

DOI: 10.24234/wisdom.v20i4.538

Nadiia ADAMENKO,
Liudmyla OBLOVA,
Olena ALEKSANDROVA,
Lana KHRYPKO,
Oksana MAKSYMETS,
Katerina PASKO,
Alla ISHCHUK

HUMAN IDENTITY AS FREEDOM STATEMENT IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF CHILD EDUCATION

Abstract

The *purpose of this article* is to reveal the specific features of personality-oriented education and to consider how a person, being in dialogue with another person, can declare freedom only by an act of own free will.

To achieve the goal set, the authors have used a set of *theoretical and empirical methods* of analysis, description, comparison, extrapolation, synthesis, hermeneutic methodology, and a method of implication. Cross-sectional studies and case studies have also been used at the intersection of philosophy and psychology.

It is emphasized that in the Ukrainian framework of the representation, this problem demonstrates the following – the “old” system of education, formed on the principle of necessity, has demonstrated its ineffective mechanism of action through a system of prohibitions and oppression. The “new” system of education, built on the principle of freedom, relies on its effectiveness, rejecting necessity and eliminating compulsion. However, the methodological error of creating something new by destroying the old and inefficient is becoming more and more evident.

Keywords: community of inquiry, freedom, philosophy for children, axiology, personality, philosophy of child studies.

Introduction

The axiology of the contemporary educational paradigm is based on the philosophy of child-centeredness, which puts human individuality at the centre of pedagogical interaction, recognizes man together with the inner world and personal needs as the highest value of human existence. This approach forms the basic principles of personality-oriented education, which has become decisive in the educational system at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries. The holistic and harmonious development of a child as a personality

is the main purpose of modernization of education. Today, educators are involved in a struggle for their souls and the souls of their students (Hattam, 2021).

The idea of child-centeredness is the basis of many pedagogical systems and scientific theories. G. Vashchenko, J. Dewey, A. Diesterweg, J. Comenius, V. Kremen, J. Korczak, A. Makarenko, C. Rogers, V. Sukhomlinsky, and others carried out a fundamental theoretical comprehension of child-centeredness. Today, in the academic environment (on the example of the National Center “Junior Academy of Sciences of

Ukraine”), an interesting combination of a philosophy of child studies and philosophy for children and youth can be seen.

The philosophy of child-centeredness is the theoretical basis of the principle of personality-oriented education, which combines the requirement of deep and specific individualization and its implementation based on various forms of differentiation. At the same time, this principle indicates the need for great attention to personal capabilities. Thus, the phenomenon of the philosophy of child-centeredness is a universal, integral basis of both axiological knowledge and philosophy of education and pedagogy, which, in turn, proves the relevance of this issue in both theoretical and practical terms.

The official website of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine states that the “New Ukrainian School” is currently one of the key changes in the country. Its main purpose is to create a school that will be enjoyable to learn in, and that will give students not only the knowledge as it does now but also the ability to apply it in real life. The “New Ukrainian School” is a place where teachers listen to students’ opinions, teach them critical thinking and responsibility. We think this makes one of the main issues of modern education – the student’s autonomy: learning to think and act freely and responsibly.

In this regard, the philosopher Matthew Lipman’s reflective model of education and the concept of “community of inquiry” become relevant for scientific research and practical experience in the context of the formation of content and forms of learning. We hypothesize that the world of good, beauty, truth, and justice cannot make a person behave responsibly. A person can create the world of good, beauty, truth, and justice in the moments of responsible attitude to events. To explain this, we will turn to 1) the disclosure of the concepts necessary for understanding personality-oriented education as the basis for the educational use of freedom by a person; 2) affirmation of the initial understanding of the concepts of this issue in M. Lipman’s teaching;

3) disclosure of a methodological approach for designating a responsible action as a force exercised by the individual (I. Kant – R. Ingarden – M. Mamardashvili); 4) demonstration of the prospects of using freedom in education and assertion of personal autonomy and responsibility.

Both the freedom of will and conscious choice require a special methodology in research, especially in the field of child studies. The use of these concepts in education requires a comprehensive approach not only in terms of philosophy but also psychology. Personality-oriented education requires a study of the practical implementation of the approaches of well-known scientists and educators for the qualitative formation of educational space based on child-centeredness. That is why general scientific and philosophical methods and cross-sectional studies, and case studies have been used at the intersection of philosophy and psychology.

Methodology

The research methodology is grounded on the principle of unity of theory and practice, which are interdependent. Historical and theoretical method of studying the concepts of values of cognitive abilities and ethics and rights of children by Gareth B. Matthews, Jerome Bruner, Matthew Lipman, Ann Margaret Sharp, Lorraine Joseph Splitter, and others made it possible to identify criteria for the review of the creating dialogues with children via philosophical questions. These criteria included inclusivity, proactivity, “distributed thinking”, communication of many people “face to face”, search for meanings, social solidarity, pondering, modelling situations, self-reflection, the presence of a challenge to each other as a stimulus for reflection. Taking these as the formation baseline of a philosophical community of researchers in the classroom, the authors of the article also applied methods of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation based on the practical use of the philosophers’ ideas – I. Kant, R. Ingarden, and M. Mamardashvili. The authors

monitored the practical results of the theoretical foundations during 2017-2020 as a result of analysis of the performance of children in different age groups (more than 500 students) at the courses “Think as a Philosopher”, “Thinking with Paradoxes”, “Thinking Equilibrium”, “Philosophy for High School Students”; in the summer philosophical camps “Praxis Camp” – the project of the PRAXIS School of Thinking and Communication of the National Center “Junior Academy of Sciences of Ukraine”. The qualitative indicators of this work led to the conclusions of this article.

Results and Discussion

Historical Retrospective of the Study of Personality-Oriented Education

The idea of child-centeredness has been leading in many foreign and domestic pedagogical systems and scientific theories of different times. For example, the researches by P. Blonsky, G. Vashchenko, K. Wentzel, J. Dewey, J. Korczak, A. Makarenko, C. Rogers, V. Sukhomlinsky, K. Ushinsky, and others are devoted to the development of the principle of child-centeredness.

J. Dewey places the child at the centre of the pedagogical system, pointing out that the child is the sun, and all education should revolve around them; the interests of the child become the values of education and the basis for the organization of all educational processes; the upbringing and education of the child should take place without compulsion and pressure (Krylova & Aleksandrova, 2003).

J. Korczak considered each child as a separate unique world with many potential opportunities, stressed the importance of creating conditions in which each child can develop innate human potentials, which it shows from early childhood. In teachers' social education system, harmonized processes of adaptation, socialization, and technologization of socio-pedagogical influence served this process. The system of ideas of child-centeredness, which was systematized in the

works “How to Love a Child”, “The Child's Right to Respect”, “Rules of Life”, “The School of Life”, “Educational moments”, “Playful Pedagogy” and others, was embodied in the social and educational work of orphanages and the activities of the pedagogical seminary “Bursa” in the training of teachers-educators (Mysko, 2015).

The situation with children in the Ukrainian family was ambiguous. Despite the desire to have children, disregard for infertile women, the treatment of the child was often severe, and repressive methods of upbringing were used. Childhood was fleeting. From the age of three, children were deprived of custody by their elders, and from the age of four, they became actively involved in working life. This can be seen in the terminology used to denote a child of different ages. Ethnographic and historical works describe in detail the life of Ukrainian children. At the same time, we should note that contemporary ethno-pedagogical studies often mythologize the Ukrainian family and the upbringing of children in it (Kvas, 2011).

Today, there is an active formation of the global educational space: a unified system of knowledge is formed; the English language and IT are widely used in education; the activities of educational institutions become internationalized and innovative. Such transformations motivate education to abandon one-sided orientation only on the social order, focus on personal needs, value dimensions of getting knowledge about the world, and self-understanding. Thus, everyone will be able to achieve the goal by developing personal qualities through their own efforts. The content of the reformed education and the renewal of the educational system are directly related to the change of the educational paradigm as a reflection of the effect of a set of theoretical principles on the whole process of pedagogical activity.

In the 21st century, it has become clear that education is a tool for influencing people's mental values and priorities, considering the interests of short- and long-term social practices. So, it is

important to address the issue of axiology (values) of contemporary education. The concept of “axiology” is widely used in philosophical, ethical, psychological, and pedagogical publications. However, the authors put different meanings into it, which leads to terminological uncertainty.

The dualism of mutual responsibility of the philosophy of values and educational culture is as follows to achieve quality education, changes should be made in such an important area as the formation of a system of personal values. Education should prepare a modern value-oriented personality. Society and education are responsible for the formation of values, which are outdated now. The assertion of outdated values adversely affects the essence of the individual and, of course, society. The formation of values inappropriate for current time limits a person, distorts the way of life, and significantly reduces or even derails self-realization.

One of the most modern sections of educational culture and educational policy is educology, represented primarily by the works of V. Ognevyuk. Educology, which studies the field of education as an open system, is an open system, which includes the requirement, conditionality, and resources introduced into it from the external scientific environment. Accordingly, a significant difference between educology and other humanities, particularly pedagogy, is that educology is a kind of educational synergy for the study of education, which shows the universal nature of education (Frick, 2021). The view of the contemporary sphere of education as a synergetic system changes our perception of chance and necessity in educational systems. The irreversibility of educational processes gives a different understanding of the nature and essence of entropic processes in educational systems. According to synergetics, fluctuations in social development and social intelligence (innovations, inventions) that affect the education system and are often perceived by educators as “chaos” should be understood as a special kind of regular irregularity and not as the destruction of the edu-

cation system because the development and self-organization of open systems are objectivated through chaos and imbalance. An example of the latter is the invention of modern information and communication technologies, which has become the mega-fluctuation of social intelligence. Not only has it changed the outline of the future, but it also has become a “bifurcation point” for all earthly civilization, caused all the civilizational processes, and transformed the sphere of education into the synergetic system. The “information revolution” radically transforms the topology of the educational space, changes its division into a metropolis and periphery, becomes the beginning of a new information-oriented civilization with a new system of life meanings, goals, and values (Ognevyuk & Sysoyeva, 2012).

In general, researchers accumulate the following idea – the main idea of child-centeredness is education and upbringing as close as possible to the abilities and characteristics of each child. Vectors of child-centeredness are:

- freedom of pedagogical creativity;
- children’s activity in the educational process;
- interests of children, creation of a learning environment that would make learning a bright element of a child’s life;
- practical orientation of educational activity;
- mandatory consideration of the interests of each child;
- education of an “independent personality ignited by love and guided by reason” (Dewey, 1997);
- ensuring the freedom and rights of children in all manifestations of their activities;
- taking into account its age and individual characteristics;
- ensuring the moral and psychological comfort of the child.

So, we can state that, in the contemporary interpretation of this term, we understand child-centeredness as the personality-oriented model of the relationship between child and adult, based on empathy, recognition of the uniqueness of child-

hood, which is aimed at ensuring conditions of self-realization and self-actualization; increasing attention to the system of its values and interests based on the humanization of the real existence of the child to form the foundations of vital competences.

Particular attention should be paid to the acmeology of education – an integrated, psychological-pedagogical science that studies the possible facets of achievements in the holistic development of growing and adult people through educational activities. Many scientists (L. Varfolomeeva, N. Vyshnyakova, Yu. Gagin, N. Kuzmina and others) discover the factors of self-improvement of the teacher, reaching the peaks of teacher professionalism and creative skill. N. Kuzmina attributes such qualities as the ability to creativity and self-development to the category of human acmeological abilities, which create the psychophysical basis for developing the creative individuality of human essence. We can conclude that the acmeology of education is the science that studies the consistent ways of excelling in holistic human development during education. The priorities and values create the integrity of human development, individuality, maturity, creativity, and spirituality. Thus, the axiological basis of the educational “acme” is a priori.

The Concept of Student’s Autonomy in
the Community of Inquiry Within the
Reflective Education System in
Matthew Lipman’s Teaching

The concept of the “New Ukrainian School”, which is currently being implemented in Ukraine, can be called a transition from the traditional to the reflective model of education. All nine components – competency formation; a motivated teacher who has an opportunity for development and the freedom to introduce new experiences; education through values; autonomy for schools, the triangle of the partnership between a pupil, a teacher, and a parent; child-

centeredness; new school structure; fair financing; modern educational environment – can be explained by six points of reconstructed education described by M. Lipman (2003):

1. Education is the outcome of participation in a teacher-guided community of enquiry, among whose goals are the achievement of understanding and good judgement.
2. Students are stirred to think about the world when our knowledge of it is revealed to them to be ambiguous, equivocal, and mysterious.
3. The disciplines in which enquiry occurs are assumed to be neither non-overlapping nor exhaustive; hence their relationships to their subject matters are quite problematic.
4. The teacher’s stance is fallibilistic (one that is ready to concede to error) rather than authoritative.
5. Students are expected to be thoughtful and reflective and increasingly reasonable and judicious.
6. The focus of the educational process is not on the acquisition of information but on the grasp of relationships within and among the subject matters under investigation.

To implement these points, the authors of the Philosophy for Children program needed to create a community of philosophical inquiry, a safe, educational space where students can exchange ideas on such philosophical issues as truth, friendship, justice, etc. “Community of inquiry” is a group of democratic spaces that help children develop critical, creative, and caring thinking skills. According to Lipman and his colleagues, the equilibrium of these types of thinking allows for a strong sense of a person’s citizenship in the

future.

Thus, the authors and followers of the Philosophy for Children need to talk about the transformation of classes into a “community of inquiry” where “students listen to one another with respect, build on one another’s ideas, challenge one another to supply reasons for otherwise unsupported opinions, assist each other in drawing inferences from what has been said, and seek to identify one another’s assumptions” (Lipman, 2003). The dialogue in the classroom is compared to a boat that bumps into the wind. Still, it moves forward. As well as the thinking process in the “community of inquiry” also progresses, and it is essential for students to understand exactly how their thinking process happens. Thus, the community of inquiry aims to solve several tasks: to develop cognitive thinking skills, research skills, as well as socialization, communication, and individualization skills.

Nevertheless, to what extent is this process autonomous for each participant? M. Lipman (2003) pays particular attention to the concept of “autonomy”. “There is a sense in which this is correct: the sense in which autonomous thinkers are those who “think for themselves, who do not merely parrot what others say or think but make their judgments of the evidence, form their understanding of the world, and develop their conceptions of the sorts of persons they want to be and the sort of world they would like it to be”. However, as the author points out, unfortunately, autonomy is often associated with a kind of impudent individualism and warns against turning into self-sufficient cognitive macho that is protected by an umbrella of unbearably powerful arguments. In our opinion, an important point in understanding the concept of autonomy is Lipman’s position on the availability of criteria for teachers’ evaluation of students. In his view, teachers should be prepared to clearly explain the reasons why the assessment decision was made. At the same time, the employer should explain the reasons for refusing to hire or promote someone. When teachers openly state the criteria, they

are guided by them, and they encourage students to do the same. Doing so, we take responsibility for our own thinking and, even more, for our education. At this point, Lipman (2003) explains: “I see no inconsistency between urging ‘cognitive accountability’ (i.e., feeling an obligation to supply reasons for stated opinions) and urging the development of intellectual autonomy among students. In case providing students with cognitive skills is a form of empowerment, such increased powers entail increased responsibilities, especially to and for oneself. There are times when we cannot let other people do our thinking for us, and we must think for ourselves. Furthermore, we must learn to think for ourselves by thinking for ourselves; other people cannot instruct us in how to do it, although they can put us in a community of inquiry where it becomes a relatively easy thing to do”. As the philosopher concludes, students should be encouraged to become intelligent for their own good (as a step towards their own autonomy), not just for our good (because that is what the increasing rationalization of society requires).

In our opinion, the question of how to become intelligent for your own good and therefore for the public good is interesting and relevant in the time of the rapid development of the information-oriented society, where there are so many different opinions, statements, and calls for action.

Responsible Action as the Force Exercised by the Individual

Lipman’s idea of a community of inquirers as critical-thinking children raises questions about the *strength of the individual* in the community. In other words, it raises the problem of the place and role of a particular child’s responsibility among the researchers. It is about the child’s autonomy to declare freedom regardless of existing positions. Also, it is about the necessity and possibility of each individual to create a world of good, beauty, truth, and justice.

The methodology for studying the personal strength of a responsibly acting child used the experiences of Kant, Ingarden, and Mamardashvili. Kant distinguishes between dogmatic and critical thinking – he shows the level of will that determines itself. Ingarden, professing the power of the individual, suggests sharing responsibility among others. Mamardashvili, asserting personal effort, shows the fate of a conscious being who takes responsibility for himself and, at the same time, for everyone in the community.

Observations in groups have shown that a child who shares responsibility tends to accept other people's opinions about universal things and analyze acts of creating good, beauty, truth, and justice. However, the children do not form their own position and get alienated from the creation of the moral world. Therefore, such a child shows the strength of the personality conditionally. As a rule, he agrees with what is offered or keeps silent about his opinion. Children who refused to limit their actions and thoughts to existing creations expressed and persisted in their opinion paradoxically. In the discussion, they contradicted themselves. However, they did not contradict each other.

The ground for our research is observations of the validity of autonomy in a real community of inquirers. Therefore, we need the one who discovered critical thinking (Kant) and those thinkers of the XX century who worked out the fundamental limitation of human creation of moral actions. Thus, based on one thing only – the strength of the individual, they disagreed about its essence. Ingarden (in "Little Book About Man") presented the experience of the dependence of the will of an individual on the community's dignity. Mamardashvili expressed the dependence of the community's dignity on the will of an individual (Mamardashvili, 2002).

To answer Kant's question: "What should I do?" N. Hartmann, in his "Ethics", suggested, "whatever that has not been done in the world yet". Thus, the philosopher argued that the act of man is not defined and can change depending on

time and space. It turned out that "decision-making and responsible actions are created by the incessant occurrence of something new – the unknown force" (Hartmann, 2002). Here, Hartman avoids the responsibility of answering Kant's question and does not notice himself thinking about the declaration of freedom as a burden but not as a duty. That is why he says that only something distant and sublime can teach. Kant himself says that the statement of freedom will come into action not objectively but within the good or the evil. Moreover, he repeated that "the truth (practicality) of their space depends not on external factors, but the personal experience of a rational being" (Kant, 1980). Therefore, a responsible action cannot occur and become necessary in a place where learners follow the teacher's consciousness. It can happen when students' abilities are realized. So, the action will be effective when the teacher allows the student to be in line with himself and, thus, he will go beyond what is already known.

The complexity of Kant's statement of freedom consists in the following: the teacher who promotes freedom is not the one who gives the student what is already known to memorize; he declares personality via his or her own will in the process of learning. Something that comes not from assessment and exam motivation (partial control) but a reasonable measure (a higher purpose). That is why, for example, student advancement cannot be seen as a consequence of the actions or qualities of the teacher. The advancement cannot be obtained. So, the teacher's achievement (not the reward) is only a free goal that allows one to understand the basic meaning of the world. It is the goal that demonstrates the need to act within free will. That means controlling the evil (arbitrariness) with the mind. The maximalist form of thinking is based on the inner experiences or mental state of a conscious being. Therefore, accidents can happen, and that changes a person and the world. In this situation, the concept – information about something – does not contain personal experiences. Moreover,

when giving knowledge, the teacher can give it in a way that is not only clear but also unclear, making the students ask questions. After all, with a complete understanding and mastering of the material, a student only needs to remember and repeat what the teacher has said. Freedom implies “disturbing” the minds by appealing to internal states and letting the thoughts participate actively.

If you ask a person who calls for overcoming the stereotypical thinking and appeals to critical thinking as an acquired ability, which is proven by an appropriate certificate, how he or she understands it, the “conscious person” will give a definition that does not raise any objections. They will say that critical thinking is what they have been taught to call a critical one. They will talk about having doubts, the full view, or seeing a situation from all sides. And it turns out that their “education” does not change anything, and actual actions (responsibility) do not occur. Nobody becomes fundamentally different. A person with initial critical thinking already has this experience and always talks about it not as it was defined but “circumstantially”.

According to Kant, a responsible action or a statement of freedom is not what is conditioned by a person; it is a world in which a person is conditioned as a rational being. Thinkers who care about a responsible action try to define the place of the “free world”. Polish philosopher R. Ingarden (2010) stated that the animal nature of a person is primordial. It precedes the new world – the place of human culture, where absolute values are revealed. Those are values of moral and aesthetic significance. So, nature is more real than the world of good and beauty. Therefore, culture, despite being created by a person, exists within the level of an animal. In addition to being closed in the natural state of things, “the world of values also offers benefits to a person. It gives them charm and a sense of happiness”.

Ingarden does not accept the unconditional nature of the world of good and beauty. He writes about the conditions of its creation and

introduces the dependence on the situations, circumstances, and acts of man. Good and beauty take the form of empirical phenomena, which means they become the knowledge accumulated due to the past and thus are transmitted to the future. It turns out that there is no disconnect between the animal nature of a person and the world of values (culture). The world of values is no different from animal nature; it was forced to be created. It exists for the sake of reducing the humiliation of being at the level of natural needs and misery. Therefore, there is one real world – a stable one, in which a non-real (secret, fictional, or transverse), spiritually beneficial, and alienating nature is created. A man manifests himself in the already existing world and transforms already existing values of good and beauty within it. A man influences and is influenced, which then leads to the ability to unite into “a single organism of mankind” (Ingarden, 2010).

The thing is that Ingarden, in his cognitive course, does not give the world of good and beauty the right to be free. He refuses to think that a man needs to be good first since the good has its own existence. It just exists, and a person cannot create it at their discretion. One cannot desire (appreciate) the good and the beauty. The good does not exist objectively because it does not exist at all. When people evaluate the good, they “weigh” the “empty space”. A person is always mistaken and never accurate. In this case, the good can exist being reproduced by a person or by human effort to stop the evil and break its continuity. Therefore, the good, when it exists, is only “subjective”. And this makes its “objectivity” – only through a person who comes from the world of good and evil. So, it does not exist without a transcendent person. A person in good does not determine the significance of what limits him and how he defines himself. Being good creates opportunities for good things and actions. That means that the world of good and beauty is not inside the sustainable world of nature but is “on the other side” of the natural course of things. Unable to take the value of the good in its former

shape and respond to what is valued as good, a person must act out of a predetermined sense of good from his own being.

However, for Ingarden, the good is contained in a person, and a person created it as a value. Giving a man the role of creator of values, the philosopher decided that the good exists objectively - regardless of its creator and, at the same time, the carrier. Therefore, it does not affect the person freely and is manifested in identifying and realizing its value by the significance of the person and not the measure of the good. The phenomenological nature of time, so to say the desire to overcome time and not to be confined by the moment "here and now", led to the thought about the conventional understanding of the world of morality. The idea that the world of good and beauty is embraced by knowledge is comprehended "indirectly".

Claiming that either "Self" overcomes time or time overcomes "Self", the philosopher faced the need to give one the right of "change" and the other - the right of "stability". He got into a mismatch between "Self" and time - movement and "stop". And it turned out that while time flows, "Self" does not exist - it is stuck between the two oblivions. Since it slips away, time does not allow a person to find it; it dooms a man to be constantly identified with the uncertainty of a new phase.

So, how could Ingarden introduce the existence of two voids of nothingness: one related to destruction - the departure of the past, and another related to the non-existence - not yet an act of the future? And how could he take away the unconditional understanding of the world and himself from morality? Perhaps he did it by cutting the void with "the real". Instead of a void, the philosopher gave special importance to the "binder". Also, he could no longer get rid of the three "heroes" of his mind. The experience of introducing a "binder" into an exclusive position is accompanied by taking away the exclusivity of both "this world" and "the other world" but

above all, "the other world".

In this sense, Kant's maximalist thinking is set aside, and a responsible action does not turn arbitrariness into a proper world. An active person should not think about the highest law but should strive to seize time and not lose himself in its flow. It turns out that the "discovering of your Self" and the formation of "Self" happen because of isolation. So, an individual is stuck in the regularity of value creation and does not need to relate to the world of good and beauty.

Ingarden (2010) allows the call for the good, the demand for the creation of a world of values, which indicates that there is no need to make a personal effort to create the real world, taking into consideration the organizer of the inner world (the good or the evil), that is where "conditional and shared responsibility" comes from.

Georgian philosopher M. Mamardashvili saw the mistakes of actions occurring under shared responsibility and the force of a responsible action created "via one's own challenges". He thought about actions from the "zero point" or "true experience" (Mamardashvili, 1990) of a man and claimed that the real acts are always beyond time and space and are discrete. That is why they are free. Thus, a person takes a responsible action not under the pressure of the future or looking to the past, but by the force of the present - through the efforts of the individual - the form and the way of their being. In this position, not only does a man create human life, but they also experience the possibility of free creation - he is being created by himself. A person is inseparable from what he or she is going through. So, the statement of freedom (understanding the higher meaning of the world through the gap of something else) is not what pushes for action but is what "Self" should do. Therefore, responsibility is not forced by the power of the new but is the force of the approval of the new. It is not repeated, but it happens at its own risk. So, it cannot be partial.

Good, Beauty, Truth, and Justice as the Forces of a Responsibly Acting Person

Ingarden gives an example of “shared responsibility” through the image of a sinking ship. The philosopher shows how people unite in case of distress and for the sake of salvation. In other words, if a person finds himself in the position of an irresponsible ruling party (captain), he can revolt and start a rescue team action. Not a specific person but each of the passengers. The teamwork action (rallying – something connecting) is what the philosopher calls shared responsibility. We turn to Kant’s imperative and talk about the possibility of responsibility existing solely personally, thus, the simulation of creating a world of good and beauty in the experience of working together. This does not mean that on a sinking ship: everyone should save only his own life or not pay attention to someone’s unwise actions. We are talking about the fact that if a person does right, it is because of his responsibility, not someone else’s irresponsibility. And the decision to save someone’s life comes from the power of one’s spirit, which is the force to action, but not in any way the foolishness of decisions made by the ruling party (the captain). In a world of imperfection and sin, everyone manifests his will. Therefore, nobody else’s will, but your own, assumes the responsibility.

While learning, we strive to show that a person can perform a good act of creating something beautiful, making a just decision, or being true only when he or she does not depend on another person’s action but does not distance himself. So, you must start with yourself. Constantly practising freedom from the masses, a person affirms the primacy of the value of good and beauty concerning how they have already been understood and realized and is not exempt from the decisions of another. A person is also capable of not becoming a puppet of someone else’s actions.

Further in this article, we will show examples of how we offer to learn the power of a responsi-

ble action through dialogues of different worlds – good, beauty, truth, and justice – by practising philosophy with children at the School of Thinking and Communication PRAXIS National Center “Junior Academy of Sciences of Ukraine”.

A) Responsibility in the world of good

Task: How do you behave at a boring concert/lesson? (What should I do when someone is not smart?).

Solution perspective: Do not give answers but allow memories. Through memory, open the opportunity to see different behaviours of oneself and to understand when actions were responsible (directed by the desire for the good) and when they were irresponsible (the ones that accept the reality of the good). It is important to understand that it is not the behaviour of another that determines your reaction, but you, yourself, decide to have patience (strength of will) or intolerance (weakness of will). Furthermore, this way to decide who you are: a thief or a benefactor in an imperfect world.

Task: How do you act on stage / in a lesson when the audience is talking / classmates are making noise? (Why cannot a person have two conversations at a time?).

Solution perspective: Ask one of the students to tell a story to someone who has his/her back turned on them, or is listening to music in headphones or is watching a cartoon. Notice the goodwill. Allow speaking to those who watched it and to those who participated and experienced inattention. See the similarities and differences in the stories.

B) Responsibility in the world of beauty

Task: What should I rely on when I see beauty in nature? How should I act in a world where there is no rule which defines beauty?

Solution perspective: Ukrainian writer Lina Kostenko’s poem “Surprised Flowers” (1996) is read to show the harmony: “This night the stars are thorny for some reason, / like scared hedgehogs. / That night the jay was crying in the cliffs, / That night the crow said, “Achoo!” / That night

the flower asked another flower: – / What is happening, can you explain? / Only yesterday it was “in summer” / And today it is “in fall”! /”.

A teacher asks questions: Why were the flowers surprised? What alarmed them so much? Do not try to talk directly about time. Turning the conversation to nature (it was summer, then autumn came) will open the opportunity to focus on the beauty of the flower – its colour, diversity, flowering, and fading. The invitation to describe the summer flower first, then the autumn flower, ends with the proposal to decide which flower is the most beautiful? Question: what makes a flower beautiful? The picture of the thorns and the picture of a rose are on display. It can be a blooming and a faded flower or a cactus and a cactus flower. Question: can thorns be beautiful? In the dialogue, it turns out that not everyone likes a rose, and some like thorns. So, no one can make another person think that something is beautiful. In conclusion, there is a reflection on why flowers are needed: for bouquets or the existence of the beautiful, then comes a reflection about the ugliness of assigning something as beautiful and the beauty of creating it. The main course of thought is that beauty is determined not by the high rating of the majority (through consumerism), but it exists through excellence (directly). That is why everyone praises not a certain flower but a person who plants, smells, or watches it.

C) Responsibility in the world of truth

Task: Focus on those feelings that arise with slander (What should I do when human dignity is degraded?).

Solution perspective: Ask for an opinion about the slander personally to the person (as far as possible from identification). It can be a character or an author. First, express what you think about them. Then, say what you do not think about them. Make sure that in the latter case, only lies and offensive things are said. For example, I do not think that Barbie (doll) has terrible hair, but I say it according to the game rules. Reflections on the cases when people say not what

they think and do not say what they really think to go along with an understanding of the harm done to the person they talk about and the pursuit of the private interests of the liar. As a result, both sides appear internally ugly and unwise. Realizing the fact of being hurt when people lie means that a responsible person will never say what they do not actually think. They will be strong enough to say only what they really think. And liars are always irresponsible. Question: Does a person tell lies about another person out of cowardice or bravery? It is important here to create conditions for the possibility of thinking about one’s own action in situations when a person could not tell the truth and situations when he did it. It is important to stop the thoughts leading away from yourself and analyze the actions of an external liar.

D) Responsibility in the world of justice

Task: What do you do with an apple in the presence of an adult and a child; poor and rich; sick and healthy; when you are hungry, and someone else is hungry (there may be more situations)? (What should I do when two people need one thing?).

Solution perspective: It does not matter who makes which decision. The main thing is to reveal the possibility of seeing what lies behind these decisions: responsibility or irresponsibility. Listen to the thought process and pay attention to those who acted schematically (an apple to the poor, child, sick, etc., and let the adult, the rich, and the healthy be hungry) and acted independently or sincerely (made a statement of freedom). Even if it was decided not to divide the apple and give it to the “not hungry”, do not blame a student, but give your opinion. The cognitive action in this decision is to throw away the apple. The main thing is to be yourself and not to be subject to external manipulation. The student must realize which way he takes – a victory or a failure – and how he judges.

Childhood is a period of intensive physical and mental development, a preparation for adult life. Today the task is to create such a living

space for a child, in which this child feels protected and provided with all the necessary means for development and functioning. It is necessary to implement a state program that would turn Ukraine into a child-friendly society where every child could receive qualified medical care, high-quality education, children's subculture that corresponds to the age and level of development. It is possible to develop a conscious and responsible person in a space with the principles of personality-oriented education, respect, and no compulsion.

Conclusion

We generalized the theoretical foundations of child-centeredness as a space of axiology of education. The study provides an opportunity to identify and update such leading ideas of child-centeredness as democratization and humanization of the educational process, variability of its forms, methods, and means, encouraging independence and creative initiative of students in the educational process, individual approach to each personality, etc. Analysis of the creative heritage of J. Korczak, D. Dewey, M. Hrushevsky, etc. and the practice of educational institutions gave grounds to formulate some proposals for further development of Ukrainian pedagogical science.

Today's urgent call is to transform the education system into something more appropriate to the real needs of the 21st century, fundamentally rethinking human intelligence. This task has been set within the recent reform of the Ukrainian legislation of the education system. It is declared in the "New Ukrainian School" concept and is the basis of the Law of Ukraine "On Education". This "new" law, passed by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine on September 5, 2017, replaced the "old" law, which had been in place since 1991, the year of Ukraine's independence. So, the "old" system of education, being formed on the principle of necessity, demonstrated its ineffective mechanism of action through a system of prohibitions and oppressions. The "new"

system of education, shaping up on the principle of freedom, counts on being effective by rejecting necessity and excluding coercion. However, the methodological mistake of creating something new by destroying the old and ineffective becomes obvious. Relying on freedom is not supposed to mean a careless attitude towards learning, as opposed to seriousness. Personal effort must be put into the place of coercion as a necessity. Our concept is based on the prohibition of giving up on obligation and disclosing talents through overcoming weaknesses. It is about seeing boundaries as a creative transformation of freedom. For us, the educators of the PRAXIS School of Thinking and Communication of the National Center "Junior Academy of Sciences of Ukraine", a major challenge was to work towards the development of philosophy with children and young people. According to the Polish philosopher Roman Ingarden, the question "Who am I?" can be answered: I am a force that multiplies itself, builds itself, and outgrows itself to the extent that it is able to build rather than crumble into the smallest of moments, giving in to suffering or indulging in pleasure. A force that resists destiny when it feels and knows that its free act saves things from nihilism. Moreover, these things will stay after the force burns in the struggle. In this context, we do not consider the necessity as "not freedom" but as a declaration of freedom. This is a moment when awareness of one's talent comes not from its "discovery", but from freedom itself without determination, beyond cause-consequence connection, that is, from "Self" or obedience to oneself. Therefore, necessity is the ability to understand your gift through yourself, not through references to the relic of the old system of education and the choice of new approaches, but beyond any external authority.

The study does not cover all aspects of this problem. We consider the study of the philosophy of child-centeredness in the space of axiology of contemporary education to be a promising area for further scientific research.

References

- Dewey, J. (1997). *Psikhologiya i pedagogika myshleniya* (Psychology and pedagogy of thinking, in Russian). (N. M. Nikolskaya, Trans.). Moscow: Sovershenstvo.
- Frick, T. W. (2021). Educology is interdisciplinary: What is it? Why do we need it? Why should we care? In B. Hokanson, M. Exter, A. Grincewicz, M. Schmidt, & A. A. Tawfik (Eds.), *Intersections across disciplines. Educational communications and technology: Issues and innovations* (pp 27-42). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-53875-0_3
- Hartmann, N. (2002). *Etika* (Ethics, in Russian). (A. V. Glagolev, Trans.). Saint Petersburg: Vladimir Dal.
- Hattam, R. (2021). Pedagogies of non-self as practices of freedom. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 40(1), 51-65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11217-020-09741-w>
- Ingarden, R. (2010). *Knizhechka o cheloveke* (A little book about a man, in Russian). (E. S. Tverdislova, Trans.). Moscow: Moscow University Press.
- Kant, I. (1980). *Religiya v predelakh tol'ko razuma* (Religion within the limits of the mind, in Russian). In *Traktaty i pis'ma* (Treatises and Letters, in Russian) (pp. 78-278). Moscow: Nauka.
- Kostenko, L. (1996, October 4). *Zdyvovani kvity* (Surprised flowers, in Ukrainian). *Chas* (Time, in Ukrainian), 39, 11.
- Krylova, N. B., & Aleksandrova, E. A. (2003). *Ocherki ponimayushchey pedagogiki* (Essays on understanding pedagogy, in Russian). Moscow: National Education.
- Kvas, O. (2011). *Viziia dytynstva v ukrainskii etnopedahohichnii tradytsii* (Vision of childhood in the Ukrainian ethnopedagogical tradition, in Ukrainian). *Visnyk Lvivskogo universytetu. Seriya pedagogichna* (Visnyk of the Lviv University. Series Pedagogics, in Ukrainian), 27, 217-226.
- Lipman, M. (2003). *Thinking in education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mamardashvili, M. (1990). *Kak ya ponimayu filosofiyu* (How I understand philosophy, in Russian). Moscow: Progress.
- Mamardashvili, M. (2002). *Kantianskiye variatsii* (Kantian variations, in Russian). Moscow: "Agraf"
- Mysko, V. (2015). *Sotsial'no-pravovyi zakhyst dytyny yak osnova pedahohichnoi diialnosti Yanusha Korczaka* (Social and legal protection of a child as the basis of Janusz Korczak's pedagogical activity, in Ukrainian). *Liudynoznavchi studii. Pedahohika* (Anthropological Studies. Pedagogy, in Ukrainian), 1(33), 101-109.
- Ognevyuk, V., & Sysoyeva, S. (2012). *Osvitohiia – naukovi napriam intehrovanoho doslidzhennia sfery osvity* (Osvitologia – the scientific approach to the integrated study of the sphere of education, in Ukrainian). *Ridna shkola* (Native School, in Ukrainian), 4-5, 44-51.