on the basis of the natural law of value, the second order simulacrum operates on the market law of value, a simulacrum of the third order – on the structural law of value.” [6, p. 87] The result of simulacrum is “the loss of the likeness’ which place is substituted by binary sign programming” [6, p. 96]: “Every sign, every message ... appears before us as a question/answer”, that is, as “a system of continuous testing ... knowledge of code ... which is included in every message ... or thing... .” So there are “certain patterns of individuals who perceive.” [6, p. 102, p. 104] Therefore, any original *expression of the addressee* is excluded from the outset: it is not provided in *the message*. According to the concept of M. Foucault, the activities of man of culture contain the aspect of unpredictability, and every unpredictable action is

regarded by society as a manifestation of “abnormal” (according to Baudrillard, in the medium of text messages any action is regarded as a response to a particular message; as for Foucault, any response is seen as an action): the modern procedure for determining the existence of a state of “abnormality” is directly connected with the procedure of detecting the code violation (violation of a particular system of rules) that “allows to represent the image of life as something identical to the crime” – because the existence of the offense is determined on the basis of *the law*, “which must precede the offense.” [20, p. 37] That is the only *action in advance stipulated* by the law as legitimate, should be recognized as such, the same actions that *deviate* from the intended act standard of legality should be defined as misconduct; and this definition extends to the whole way of life. It is clear that with this approach, no *genuine expression* will be regarded by law as legitimate and normal action. The law operates here, in fact, as a text message that determines standardized answers.

In the concept of Deleuze, the unpredictability of man of culture is a necessary reaction to the chaotic situation in which he is located. Deleuze refers to the classical sources for an explanation of this situation; in particular, to Plato’s dialogue “the Sophist”, where he finds the concept of *two types of images*: good, which is *a copy of the object*, and bad, which is *a simulacrum, or a ghost*. A copy, according to Plato, is the image based on the perception of the observer, [17, p. 236] the simulacrum is a false image, however it claims the status to which it has no right to claim by its *origin*, by its *nature*. But *the structure* of simulacrum somehow *forces us* to accept it as genuine, and this leads to a violation of the true order of perception making true knowledge impossible. Since culture is knowledge, expressed in a certain way, the lack of knowledge leads to the lack of culture, and hence to the impossibility of the existence of the man of culture. In this respect, the role is given to simulacrum – because “in a good copy there is always the procedure, that generates it”; in relation to the simulacrum, “imitation ... is, however, only the simulation [of the idea].” [7, p. 336]

But that’s not all. If we put the problem of knowledge but not the problem of consciousness at the basis of our questions and cognition is considered in terms of communication, then we can talk about the *reproduction of ready-made samples* like, say, M. McLuhan does, that is, as “extensions of man outward – to the stage of the technological simulation of consciousness, when the creative process of cognition will be collectively and corporately distributed to the whole human society... .” [12, p. 5] Here McLuhan introduces the subject of the message, which he defines as medium

(medium), that is a particular technology of impact on humans. “The impact of technology does not happen at the level of opinions or concepts; it changes the proportions of the sensual, or samples of perception, consistently and without resistance. A serious artist is the only one who is capable of meeting with technology face-to-face without harm for himself, and because he is the expert who is aware of the changes in sensual perception.” [12, p. 22–23]. That’s why today “... we want to gain a foothold in our own culture.” [12, p. 23] So, according to his conception, the man of culture is at the forefront of society taking responsibility for his future.

A true artist creates *effective* images that are able to withstand simulacrum. This is, in fact, the concept of D. L. Andrieiev, who said that “the images of art are more vast and multifaceted than the aphorisms of theosophism or philosophical arguments. They leave more freedom to the imagination, they leave everyone [the opportunity] to interpret the doctrine as it is more organic and understandable for their personality.” That is why “no one can have more powerful and bright impact on mankind than a brilliant artist of the word who became a visionary and a saint and who was placed at the height of world’s leadership of public and cultural change.” [1, p. 20] Actually, the artist who strongly affects society, creating a culture with their creativity, is the man of culture, as for Andrieiev.

So far *self-expression* has been considered as something self-valued, and therefore everything that interfered with it has been regarded as the problem of self-expression that we have also identified as a problem of the man of culture. However, M. M. Bakhtin offers a different concept – *the concept of self-expression in the process of understanding the other*. It turns out that the other is not a problem for my self-expression, on the contrary, it is its *meaning*. If so, then the man of culture exists precisely because of the existence of *the other*. More precisely, he exists thanks to his stay *outside* of it. This “causes a certain area of my exceptional activity, that is, of the combination of such internal and external actions that only I can do against the other, that are completely unavailable for him from his position outside of me, actions, that fill the other in those moments where he himself is unable to fill.” [2, p. 23–24]. And it is not the other who substitutes my consciousness, forcing it to accept the simulation as reality, but *me* who use his means of self-expression as a “technical device of penetrating in him,” as “the way of penetrating in him and almost merging with him from the inside.” [2, p. 25] This procedure is a prerequisite for “aesthetic activities,” which “starts ... then when we return to ourselves, and in our place ... prepare and complete the material to use ...” *I process* the material of his self-

expression that I got from inside of him, that is, *creatively* perceive it, and this material does not have the function of the message now but the new, *final* function: the position of his body, which told us about the suffering and led us to his inner suffering, now becomes purely plastic value, the expression that embodies and completes the expressed suffering ... And all these values, completing the image of him gleaned by me from the excess of my vision, my will and feeling.” [2, p. 26] Thus, the man of culture, on the concept of Bakhtin, makes its self-expression by providing opportunities to express himself to *the other*.

As for A. F. Losiev, expression is “*the equal distinction of internal and external.*” [11, p. 45] It is possible in three forms: *the schematism, allegory and symbol*. If the image as the result of the expression, “embodies the idea that is strange to its material, ... this idea, this “internal” is a method of combining separate parts, bare *scheme*.” [11, p. 46] *Allegory* is “the “image” as an *illustration* of how ... explanation of the idea ... is not essentially connected with the very idea. The symbol is based on the formula: “In the “image” there is nothing that would not exist in the idea itself.” [11, p. 48] Losiev notes that “*the same expression, according to the way it relates to other semantic or expressive physical forms, can be a symbol, and allegory and the scheme at the same time.*” [11, p. 51] If it is the *application* of a certain idea, it is a *scheme*. (From this point of view, for example, *the image* of the offender/abnormal, as it is depicted in Foucault, is a *scheme* because it is the result of applying to a person a predetermined *idea* embodied in the form of *law*. *An allegory* is “a visual example” decoding the message (in terms of Baudrillard). *A symbol* is a *completed* image: both internal and external are merged into the indestructible unity.) If you look at the notion of symbol proposed by Losiev, you can see that symbol is the first candidate for the role of “an icon”, object of *worship*, an idol. This is the status that Losiev gives to a notion of *identity*: “... personality is always an expression, and therefore such is fundamentally *symbol*.” [11, p. 75] Thus, Losiev formulates the concept of the man of culture as a symbol.

In search of a means of creating a symbol, let us refer to W. Benjamin. Analyzing the peculiarities of the motion pictures, he notes: “... for the first time – and this is the achievement of the movie the man finds himself in a position where he must act with his whole living personality, but without the aura.” [3, p. 38–39] In each shot the person should be *fully* represented as a symbol. The purpose of this image is “the product of the controlled action ... which could be followed ...” The audience, mimicking the cinematographic image, needs to create an absent aura: the moment of their connection, in

fact, would be the moment of creation of symbol. To achieve this effect, the image should be perceived *naturally, easily*, without resistance. Actually, the natural *effect of the existence* of the image is the determining factor here. The main thing, as for Benjamin, that determines an effective image is the creating a certain effect. The image that creates no desired effect, cannot become a symbol, and hence cannot be perceived as a personality. Conversely, a spectacular image is automatically perceived as a personality or as a personality trait and, thus, leads to a specific action (reaction). Thus, the concept of Benjamin, the man of culture should create a certain effect, which will force you to take him as exactly the man of culture, and not as something else.

J.-P. Sartre is known as the author of the following statement: “Man is primarily a project that is experienced subjectively, he is not moss, not mold and not cauliflower.” [17, p. 323] In this project, there is an amount of techniques and qualities that let it to be made and determined, precede its existence. “... In this case we deal with a technical view of the world, according to which production precedes existence.” [17, p. 322] Man *exists* from the beginning and he *is not made* of any preassigned set of elements, joined together according to a certain externally imposed plan. This is the essence of the concept of the man of culture. Sartre is convinced that “each of us chooses himself”: “Indeed, none of our actions in the process of creating an individual as we would like us to be, would not create at the same time the image of a man as he, in our opinion, should be. To choose means to simultaneously affirm the value of what we choose ... If ... our existence precedes our essence and if we want to exist, creating at the same time our image, this image is significant for our era as a whole.” [17, p. 324]

It is the image that we create, determines the effect of perception of us by others. What is the primary impulse that leads a man – the creator of image to his creative activity? I. A. Ilyin says it is a mysterious voice “which calls [a man] to *perfection* ... and the desire to respond to the call and finding ways forward to perfection, gives a person the dignity of *the spirit*, brings *spiritual meaning* to his life and reveals to him the opportunity to create a true culture on the earth. ... And the first thing every person needs, the person who wants to create culture, is the feeling of his *originality, commitment and responsibility*.” [9, p. 300]

If this feeling is carefully cultivated, a system of actions aimed at creating a certain ideal of the man of culture can be designed on its basis. But to create a man means to educate him. The concept of bringing up the man of culture we can find in K. D. Ushynskiy. According to Ushynskiy, “the special

idea of education of each nation is, of course, a very special idea about person, about what man should be according to the people’s concept in the period of national development. Every nation has its own ideal of man and demands from education to nurture this ideal in individuals.” [18, p. 122]

For realization of the ideal that is the man of culture, we need the appropriate conditions. Every existence takes place in a particular environment. A particular feature of a human being, according to Karl Jaspers, is that he, at least partially, creates his own environment: “Living in the environment, partly created by himself, is a feature of the very essence of man. In the created environment, he feels not only a result of liberation from his needs but also the impact of the beauty, symmetry, and the forms he created. He claims his reality to the extent of expanding his environment.” [22, p. 117–118] Through the creation of his own environment the person goes into the creation of his own culture: he is like under the hood of culture and any manifestation of it is a touch of culture.

The defining environment for humans, according to O. Spengler, is culture. “... The first thing that stands as an inevitable fate before a man and that cannot be understood, cannot be changed by someone’s will or opinion, is the time and place of his birth: each person is born rooted in a certain nation, religion, status, time, and culture. ... With his birth given are his nature and range of possible problems for him, inside of which there is a rightful place for freedom of choice.” [21] Thus the concept of Spengler lies in the fact that man by his position of embeddedness in culture is bound to be the man of culture.

But culture operates not in an abstract way, but through its media, those who can be called “people of culture”, first and foremost, they are its creators: the poets, artists, etc. How does the man of culture *act*, how does he change the environment in which he was born? The answer to this question can be found in Ivan Franko. “... The suggestion [of the poet] has ... to touch the inner being of the reader, giving him a new *grain of life experience*, a new practice and at the same time, combining something new with the stock of experiences that are active or which are dormant in the soul of the recipient. To say it briefly: the poet expands the contents of our inner “I” touching it to a greater or lesser depth.” [19, p. 46] It means that the man of culture by his creative action from the outside on people, creates in them a new *reality*, which, in turn, does manifest itself in some way to the outside, causing some changes there. Thus, the concept of Franko’s culture is that through his creative activity the man of culture influences the world.

It is the *activity* aspect of man that is, in the opinion of such scholars as V. S. Bibler, V. Y. Davydovych, M. S. Kagan, E. S. Markarian, V. M. Mezhuiev, etc., are essential for understanding culture. Bibler notes that “in the culture a man creates his image (lifestyle, way of activity) as something separate and detachable from his body, as his being outside himself *in the world*.” [4, p. 112] According to Kagan, “under activities you must understand *the way humans exist* and it would be legitimate ... to define them as Homo agens, i.e., *acting man*.” [10, p. 5] Markarian considers the world as a complex system, the importance of which is “... to be its adaptive function” [14, p. 55] and, therefore, any activity, the man’s of culture activity, is *the mode* of activity of this system aimed to adapt to the environment in the broadest sense of the word. Davydovych approaches culture as *the way* of activity [8, p. 80], meaning by this a specific mechanism or technology for the production of cultural products. And finally, in Mezhuiev, culture appears not as the modus and not as a method of operation of a unified system, but as an independent system “created in the process of *human* activities in their relationships with others, linking people in time and space ... [and] defining the existence of man as a person, as a creator, the subject of this relationship.” [15, p. 302–303]

Conclusions and prospects for further research in this direction

In the process of analysis of philosophical literature on problems of man and culture:

- 1) analyzed are the concepts of the man of culture;
- 2) defined is the path to the appropriate understanding, definition, and perceiving of this concept, that creates the prospect of its productive use in practice, and further research in this direction.

References

1. Andreev D. L. Roza mira [Rose of peace] / D. L. Andreev – Moscow: Prometei, 1991. – 289 p.
2. Bakhtin M. M. Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva [Aesthetics of verbal creativity] / M. M. Bakhtin – Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979. – 424 p.
3. Ben'yamin V. Proizvedenie iskusstva v epokhu ego tekhnicheskoy vosproizvodimosti [The Works of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction] / V. Ben'yamin – Moscow: Medium, 1996. – 240 p.
4. Bibler V. S. Myshlenie kak tvorchestvo (Vvedenie v logiku myslennogo dialoga) [Thinking as Creativity (Introduction to the logic of mental dialogue)] / V. S. Bibler – Moscow: Politizdat, 1975. – 399 p.
5. Bibler V. S. Ot naukoucheniya k logike kul'tury: Dva filosofskikh vvedeniya v dvadtsat' pervyy vek [From science studies to the logic of culture: Two

- philosophical introduction to the twenty-first century] / V. S. Bibler – Moscow: Politizdat, 1990. – 413 p.
6. Bodriyyar Zh. Simvolicheskiy obmen i smert' [Symbolic Exchange and Death] / Zh. Bodriyyar – Moscow: Dobrosvet, 2000. – 387 p.
7. Delez Zh. Logika smysla [Logic of sense] / Zh. Delez – Moscow: Raritet, Ekaterinburg: Delovaya kniga, 1998. – 480 p.
8. Zhdanov Yu. A. Sushchnost' kul'tury [The essence of culture] / Yu. A. Zhdanov, V. E. Davidovich – Rostov-na-Donu: RGU, 1979. – 264 p.
9. Il'in I. A. Put' k ochevidnosti [Path to the evidence] / I. A. Il'in. – M.: Respublika, 1993. – P. 291–403.
10. Kagan M. S. Chelovecheskaya deyatelnost'. (Opyt sistemnogo analiza) [Human activity. (Experience of system analysis)] / M. S. Kagan – Moscow: Politizdat, 1974. – 328 p.
11. Losev A. F. Dialektika mifa [Dialectics of myth] / A. F. Losev // Filosofiya. Mifologiya. Kul'tura [Philosophy. Mythology. culture]. – M.: Politizdat, 1991. – P. 21–186.
12. Maklyuen M. Ponimanie Media: Vneshnie rasshireniya cheloveka [Understanding Media: The external expansion of human] / M. Maklyuen – Moscow: Giperboreya, Kuchkovo pole, 2007. – 464 p.
13. Mamardashvili M. K. Estetika myshleniya [Aesthetics of thinking] / M. K. Mamardashvili – Moscow: Moskovskaya shkola politicheskikh issledovaniy [The Moscow School of Political Studies], 2000. – 205 p.
14. Markaryan E.S. Ocherki teorii kul'tury [Essays on the theory of culture] / E.S. Markaryan // Izbrannoe. Nauka o kul'ture i imperativy epokhi [Selection. The science of culture and the imperatives of the era]. – Moscow. – SPb., 2014. – P. 10–348.
15. Mezhuiev V. M. Ideya kul'tury. Ocherki po filosofii kul'tury [The idea of culture. Essays on the Philosophy of Culture] / V. M. Mezhuiev – Moscow: Universitetskaya kniga, 2012. – 406 p.
16. Plato Sofist [Sophist] / Plato // Collection of works in 4 vol. – Vol. 2. – Moscow: Mysl', 1993. – P. 275–345.
17. Sartr Zh.-P. Ekzistsentsializm – eto gumanizm [Existentialism is humanism] / Zh.-P. Sartr // Sumerki bogov [Twilight of the Gods]. – Moscow: Politizdat, 1990. – P. 319–344.
18. Ushinskiy K. D. O narodnosti v obshchestvennom vospitanii [On the nation in public education] / K. D. Ushinskiy // Collection of works in 2 vol. – Vol. 2. – Moscow-Leningrad: Pedizdat, 1948. – P. 69–166.
19. Franko I. Ya. Iz sekretiv poetychnoyi tvorchosti [From secrets of poetic creativity] / I. Ya. Franko // Collection of works in 50 vol. – Vol. 31. – Kyiv: Naukova dumka, 1981. – P. 45–119.
20. Fuko M. Nenormal'nye [Abnormals] / M. Fuko – SPb.: Nauka, 2004. – 432 p.
21. Shpengler O. Pessimizm li? [Pessimism or?] / O. Shpengler. – Internet source: http://royallib.com/book/osvald_shpengler/pessimizm_liotvet_moim_kriti_kam.html

22. Yaspers K. Istoki istorii i ee tsel' [The origins of history and its purpose] / K. Yaspers // Smysl i naznachenie istorii [The meaning and purpose of history]. – Moscow: Politizdat, 1991. – P. 27–286.

ЛЮДИНА КУЛЬТУРИ В АСПЕКТІ АНТРОПОЛОГІЧНИХ КОНЦЕПЦІЙ: РЕТРОСПЕКТИВНИЙ АНАЛІЗ

А. С. Ушаков

Стаття присвячена аналізу антропологічних концепцій людини культури. Зазначається, що людина культури – це людина, котра сама закладає начало або принцип своєї сутності, не покладаючись у цьому ані на природу, ані на будь-який інший зовнішній чинник. Як на головну проблему людини культури вказується на проблему самовираження. Ця проблема безпосередньо пов'язана з проблемою симуляції реальності. Усунути цю проблему може лише активна діяльність людини культури, що виражається в її творчості. Це висуває на перше місце людину-творця, людину культури. Лише всебічне дослідження феномену людини культури здатне допомогти нам зрозуміти напрямок, у якому рухається людство.

Ключові слова: людина культури, антропологічна концепція, культурна парадигма.

ЧЕЛОВЕК КУЛЬТУРЫ В АСПЕКТЕ АНТРОПОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ КОНЦЕПЦИЙ: РЕТРОСПЕКТИВНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ

А. С. Ушаков

Статья посвящена анализу антропологических концепций человека культуры. Отмечается, что человек культуры – это человек, который сам закладывает начало, или принцип своей сущности, не полагаясь в этом ни на природу, ни на любой другой внешний фактор. Как на главную проблему человека культуры указывается на проблему самовыражения. Эта проблема непосредственно связана с проблемой симуляции реальности. Устранить эту проблему может лишь активная деятельность человека культуры, которая выражается в его творчестве. Это выдвигает на первое место человека-творца, человека культуры. Лишь всестороннее исследование феномена человека культуры способно помочь нам понять направление, в котором движется человечество.

Ключевые слова: человек культуры, антропологическая концепция, культурная парадигма.

Ushakov Artem Sergiyovich – Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of Foreign Philology and Translation Practice Department of Kyiv National University of Culture and Arts (Kyiv, Ukraine). E-mail: artem.s.usakov@gmail.com

Ушаков Артем Сергійович – кандидат педагогічних наук, доцент кафедри іноземної філології та практики перекладу Київського національного університету культури і мистецтв (м. Київ, Україна). E-mail: artem.s.usakov@gmail.com

UDC 37.04:140

PEDAGOGICAL CONCEPTION OF HUMAN AS A NEW PHILOSOPHY OF PEDAGOGICAL ACTIVITIES OF A MODERN EDUCATOR

O. I. Vyhovska

The readers are suggested the concept of “human”, in which the central position belongs not to “personality” but to human per se. Such approach is not set for the Ukrainian pedagogical science and practice yet.

In the article the author gives a formula which in fact defines structural components of the concept of “human”, their place and role.

On the basis of the author's own investigations it is justified that this Conception is needed by teachers and it is going to be introduced into educational process, and that will lead to radical changes in school practice.

Nowadays it is of great importance to understand what skills a student should gain in order to be successful and self-sufficient. Hence, a teacher foresees the things that depend on his/her activities and knows what should be observed in a child.

Keywords: Concept of “human”, structure of the concept, individuality, pedagogical conception of human, changes predicted in pedagogical practice.

The conception of human is a central one in pedagogical science and practice. It is the same for development of a society which is gaining the orientation focused on human: on the one hand, under such circumstances the individual development of human is the main proof of progress, on the other hand, it is the main pre-condition of further society development. Therefore, the realization of the principle of a child-centered education and