

Training of Modern Personnel: Anthropological Foundations of Education

Tamara V. Agapova

Dept. of Foreign Languages
Krasnoyarsk State Agrarian University
Krasnoyarsk, Russia
agapova-07@mail.ru

Larisa Y. Aisner

Dept. of Foreign Languages
Krasnoyarsk State Agrarian University
Krasnoyarsk, Russia
larisa-ajsner@yandex.ru

Oleg D. Naumov

Dept. of Philosophy
Krasnoyarsk State Agrarian University
Krasnoyarsk, Russia
naumoff-on@mail.ru

Abstract—The article deals with the activities of the classical University carried out in the conditions of the fourth industrial revolution, actualizing the question of training demanded and competitive staff of the future. In addition to the analysis of economic efficiency indicators of considered institution, the attention is focused on the anthropological mode of personality formation of the future specialist through the analysis of functioning of the power and educational practices. By means of genealogical and hermeneutic methods, cultural and anthropological reconstruction and analysis of the ancient practice of “care” in modern conditions are carried out. The study proves the idea that one of the fundamental conditions of modern sustainable development strategies is actualizing the principle of “self-care” as a crucial criterion of personal self-determination of specialists of the future. In addition, it is stated and argued that the actualization of the ancient principle of “care” in modern conditions can be considered as one of the ways out of the crisis of the educational system, as well as the global anthropological impasse characterizing the current state of society.

Keywords: *university, education, subject, practices of subjectivation, power, staffing, sustainable development, modernity*

I. INTRODUCTION

In the situation of the fourth industrial revolution, which characterizes the face of modernity, the question of staff potential as the basis for sustainable development cannot but problematize the tasks facing the system of modern education. In this regard, it is necessary to note that a modern University changing according to the trends of the era can and should be considered not only in the aspect of its economic profitability, but also from the anthropological perspective of the future society formation that develops good answers to the

challenges of postmodernity. Its distinctive feature is the multi-variant scenarios of socio-economic development, which requires the subject not so much a high level of self-determination, but the ability to effectively dialogue with the rapidly changing world, allowing it to remain in demand and competitive specialist [1].

II. METHODS

The approach to the problem posed allows us to raise the question of staff training of the future in the cultural anthropological mode [2, P.207], focusing on the effectiveness of subjectivization practices existing in the modern academic environment, integrating the formation process of skills, competencies that allow the subject to carry out the long-term planning procedure, modeling and implementing the strategy of its own existence.

Characterizing the current stage of University education development, we should pay attention to the situation of the cultural gap asserting itself through a radical refusal of the “dialogue with the studied tradition, text, event” [3, P.15], as well as the refusal of “constant questioning of a tradition” [3, P.336]. In this regard, a modern University can be considered as a dual reality, where, on the one hand, there is a tendency to non-critical adherence to tradition, and, on the other hand, there is a habit of thinking about the relevant in the categories of the past. In addition, the modern educational environment has no conditions for self-criticism [4, P.149]. Thus, the attitude to tradition under the conditions of a modern University can be characterized paradoxically: “fidelity to tradition” is simultaneously combined with “critical disengagement with it” [5, P.18], which points to the post-traumatic foundation of the future problematizing not only the

memory but the very question of oblivion, which remains open.

III. RESULTS

We believe that one of the consequences of the described situation is the theoretical-methodological reactualization of the “self-care” discourse known since the Antiquity era in the conditions of modern educational practices. In this regard, it can be assumed that the concept of “care” should be understood as a cultural anthropological meta-basis of the self-determination process of the future demanded and competitive specialist. An interdisciplinary approach to solving the problem allows us to confirm the proposed thesis [6].

Principles of an interdisciplinary approach to the consideration and interpretation of the “self-care” concept are interpreted in the works of modern teachers, such as I.P. Ivanov and O.S. Gazman [7, 8, 2-5]. However, the research strategy of these authors is not without conservatism. In particular, “care” is interpreted as, first of all, care for others, and not for oneself, thus being as one of the ways of organizing the collective, standing in the value paradigm of modernity below the individual beginning of the subject. At the same time, I.P. Ivanov and O.S. Gazman note that “care”, hypothetically, can be considered as an ethical basis for the individualization of collective action, which is expressed in the concept of “pedagogical support” [2, P. 209].

IV. DISCUSSION

Many humanitarians have abandoned such a one-sided interpretation of the concept. In particular, M. Heidegger understands “care” as a funding structure of the human being integrity, pointing out that it makes possible a situation when “to be-always-already-ahead-of-oneself-in-the-world-as-being” [9, P.192]. In other words, we are talking about the understanding of “care” as the completion of human subjectivity, assuming itself from its own bases [10], thereby showing the practical motive, acting as the result of the activity of “care”, which allows us to think of the subject as subjectivity [11, P.125].

In the ontological aspect, this kind of “care” is not a care for something specific, but a constant process, we identify with the ontology of a person or a subject of “care” in the existence of which the concept is perceived not as an educational practice, as having a universal ontological sense [12, Pp. 124-125].

The concept of “care” receives the subsequent development in the works of M. Foucault, who focused his attention on the anthropological practices of self-change of the subject, which allowed us to study it not as a stationary entity, but in the mobile and dynamic practices of subjectivation, which, on the one hand, are applied from the outside, but at the same time, on the other hand, are refracted from the inside [4, 148]. Thus, strategies of subjectivation, according to M. Foucault are a special way of submitting oneself, when the forms of society domination over the subject meet with his power over himself, that is, a situation where external discipline confronts with internal self-discipline, and external

control is supplemented and strengthened by internal self-control. In this sense, the subject is a fold of internal and external, or, say otherwise, a specific effect of the power dominating over itself, and also “effect of the self-directed knowledge, morality judging the own system of regulatives. There is no subject outside this disposition” [13, P.6].

Implementing the project on the genealogy of a modern subject, M. Foucault notes the cultural historical, more broadly, cultural anthropological differences, stating that the specific feature characterizing a modern subject is that the “art of existence” is freed from the oppression of social and cultural institutions, transforming itself into the potential possibility of individual freedom, which requires its actualization through internal choice, which essence is the intellectual destruction of tradition and search for meaningful alternatives to existence [15, P.140].

M. Foucault's contribution to the development of a modern interpretation of “care” includes interpreting this concept as an invocation not so much to know oneself as to work on oneself, implying the modification of oneself as a necessary condition for finding the truth. Thus, subjectivation, according to M. Foucault, is “a process by which we obtain the folding of the subject, or rather, subjectivity, which, obviously, serves only as one of the given possibilities for organizing a certain self-consciousness” [16, P.173].

In addition, M. Foucault distinguishes external and internal subjectivation, understanding under the first - the result of the practices of objectification and separation, and under the second - the result of the work of “using pleasures”, saying about a person as a creature, first of all, willing and being free, abiding in the process of self-determination due to the effective functioning of “practices of the self” and “techniques of the self” [16]. It is these mechanisms of subjectivation, according to M. Foucault, that ultimately form a moral subject, the formation of which is associated with “self-education through various kinds of life techniques” [2, P.208], through which “people not only establish rules of conduct for themselves, but also strive to transform themselves and make from their life a work that would carry some aesthetic values and meet certain criteria of the style” [11, P.280]. Speaking about this process, it is important to note that the key role in it is played by the situation of self-problematization by the subject of his own foundations during which is produced subjective knowledge about himself, the world and his attitude to it [6].

Thus, the “self-techniques” offered by M. Foucault can be considered as one of the variants of freedom practices, implying a critical view not only of the world, but also of oneself in it with the purpose of seeing and “accepting only what depends on free and reasonable choice of the subject” [12, P.35].

Speaking about the practical significance of his interpretation of “care” in modern conditions, M. Foucault on the pages of the “Hermeneutics of the subject” developed a project of a special discipline - psychogogics, understanding under it the process of transmitting “such a truth, which function is not to supply the subject with any relations, but rather, a change in the mode of subject existence” [18], which

implies the necessary addition from pedagogics, comprehended by the philosopher, as the transmission of “such a truth whose function is to supply the subject with any relations, abilities, knowledge that he did not have before and that he will have to get by the end of pedagogical relations” [18]. Thus, the difference between the first and the second one is that pedagogy implies the transfer of knowledge by the teacher to his student, while psychogogics, putting the teacher’s figure in question, focuses on the cultural anthropological foundations of the subject’s self-realization process, which internal dynamics reveals itself in the range from art “self-care” to self-knowledge initiated by an external authority to the subject, asking only one question: how the modern era puts and solves the question of the subject’s truth, creating specific practices of hermeneutics of his subjectivity perception.

At the same time, the everyday practice of this kind of “care”, according to M. Foucault, is an invocation for the overthrow of external power in order to create a “critical ontology of ourselves”, which should be considered “not as a theory, not as a doctrine or even not as a permanent set of accumulated knowledge; it should be understood as an attitude, ethos, philosophical life; when criticism of what we are is at the same time a historical analysis of the limits set for us and a study of the possibilities of their overcoming” [14].

V. CONCLUSION

Thus, we believe that the perspective addressed by the modern University to the staff of the future as a key to understanding the specifics of building a sustainable development strategy can be formulated as follows: “self-care” is essentially a care for the own limits. This circumstance indicates the ability of the subject as a highly effective existence in a changing socio-cultural reality [19, P.172], through the practice of consistent decision-making and production of non-trivial strategies of their own being.

In this regard, the problem of self-determination can be reformulated from the problem of self-preservation of marked limits to the question of their testing in order to find common ground and “build bridges” in the situation of the noted gap, characterizing a modern educational system that prepares such specialists who will be able to “separate themselves from themselves”, as well as to change their own thought and the thought of others, but not by means of a sudden insight, but by developing themselves [20, P.211], an assiduous transformation and a slow change by a constant care about the truth [11, P.319].

REFERENCES

- [1] "Contemporary global challenges and national interests, The 15th International Likhachov Scientific Conference", Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences under the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, 2015.
- [2] E.V. Galazhinsky and V.I. Kabrin, "Prospect for the development of the creative personality of a transfessional in the conditions of a change in the scientific and educational paradigm of the university", *Bulletin of Tomsk State University*, 2019, no. 447, pp. 207–214.
- [3] H.-G. Gadamer, "Truth and Method: Fundamentals of philosophical hermeneutics", Moscow, 1998.
- [4] M.N. Dudina, "A modern student in self-esteem "self-care": the results of an empirical study", *Bulletin of Tomsk State University*, 2018, no. 433, pp. 146–151.
- [5] M. Heidegger, "Kant's Thesis of Being", *Kant's Philosophy and Modernity: Collected Translations, Part 2*, Moscow, 1976, pp.18–25.
- [6] Materials of the International Conference "Scientific research of the SCO countries: synergy and integration", 2018, Part 1 Participants' reports in English.
- [7] I.P. Ivanov, "Educate Collectivists", Moscow, 1982.
- [8] I.P. Ivanov, "Encyclopedia of Collective Creative Affairs", Moscow, 1989.
- [9] M. Heidegger, "Being and Time", Moscow, 1997.
- [10] W. Shulz, "Ueber den Philosophiegeschichtlichen Ort Martin Heideggers", in: Heidegger: Perspektiven zur Deutung seines Werks, Weinheim, 1984, pp. 95-140.
- [11] M. Foucault, "The will to truth: on the other side of knowledge, power and sexuality", *Works of different years*, Moscow, 1996.
- [12] S. N. Stavtsev, "Transcendental nature of the fundamental ontology of Heidegger", *Metaphysical studies*, issue 6: Consciousness: Almanac of the Laboratory of Metaphysical Research at the Faculty of Philosophy of St. Petersburg State University, 1998, pp.125–136.
- [13] D. V. Michel, "Michel Foucault in the strategies of subjectivation: from the "History of Madness" to "Caring for oneself": materials from lecture courses of 1996-1998, Saratov, 1999.
- [14] S. E. Elkin, S. Yu. Solodovnikov, O. S. Elkina, Yu. V. Meleshko, S. V. Kuregyan, E. I. Bakhmatova, U. B. Tubanova, and A. L. Pastukhov, "Strategy of Human Capital Management as an Element of Economic Security", Saint Petersburg, 2018, 246 p.
- [15] M. Foucault, "Subject and power", *Intellectuals and power: in 3 parts, Part 3, Articles and interviews, 1970-1984*, Moscow, 2006, pp. 161–190.
- [16] M. Foucault, "Ethics of self-care as a practice of freedom", *Intellectuals and power: Selected political articles, presentations and interviews: in 3 parts, Part 3: Articles and interviews, 1970-1984*, Moscow, 2006, pp. 241–270.
- [17] M. Foucault, "The history of sexuality – III: Care for oneself", Moscow, 1998.
- [18] M. Foucault, "Hermeneutics of the subject": a course of lectures delivered at the College de France, Moscow, 1991, pp. 284–311.
- [19] A.-K. Wagner, "Prestigious School of International Culture", 2015, *logos 1 (91)*, pp.168–186.
- [20] M. Martin, "Educating Superiority", 2015, *Logos 1 (91)*, pp. 187–218.