Yatsenko O.
Associate professor
National Pedagogical Dragomanov University

FROM ONTOLOGY TO TECHNOLOGY, FROM REALITY TO VIRTUALITY

1. Abstract

A technics and technology exist as long as human civilization. Human is not just able to adapt to the habitat, but can also change the world according to the own order. In March 2014 World Health Organization has reported that in 2012 around 7 million people died [1], what is one eight of the total global deaths, in the result of the exposure of air pollution. It is generally known that this is not just the only one result caused by the pollution of the environment. The consequences of human's influence to nature are so huge and irreversible, that the solution of the problem seems to be the creation of new virtual reality. The number of the internet users attained to 3 000 000 000 persons in July of this year [2]. The third part of the planet's population spends one third of spare time in the internet. Families spend just eight hours a week together on average, during the weekend in the best case two hours twenty minutes are devoted to the communication between family's members, during the week the amount of that time shrinks to just 36 minutes in a day on average [3]. So, the problem of subjectivity, society and communication grows rapidly and is of the highest current interest.

2. Introduction

The first well-known monograph about philosophy of technology appeared in Germany in 1877 in the form of Ernst Kapp's book "Foundations of a Philosophy of Engineering". The author asserts that technological artifacts should be thought of as man-made imitations and improvements of human organs (see Brey, 2000; De Vries, 2005). Limit physical possibilities of human were replaced by unlimited technical feasibilities. Now we already know exactly, that boundless possibilities do not exist. And the unreasonable uses of available possibilities are very dangerous. Therefore the critical comments upon a technics often sound as warning. This tradition is traced from Rousseau to Heidegger. But a technics is not an instrument only. So, Robert de Poche defines a technics as "a set of methodological procedures, founded on the scientific knowledge, used in production", and the technology as "the study of technics, equipment and machinery". So, a technics unites concepts of knowledge, value and creation. Technology is a glue of contemporary culture, channel of interaction between the different levels of architecture of contemporary civilization. Gernot Böhme (2008) has distinguished the problem of a technics to four main paradigms. The ontological paradigm describes principle of existence and cooperation of technics with other things, phenomena and the worldwide. The anthropological paradigm focuses on a human as subject of technological

relation, and also on possibilities and risk of this activity. The historical and philosophical paradigm gives the widest context for understanding the problem of a technics. The epistemological paradigm demonstrates the quality passing to new knowledge, exposes the specific of transformations in the dynamics of technology. The problem of measure of the ability of a technics in the context of changing the environment and human is very acute. The supporters of “posthumanity” and ""transhumanism” consider that the question of measuring is superfluous. Any modifications of human reason and body are conditioned by the necessities of progress, are the methods of human's adaptation to the terms of the changing world. The critics of these conceptions of boundless optimism repose in the danger of such persuasions. Well, Francis Fukuyama warns of destruction of the concept of social justice and possible social shocks. Whether a human will become ”natural born cyborgs” (Donna Haraway), or will cognize the world in coordinates of ”quasi-transcendental” (Derrida), there is a challenge infront of contemporary culture and civilization. Thus, methodology of the phenomenon of technics is taken to such basic approaches. 1. The technics as an instrument. Such understanding exposes the capacity of technics for transformation of reality. That is why technology is able to produce similarity of reality. 2. The technics as knowledge, value and creation. This methodology of research exposes the rationality invested to a technics. And the phenomenon of technics not just creates new values, but substantially transforms an idea about a value. 3. Technics as element of different paradigms of research. Distinction of paradigms in research of technics is useful to the certain tasks. The problem of subjectivity most brightly opens up in the anthropological paradigm of research. A historical-philosophical paradigm in the study of technics gives an opportunity to analyze the different ways of cooperation of people, so and different types of sociality. The epistemological paradigm accents attention on the communication based on general knowledge and world view. An ontological paradigm focuses to essence of connection of the different phenomena in the single system of reality. So, technology’s influence to ontology is already obvious. Classic ontology is based on a statement about dependence the material, physical world of spiritual, ideal. Ontology of technocratic standard is space of pure freedom, pure metaphysics. All determinants and coordinates of this ontology conflict with the classic paradigm of thinking.

3. Objectives and methods

The general aim of the study is to analyze the influence of innovative technologies to subjectivity, sociality and communication. Technologies transform ontology substantially, and even create own - virtual reality. An anthropogenesis and a sociogenesis are also subjects of influence of technologies. Thus, the following questions require the answer: Is there a measure of influence of a technics to ontology or reality infinitely plastic for changes? What consequences of influence of a technics to subjectivity, sociality and communication in society? How do the philosophical grounds of problem of a technics forms a motivation at the specialists of the applied sciences? The

hypotheses of the research are the next: The concept of technics has direct attribution in the concept of knowledge. Knowledge is possible as memory, including as a historical memory. In fact exactly memory is founding of subjectivity as stability of experience. So, development of technics and technology is an explication of subjectivity. Consequently, a technics is needed for satisfaction of queries of subjectivity. If progress of human's culture is a progress of human's freedom, then at the same time this process is a growth of scales of human's subjectivity. Subjectivity is supersaturated by maintenance, and accordingly becomes to depersonification. Therefore there is a concept of ideal and real communicative association. Having a great number of channels the communications given by a technics, personality is focused on own subjectivity. On the other hand, a technics extends space of freedom considerably. Reality is preceded possibilities, and technics is a realization or materialization of possibility. Besides things appears much more "clever" than most users. Thus the coordinates of human's existence change substantially. The technocratic civilization sets the parameters for subjectivity, sociality and communication. New generation produce the strategies of survival in the conditions of new ontology. The theoretical and empirical studies, interviews and writing competition data are to analyze mainly qualitatively. Validity of the study assumes the selection of the respondents in accordance with the objectives of the research and the work experience of the respondents in the field of the research.

4. Results and ethical questions

The problem of increase of a technics influence in contemporary society is important for the whole spectrum of sociocultural relations in the worldwide. It is questions of psychological, social, political, economic, ecological character and other. The question is about the origin of new ontology, principles of functioning of that are very indefinite. Strategies of survival are also misty accordingly. This research expects to find useful outcomes by the end of the project.

5. References

1. http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2014/air-pollution/en/

2. http://www.internetlivestats.com/internet-users/

3. http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2363193/No-time-family-You-Parentschildren-spend-hour-day-modern-demands.html

4. Böhme, G. (2008): Invasive Technologie: Technikphilosophie und Technikkritik, Kusterdingen: Die Graue Edition.

5. Franssen, M.P.M. (2009): “Analytic philosophy of technology”, in: J.K.B. Olsen, S.A. Pedersen & V.F. Hendricks (Eds): A Companion to the Philosophy of Technology, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 184-188.

6. Kaplan, D.M. (Ed.) (2004): Readings in the Philosophy of Technology, Lanham (Md.): Rowman & Littlefield.

7. Mitcham, C. (1994): Thinking Through Technology: The Path Between Engineering and Philosophy, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

8. Wartofsky, M.W. (1979): “Philosophy of technology”, in: Asquith, P.D. & Kyburg, H.E. (eds): Current Research in Philosophy of Science, East Lansing (MI): Philosophy of Science Association, pp. 171-184.

Жукова Г. В.
кандидат педагогічних наук, старший викладач
кафедри методик та технологій дошкільної освіти
Національний педагогічний
університет ім. М. П. Драгоманова

ПОЗААКАДЕМІЧНА ОСВІТА ЯК ПРІОРИТЕТНИЙ НАПРЯМ МОДЕРНІЗАЦІЇ ОСВІТИ В УКРАЇНІ

Людство у третьому тисячолітті починає розуміти, що завдяки особливостям сучасної освіти виникає ситуація різноманітності в судженнях про результативність і якість навчання. Освіта характеризується появою критеріїв розмежування академічної і неакадемічної внаслідок чого сформувалося легітимне бачення сучасної епохи в філософії, педагогіці та інших науках. Визначення ролі і місця освіти в сучасному суспільстві потребує філософського аналізу та порівняння функцій академічної і позаакадемічної освіти. Диференціація цих понять відкриває нову сторінку в значенні і розкритті потреби особистості у тому чи іншому виді освіти.

Закон України «Про освіту» у першій статті, встановлюючи право суб’єкта освітньої діяльності на автономію та при уточненні поняття академічна діяльність, наводить приклад освітня діяльність. Стаття восьма даного Закону визначає формальну освіту як таку, що здобувається за освітніми програмами відповідно до визначених законодавством рівнів освіти, галузей знань, спеціальностей (професій). Тобто, вона є академічною, оскільки здобувається у академічних закладах за академічними програмами. На противагу неформальна освіта є такою, що здобувається, як правило, за освітніми програмами та не передбачає присудження визнаних державою освітніх кваліфікацій за рівнями освіти, але може завершуватися присвоєнням професійних та/або присудженням часткових освітніх кваліфікацій [3]. Відповідно, вона є паралельною формальній, бо також навчає за освітніми програмами, присуджує кваліфікації, але вона відокремлена від академічних закладів. Інформальна освіта – це самоосвіта, яка накопичує знання не в навчальних закладах формальної і неформальної освіти, але зазначає здобуття компетенцій. Інакше кажучи, формальний світ – це офіційні державні навчальні заклади, а неформальний знаходиться в проекції інноваційної сфери і є позаакадемічною освітою.