

Olga Dolska

Department of Philosophy

National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute"<sup>1</sup>

Olga Gorodiskaya

Department of Philosophy

National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute"<sup>2</sup>

Jakov Tararoyev

Department of Philosophy

National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute"<sup>3</sup>

## Anthropological Dimension of Constructivism in the Culture of Presence

**Słowa kluczowe:** konstruktywizm; wymiar antropologiczny; podmiot; subiektywizacja; kultura obecności; obecność; racjonalność.

**Keywords:** constructivism; anthropological dimension; subject; subjectivation; culture of Presence; Presence; Enlightenment rationality.

### Relevance

During the 21<sup>st</sup> century the fundamental changes in philosophy, science and education have taken place. These changes were fulfilled in the formation of a new type of culture focused, on the one hand, on the subject in obviously crisis situation and on the constructivism approach, on the other hand. Analysing the 20<sup>th</sup> century, A. Badiou expresses the specific character of humankind and philosophy development with a key question: what was the matter of thinking this century and was not the matter before? In philosophy everything was manifested around new human formation idea. To Badiou's mind people were considered to be the

---

<sup>1</sup> Olga Dolska, Department of Philosophy, National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute", Kirpichov st., 2, 61002, Kharkiv, Ukraine, [dolska2016@gmail.com](mailto:dolska2016@gmail.com), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9577-8282>.

<sup>2</sup> Olga Gorodiskaya, Department of Philosophy, National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute", Kirpichov st., 2, 61002, Kharkiv, Ukraine, [olgaorod241@gmail.com](mailto:olgaorod241@gmail.com), <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7665-2185>.

<sup>3</sup> Jakov Tararoyev, Department of Philosophy, National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute", Kirpichov st., 2, 61002, Kharkiv, Ukraine, [tarjv2010@gmail.com](mailto:tarjv2010@gmail.com), <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0734-0804>.

simple material things which were suitable to be used in some projects as well as to be sacrificed in the aims of the projects. The authors of such insane ideas deployed their world conversion programmes in global scope although those programmes were the constructivist ones. Alas such projects activities were accompanied by the absence of morals acknowledged as an old world vestige (Badiou A., 2005). Hence there were put forward the number of questions: What the 21<sup>st</sup> century ought to be? Could we continue using constructivism according to the same anthropological reference points? Or we have to follow new anthropological dimensions and basis? Many researchers indicate the absence of spiritual basis which could delineate the character of relations development in 21<sup>st</sup> century (Jasiński K., 2018). Our purpose is to analyse the opportunities and the risks of constructivism approach topical for science, education and life as well as to outline new anthropological dimension's nature.

## 1. Constructivism description in contemporary researchers

To confirm Badiou's position there might be said that constructivism is supposed to be the general motto for today. The mainstream of such core for human spheres as science, education and mass-media convinces us in it. Reimagining the positivist model of knowledge (especially in theoretical content of scientific observation and empirical facts) M. Mulkey made an attempt to create a new type of the sociology of knowledge that develops from idea of the scientific knowledge social constructing (Malkay M., 1983). In physical world there is no something such reliable to determine scientists' corollaries unambiguously. It allows them to construct different interpretations of reality using language and symbolic resources. To M. Malkay scientific knowledge doesn't possess any epistemological status, it is included into culture, opened for various social influences, and moreover it accentuates on hermeneutics. He noticed (Malkay M., 1983, p.167):

Sociologists and philosophers have approached to the general comprehension of science as interpretative activity on account of which the nature of physical world is constructed socially.

At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century V. Lektorskiy emphasized the necessity of searching the truth sustained by the virtual scores. But how much does science take its bearings at the reality of facts today? Or after

all is it attracted by something aesthetic (inherently postmodern) as, for example, so called “Theory of everything”? The confirmation is Lektorskiy’s thesis that non-classical epistemology is intended for the epistemological realism (Lektorskiy V., 2007).

Constructivism topic is present in basic areas of contemporary life, and it is considered in completely different contexts. The horizons of constructivism application were significantly expanded: nowadays there is a discussion of its implementation not only in science, education, psychology, etc. Politics and international relations, commonwealths and migratory processes norms, border security politics and core international texts, global market, – all these as well as many other terrains acquire scientific foundation using constructivism’s methodology.

Analysing the latest articles there might be noticed that constructivism has gained theoretical and practical tone as in natural sciences as in humanities. The example is T. Baird’s article where he remembers us about the strategy constructivism approaches in state policy elaboration. He proceeds on Saurugger’s theoretical statements (Saurugger S., 2013; Saurugger S., 2010) and points out how much constructivism is practical now (Baird T., 2017).

M. Brosig analyses also constructivism and the worth of constructivism’s reasoning. In the focus of his attention there is compliance norms epistemology used in international texts particularly in European integration texts. He emphasises the significance and the worth of constructivism’s approach in international compliance norms research. Here is his comprehension of constructivism (Brosig M., 2012):

Constructivism is a multifaceted approach ranging from moderate constructivism (middle ground) applying a positivist research agenda to reflectivist constructivism which applies a strict post-positivist perspective. The critique formulated in this article refers to both streams producing incursions of different depth and reach. Finally it is not the intention of this study to develop a ‘ready to use’ alternative constructivist toolkit for application, this is a task for future research, but only aims at providing reasoning for doing so by exploring the limitations of the rationalist approach and by formulating an internal (benevolent) and external in some instances more fundamental critique.

There are not less interesting researches on constructivism ontology. C. Hay substantiates the institutional character of constructivism considered to be a product of social building and a deeply institutional way of thinking. He points out that “constructivism’s ontology of social and political life is profoundly institutional. It is institutions which characterise social as distinct from natural reality and it is institutions which configure the very social and political terrain we inhabit” (Hay C., 2016).

There might be named the works (Berger P.L., Luckmann T., 1966), (Checkel J., 2004), (Hacking I., 1999), (Searle J.R., 2010), etc. considering the specificity of social constructivism. Hay characterises it as follows (Hay C., 2016):

In considering the specificity of social constructivism I have tended to focus on it as a profoundly social mode of analysis and one that issues from, as it develops out of, an (institutional) ontology of the social. But it is also profoundly political in a rather distinctive – and in fact surprisingly normative – way. For, as a mode of analysis it is characterised by one thing more than any other: its aim to identify and reveal the politics in processes that might otherwise be seen as natural or necessary.

The idea of constructivism was realised as well in the educational scope. At the fall of the 20<sup>th</sup> century there was intensified appeal to the constructivism theory (and its main idea is personal management of knowledge). These pedagogical intentions were promoted by new findings as in cognitive as in psychological and pedagogical researches (K. Lorenz, J. Campbell, G. Vollmer, G. A. Kelly). In spring 2017 in Poland on the basis of the Szczecin University there has run the conference “Educational Contexts of Constructivism”, and the scientists from Poland, Ukraine and Great Britain have taken part in it. Inasmuch as constructivism is an interdisciplinary project, didactics that may be founded on this basis needs the combining in its propositions thoughts of different scientific directions – from philosophy to communication theory. Nonetheless conference participants were unanimous in idea that eventually constructivism and didactics based on it would gain a number of advantages. First, it vastly increase possibilities in education as far as it allows students “to play” with reality and with their empirical world. Second, it offers students to create reality and themselves. Though the virtual state of constructivism in the educational practice is not enough clear (is it a trend or a direction – the question is unsolved) application of it in the pedagogical experience is a fulfilled fact, and the reports at the conference became the testimony of it (Honcharenko O., 2017).

As we see, education and science are paving the ways further to the more potent range of constructivism ascendancy: we are referring already to the effects of global techno-constructing of human personality because of the growing capacity of Information and Communication Technologies. The last ones have overcome all constructivism opportunities: TV-shows, electoral races, reality-shows and other inventions of the TV-producers. Moreover there should be mentioned Publicity as it is where constructivism expands its opportunities as well. Together with TV constructivism

masters there are constructivism experts in human's body modification. Gender reassignment and feminism issues are obviously attract attention in modern philosophy. The most well-known representative of constructivism in feminism's theories is J. Butler, author of "Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity", "Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of «Sex»". She analyses detection of social and cultural impacts in gender definition and proves that gender, sex, sexuality are the forms of body's social constructions. Furthermore thanks to advanced technologies we also can't ignore such issues as genetic modification, stem cell therapy and stopping of the aging – all these practices will eventually change a human body completely. In consequence we already may see an active user of a new reality and a new culture. But the notion about new reality which includes the huge forces that influence on our lives remains in frame of the same, simply mechanical interpretation of the world. Unsurprisingly, situation of culture at the turn of 21<sup>st</sup> century casts the doubt as for the rational character of many things and of constructivism as well. First and foremost Enlightenment rationalism and the concept of unified subject were questioned and excoriated.

## **2. Riddling of subject theory and emergence of subjectivation theory in the context of Enlightenment rationality crisis**

The Enlightenment epoch motto *Sapere aude* (dare to know) turned to the individual formed the peculiar subjectivity. Enlightenment rationality was grounded on the reference to Reason and philosophy formed rationality contents according to understanding and interpretation of the scientific and technical development. E. Kant required reflexing the cognitive dogmas in the monologic reason context including all life spheres. He formed Enlightenment ideology on the basis of service to the state and self-knowledge subordinated to law and moral. To his mind science had namely to strengthen the ideological schemes due to the mathematics and physics development as if the laws of mechanics with its rigid determinism form were influential for the thinking designated as rational one.

But on the boundary of 19<sup>th</sup>–20<sup>th</sup> century it was understood that Enlightenment ideology had lost its meaning although positive knowledge had really increased in a huge world scale. Nevertheless the well-known metaphor of "death of subject" had begun defining an intellectual upheavals and a new sense of culture. At the turn of 21<sup>st</sup> century questions about relevance of the rational and the subject of cognition have become

more frequent and even dramatic as the far as in the middle of 20<sup>th</sup> century total utopias and rational irrationality tendencies proliferated all over the world in an enormous scope. The representatives of post-modernity have responded on those upheavals in through-going manner: they designated a new social and cultural phenomenon genesis – “crisis of identity”. Its essence is a destruction of the human’s personality holistic perception. Human one is not already the bearer of moral enquiries; he is not able to perceive his life as something united. The propositions of different worldview approaches and kaleidoscope of social roles as well as time-worn educational machinery don’t promote human’s searching of himself and, of cause, don’t offer to counter Chaos or to overcome it. There is a question in this context: does constructivism approach have a meaning and a force to change human? The metaphor of “death of subject” has become an impetus of a new sense of epoch description. Pursuing such a thought, G. Deleuze has proposed to discuss the subject topic in the concept of “Fold” which designated the possibility of “a new peculiar subjectivity” existence and it became the “subjectivation zone”.

In frame of non-classical epistemology new researches lead us to the necessary revision of certain classical epistemology guidelines in regard to the comprehension of knowledge and the possibilities of it substantiation as well as to the comprehension of consciousness and “I” as a bearer of knowledge. Naturally this situation pushes out such issues as: who constructs and by what laws? So, modern epistemology gets the status of Evolutionary constructivism and classical epistemology subject is acknowledged as the one located out of reality. I. Chernikova, the representative of non-classical epistemology, emphasizes (Chernikova I., 2011, p.72–73):

...the correspondent theoretical comprehension of such reality is inseparable of the mental and communicative processes, and imagination and creative work are opposed to logicism as a scientific method. World ontology of such objects is manifested by means of human psychology. We learn to see the world less through devices and more through human, the point is we learn to see human.

Reviewing researchers on constructivism peculiarities, particularly M. Brosig’s investigations, it’s useful to focus on two clauses. First: constructivism remains a potent scientific approach not only for theoretical studies. It might be the bearer of practically aimed guidance. Second: there is a huge relevance of rationality in using the approach. However M. Brosig in his article “No Space for Constructivism? A Critical Appraisal of European Compliance Research” emphasises that there were neglected many factors in researching of causal links mechanism in com-

plying with norms. In fact these factors are capable to change content and meaning of the norms. That's why author indicates the necessity to take into account transformation of rationality (Brosig M., 2012):

The fact that actors act rationally does not tell us very much about why they do so or where rationality is coming from or how it is changing over time. In this context, constructivism has not challenged the importance of rational behaviour perse (preference formation can also be explained with recourse to rational theories) but has argued that those conditions which constitute preferences, norms, and institutions cannot be less consequential than those conditions which directly trigger a certain action.

It's worth to pay attention to the conclusions made by M. Brosig in his work, he begins with follows: "This article problematizes the dominant 'rationalist turn' within compliance research". So he points out the limited nature of rational approach especially because many researchers rely on the old kind of rationality. It confirms our idea that Enlightenment rationality in contemporary culture/world lost its value and relevance.

Thus the subject determined by Enlightenment rationality has to leave off map of the 21<sup>st</sup> century philosophy. Replacing the idea of "death of subject" the subjectivation concept is formed according to a new condition – a new sense of culture. But for comprehension and description of it there should be new instruments as the categories capable to help us in the mastering. They should help us, firstly, to realise the character of changes in culture and, secondly, to shape the principles of anthropological dimension so long-wished for further researches in the humanities.

### **3. Instruments of after-post-Modern culture in the Humanities (to the problem of a new anthropological dimension formation)**

In Classical early-modern metaphysics Reason used to be the real home for human, and starting with Early Modern time this situation had promoted the designation of culture as the culture of meaning. Nonetheless there might be said Post-Modern attempted to initiate the erosion process. It has led to the ambiguous evaluation of Post-Modernism in our life. After Post-Modernism phenomenon we have faced with after-post-Modern culture declares itself as based on the former Post-Modern researches. There have emerged the theoretical elaborations in the humanities which refuse of Enlightenment rationality, characterise the culture

of Meaning and reveal the courage to evaluate subjectivation in a new comprehension context of the humanitarian practices. H.U. Gumbrecht has proposed the humanitarian research transformation program and declared two epistemological breakthroughs in the humanities. He requires ensuring about human's return to reality inasmuch as the "culture of meaning" becomes destructive without the "culture of Presence" (Gumbrecht H.U., 2006, p.86).

To Gumbrecht's mind the analysis of culture is possible on condition of request to the complex patterns assemble together the culture of meaning and the culture of Presence components. New culture correlates human transformation for the better with Space refusing of independent human activity. "In the culture of Presence the world is the one where people try to sustain relations with it including themselves that is their bodies, and in the culture of meaning people have a tendency to consider world transformation (improvement, reduction, etc.) to be their mission" (Gumbrecht H.U., 2006, p. 88–89). Such position requires using both cultures instruments.

He has named the categories that "hook" the Presence phenomena. There are the bodies in the culture of Presence but not the subjects so representative in the Modern. Knowledge is a result of the world self-revelation comprehended as a gift, but not an effect of a human's interpretation. Space becomes the issue of a special attention. That's why alongside with *spirit*, *consciousness*, *res cogitans* categories there should be used such categories as *the body*, *the body as a space part*, *knowledge opens through the events, things, inclusion of the body into space rhythms, space of people relations establishing*, etc. (Gumbrecht H. U., 2006, p. 86). Gumbrecht has named Post-Modern tradition a kind of "Constructivism aberration" and explained it as well. Thus in Western Culture the precipice between pure spirituality of human existence and pure materialness of the world became the extreme one. The culture of meaning formed the subject-object paradigm and ontology of it was dependent on the human's consciousness processes. Gumbrecht has named this position the anti-substantial one and it can't break the harsh interaction between subject and object. However the culture of Presence gives the opportunity to refuse the total control. To his mind comprehension of these two cultures opposition might help us to resume the contact with the world of things and to leave the subject-object paradigm.

The culture of presence idea was formed on the basis of two epistemological upheavals. In first one Gumbrecht proposed "non-hermeneutical program" of literary criticism emphasising on analysis of communications when the core interest "moves from interpretation to appearance of



meaning at the concrete historical and meta-historical levels” (Gumbrecht, H. U., 2006, p. 26). The second epistemological upheaval was founded on the “production of Presence” effects that gave the opportunity to propose more expanded approach to communication including effects of Presence, effects of touch, closeness or intensity of space interaction, inclusion of bodies locations and their space relation to the world and its items. And the key is that meaning formation process “gets” into dependence of such relations.

Brosig emphasises also the particular significance of communicative processes when applying constructivism’s method (Brosig M., 2012):

Constructivists have argued that the discursive nature of social kinds (including norms and preferences) follows a logic of argumentation in which communicative reasoning structures the discourse (Risse, 2000). While the rational approach to norm compliance uses a concept of fixed norms, norm validation requires a continuous norm construction process entailing discursive elements. The constructivist assumption is that sustainable compliance is less a function of effective sanctioning but much more reliant on the acceptance of norms by the state and communicative leadership by providing supreme reasoning. Exploring conditions for norm acceptance, has so far not figured prominently in the compliance scholarship.

Hence, if in metaphysical tradition all the relations are dependent on the human’s consciousness processes and Post-Modern tradition focuses on this situation, the culture of Presence insists on the break with the Cartesian-metaphysical tradition. Comprehension of new oppositions allows “providing the universal distinctions” that give place for a new “intellectual surrounding” and look not for paradigm dominance but for “production of Presence” in science, education and life (Gumbrecht H. U., 2006).

Constructivism is aimed at effect on reality even at building it. Obviously in natural sciences constructivism is welcome because of the link with the evolutionary constructivism. Hence the question is: in what context we have to comprehend reality? Could we characterise it as passive and suitable for “guidance”? But there could be also put the question about its activity. According to Modern that is Cartesian tradition reality doesn’t have active capabilities. In frame of Post-Modern it is only the ironic product resembles narcissism. Curious enough, reality positions itself as an active substance in opposite to subject became not only inactive but it unexpectedly disappears. It was not accidentally that E. Husserl queried about the crisis of science: the last one had lost the contact with real life basis and replaced the real life world by the imitative world of abstractions. Probably, continuing Husserl’s ideas J. Horgan describes modern science ironically that is ambiguous. Consequently it might be said that science today is enough complicated as for the issues of reality.

#### 4. Presence phenomenon meaning for anthropological dimension

Culture obviously relies on anthropological dimension as it is the central axis of human formation process. Paradox situation aggravates, on the one hand, by still metaphysical comprehension of the anthropological base and, on the other hand, by the emptiness of its existential dimension as far as existence of today's education doesn't deal with metaphysical paradigm. It presupposes a certain problem and absence of the transcendental reference points. Because of this anthropological dimension of education remains inefficient and doesn't give real reference points for the obtaining of the transcendental "keys". Existence requires the transcendental functions as optics, as a key of reality namely it has cognitive and vital meaning.

There is a question: what in new culture ought to be the transcendental? The response could be found relying on A. Badiou's event philosophy, F.R. Ankersmit's experience philosophy, post-soviet time and space cultural studies of the fall of 20<sup>th</sup> century, E. Levinas' philosophy of the Other, etc. A. Badiou reflects upon science in the event philosophy context and evaluates an experience in a new way (Badiou A., 2010). F.R. Ankersmit actually discovers an experience anew: it is not reduced to language, something generates meanings is the most essential for it. Experience overcomes the linguistic transcendentalism of the humanities where "language speaks by human and subject acts as a language author. For him not fact or narrative manifests history but experience-event the out-language status of which is determined by its height" (Ankersmit F.R., 2007, p. 21).

S. Downes and G. Siemens began to speak about new importance of experience in education (Downes St., 2010; Siemens G., 2005). They have offered their vision of educational process – by connectivism named it "an education theory in digital epoch". These scientists-practitioners aim at analysing the opportunities of education in the technical-and-technological explosion time. The main task of this education form is permanent building of a net and creating practical models which allow to copy actions and to classify the interactions between students and community. Event becomes the element of Presence. That's why the issue of virtual world probability emerges moreover in this world *Presence* category occupies the key role. The discussion and the realisation of this category could be found in the works of M. Heidegger, J.-L. Nancy, J. Derrida, U. Eco, G. Deleuze but for us H.U. Gumbrecht's researches became the real indicator of the category comprehension. He reflexes about Presence and about production of it. H.U. Gumbrecht insists (Gumbrecht H.U., 2006, p. 29):

...for us “the present one” is situated (wholly according to the content of Latin form *prae-esse*) directly in front of us, in the dimension of our bodily accessibility and perceptibility... the word “production” will be used according to the shape of its epistemological meaning. If *producere* means precisely “endure”, “put forward”, in expression “production of Presence” there would be underlined that perceptibility effect made by the material means of communication remains in continuous motion. That is to say, talking about “production of Presence” we understand that (space) perceptibility effect made by the means of communication depends on space motions of more or less closeness and more or less intensity.

As we see H.U. Gumbrecht emphasizes already not the social identity constructing but the form of the subjectness – respondent or capable to response. Hence there are substantiated human’s responsive characteristics as an ability to share experience and as a response to significant event. It proves that experience sphere has to follow communication horizon (presupposes outlet to the transcendental) with opportunity to share experience. Autonomous active subject disappears making possible the emergence of Presence phenomenon by virtue of anthropological boundary of subjectness formation as far as this subjectness can respond, compassionate, be responsible for others, etc. It’s interesting in researches of computers, audio and video means of communication *Presence* category is discussed in different contexts. Transition to a new level of ICT mastering and elaboration confirms the necessity of all human’s dimensionalities safekeeping and transmitting by the means of communication because those dimensionalities constitute today such a capacious concept as “Presence”.

So the natural question is how much constructivism may include in the Presence idea and the idea of subject capable to response. Is it possible yet to talk about its realisation as a basis of a new anthropological dimension? To our mind the research of constructivism in its anthropological characteristics acquires the proponents.

American psychologist J. Raskin (“Journal of Constructivist Psychology”, editor-in-chief) writes that social constructivism is realised not by isolated people, but “in coordinated people’s actions in concrete contexts”. Constructivism’s rationality presupposes a particular significance of each subject’s personality features as much as “socially determined meanings are constructed collectively”. Meanwhile there is a special contribution of historical context of any ethical norms and even standards. He writes (Raskin J., 2017):

It is not that there are no shared standards for objectively determining what people did; it is just that these standards, in being used to judge behavior, are inevitably reflective of the way we ethically make sense of things at the current mo-

ment in history. This is what makes evaluating the ethical actions of people from past historical eras challenging. Still, that does not mean we should not or cannot do so.

For Raskin historical experience gains the special meaning as well as nowadays history's moment and certainly each one's personal features including personal experience (Raskin J., 2017):

While writing this, I was reminded of George Kelly, who said the questions we ask are often more important than the answers we give them. If so, then I hold out hope that the present exchange has succeeded in some small way by contributing to an ongoing dialogue. I believe that any thoroughgoing account of ethical meaning making must take into consideration both the social and personal aspects of construing, while also acknowledging that ethical constructs – once devised – become experientially real things people can use to evaluate events and govern their actions.

There may be supposed that *Presence* category helps to emphasise in constructing of reality and facilitates the consistency in these processes. Nonetheless the focus is such experience which is capable to elevate human to the transcendental level.

The most topical research areas today using the *Presence* category are robotics, artificial intelligence and consciousness work analysis. Contemporary transition to a new level of ICT mastering and elaboration requires complete comprehension of human basis and it is impossible without *Presence* category. M. Lombard and T. Ditton talk about six different conceptual notions of Presence expressing that analysis of the literature on this phenomenon is still in its initial state (Lombard M., Ditton T., 2006). The scientists of the virtual world psychology manifest particular interest to phenomenon. For example, Kwan Min Lee defines it as “a psychological condition in which the virtual objects are perceived as the real ones by different ways: as sensory as non-sensory” (Lee Kwan Min, 2004). But the achievements in three-dimensional things creating are the most impressive. 3D technology was developed almost for three decades but only in 2013 it was claimed to be the most wonderful way of goods production in the world. The breakthrough technology of 4D printing on the basis of Programmable matter (PM) conception has become the consistent continuation of the previous 3D. Indeed the matter but not the materials as the elaborators insist: to their mind there is the transition to the philosophical categories domain (4D printing: the path to programmable matter, 2017).

The Presence issue is analysed in neurophysiological researches of V.S. Ramachandran (Centre for Brain and Cognition, University of Cali-

fornia, San Diego). In his book “The Emerging Mind” Ramachandran has considered traditional for philosophy questions about art explaining its significant influence on human in the situation of Presence in front of masterpiece. To his mind (Ramachandran V., 2006, ch. 4, p. 11):

...solutions of aesthetic problems are in the deeper comprehension of the links between optic brain centre and emotional limbic structures (as well as between governing internal logic and evolutionary basis). As soon as we get clear comprehension of the links, we'll be closer to the huge chasm separates two cultures – science, on the one side, and art and philosophy – on another.

We may be sure Ramachandran's researches bring us closer to a new type of culture. Unsurprisingly, neurophysiologist A. Damasio (University of Southern California, Salk Institute, Brain and Creativity Institute) in his work “Descartes' Error: Emotion, Reason, and the Human Brain Kindle Edition” positions himself to be a proponent of anti-Cartesian revolution.

New scientific-technological direction of NBICS-convergent model development as a technological modification catalyst of technological and social medium became an impetus for conscious going out of Enlightenment paradigm and Enlightenment rationality (Bainbridge W.S., Roco M.C., 2005; Bainbridge W.S., Roco M.C., 2016). There are more and more researches emphasize an avoidance of one-sided utility and keeping in mind the invalidity of extreme rational approach (in Descartes' meaning) when communication (particularly with machines) is based on the abstract phenomena of human thinking separated of his body. Though contemporary scientific investigations focus mostly on provocative actions connected with artificial intelligence. We remember how J. Delgado, professor of Yale University, in 1960s carried out the experiments on animals when implanting electrodes into their brains and controlling the situations scientist needed. Scientific community was concerned at the developing project. But after Delgado's book “Physical Control of the Mind: Toward a Psychocivilised Society” there was made a decision to prohibit the experiments. Obviously Delgado's constructing activity intersected in perspective with the menace of great Utopias' technologies so ethical and anthropological issues would become unacceptably acute.

Sometimes we can't evaluate interactions between science and philosophy, science and art, science and education. Knowledge of these key points becomes high-demanded thanks to the culture of Presence.

## Conclusions

As we see natural and technical sciences as well as IT-sciences emphasise constructivism and attach its evolutionary status, but the humanities' attitude to it is enough ambiguous. The topic of human and reality construction is discussed in philosophical, scientific, educational, social and psychological circles. There is founded the paradox situation when sciences' optics is forming by different anthropological dimensions.

If we talk about an epoch of a new attitude to the world and human when phenomenology of subjectness is a responsive one, entirely different culture is revealed. It "clears" a place for a new intellectual medium needs to be free of an awful constructivism position formed on the metaphysical comprehension of subject. In the contemporary humanities anthropological dimension could be understood only in the context of the culture of meaning and the culture of Presence synthesis because the content of the last one is out of Enlightenment rationality traditional norms and it means failure and even collapse for them. In the culture of Presence there are such values as experience effect, strong impression effect and even transcendental level of this strong impression. The psychosomatic phenomena of empathy and capability to response may/have to become the mediator between human and human, human and nature, human and Universe.

Culture focused on the processing of human relations has to effect on a crucial transformation of human and total openness together with self-realisation has to determine future pathways. New intellectual medium as we see focuses not on the social construction of identity but on the nascence of subjectness capable to response. Such position is aimed at full-fledged dialogue with real world – empathetic and intensive. So, an issue of anthropological paradigm invalidity remains unsolved.

### ANTROPOLOGICZNY WYMIAR KONSTRUKTYWIZMU W KULTURZE OBECNOŚCI

(STRESZCZENIE)

Zgodnie z założeniem autorów funkcjonowanie człowieka w takich sferach, jak: nauka, epistemologia, edukacja, różne praktyki życiowe itp. coraz częściej opiera się na konstruktywizmie. Autorzy podkreślają, że już w XX w. był oczywistym fakt, że jeśli podejście konstruktywistyczne opiera się na oświeceniowej racjonalności, to powoduje wiele zagrożeń i negatywnych konsekwencji. Powodem takiej sytuacji jest specyficzne pojmowanie podmiotu, które wpływa na niedoskonały antropologiczny wymiar racjonalności. Analiza modyfikacji tego zjawiska skłoniła autorów do uwzględniania idei

kultury obecności, zwłaszcza podejmując tę kwestię w wymiarze antropologicznym. Kultura obecności w tym kontekście „zwalnia” miejsce dla nowego „intelektualnego otoczenia”, charakterystyczną cechą którego jest obecność nagannej konstruktywistycznej pozycji, która została ukształtowana przez metafizyczne rozumienie podmiotu. W artykule przedstawiono zakres pojęciowy tej kultury, podkreślono jej znaczenie w nowych warunkach życia oraz przeanalizowano zjawisko obecności w badaniach prowadzonych przez współczesnych naukowców. Kultura obecności przyczynia się do zaniku autonomiczności podmiotu. W wyniku określonych zdarzeń owa podmiotowość może być zastąpiona subiektywizmem, dla którego charakterystyczna jest zdolność do reagowania, empatii, odpowiedzialności za innych itd. W związku z tym współczesna humanistyka musi ponownie odwołać się do wymiaru antropologicznego, ponieważ zrozumienie przedstawionego w artykule zjawiska nie może być rozważane wyłącznie w tradycyjnych normach oświeceniowej racjonalności i dyskursie metafizyki.

## ANTHROPOLOGICAL DIMENSION OF CONSTRUCTIVISM IN THE CULTURE OF PRESENCE

### (SUMMARY)

To the authors' mind human activity is more frequently based on Constructivism in spheres as science, epistemology, education, upbringing, number of living practices, etc. The authors emphasize if such approach relies on Enlightenment rationality there are many risks and negative consequences of it using what was obviously already in 20<sup>th</sup> century. The reason is in specific comprehension of subject that influences on imperfect anthropological dimension of the rationality. Analysing of its modification has necessarily led the authors to take into account the Culture of Presence idea in the process of anthropological dimension realisation. The Culture of Presence “clears” the place for a new “intellectual surrounding” where there is a need to leave the awful Constructivism position formed through metaphysical comprehension of subject. In the article there were proposed the categories of those culture, there emphasizes their relevance in new life conditions and there was analysed the Presence phenomenon in the contemporary scientists researches. The authors underline the Culture of Presence basis and implementations of this culture contribute to disappearance of self-contained subject. In the event situation the subject could be replaced by subjectivity capable to respond, to empathize, to be responsible for others, etc. The contemporary humanities need to renew anthropological dimension inasmuch as comprehension of it cannot be guided at traditional norms of Enlightenment rationality and metaphysics discourse.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 4D printing: the path to programmable matter, 2017, URL: <http://integral-russia.ru/2017/05/04/4d-pechat-put-k-programmiruemoj-materii/> (4.05.2017).
- Ankersmit Franklin R., 2007, *A Sublime Historical Experience*, Moscow, Europe Publishing House, URL: <http://abuss.narod.ru/Biblio/ankersmit/ankersmit8.htm> (4.05.2017).
- Badiou Alain, 2005, *The Century*, URL: <https://ru.scribd.com/doc/177311558/Alain-Badiou-The-Century#> (4.05.2017).

- Badiou Alain, 2010, *Philosophy and Event. Conversations with a brief introduction to the philosophy of Alain Badiou*, URL: <https://www.libfox.ru/638253-alen-badyu-filosofiya-i-sobytie-besedy-s-kratkim-vvedeniem-v-filosofiyu-alena-badyu.html> (04.05.2017).
- Bainbridge William S., Roco Mihail C., 2005, *Managing Nano-Bio-Infocogno Innovations: Converging technologies in Society*, Complete Report in PDF format, World Technology Evaluation Center, URL: [http://www.wtec.org/ConvergingTechnologies/3/NBIC3\\_report.pdf](http://www.wtec.org/ConvergingTechnologies/3/NBIC3_report.pdf) (04.05.2017).
- Bainbridge William S., Roco Mihail C., 2016, *Science and technology convergence: with emphasis for nanotechnology-inspired convergence*, Journal of Nanoparticle Research, No 18 (7), June, URL: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305643543\\_Science\\_and\\_technology\\_convergence\\_with\\_emphasis\\_for\\_nanotechnology-inspired\\_convergence](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305643543_Science_and_technology_convergence_with_emphasis_for_nanotechnology-inspired_convergence) (4.05.2017).
- Baird Theodore, 2017, *Interest groups and strategic constructivism: business actors and border security policies in the European Union*, Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2017.1316185> (4.05.2017).
- Berger Peter L. and Luckmann Thomas, 1966, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Brosig Malte, 2012, *No Space for Constructivism? A Critical Appraisal of European Compliance Research*, Perspectives on European Politics and Society Vol. 13, No. 4, p. 390–407, URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15705854.2012.731931> (4.05.2017).
- Checkel Jeffrey T., 2004, *Social Constructivisms in Global and European Politics*, Review of International Studies, 30, p. 229–44. // URL: [https://www.sv.uio.no/arena/english/research/publications/arena-working-papers/2001-2010/2003/wp03\\_15.pdf](https://www.sv.uio.no/arena/english/research/publications/arena-working-papers/2001-2010/2003/wp03_15.pdf) (4.05.2017).
- Chernikova Irina, 2011, *Typology of science in the context of modern philosophy of science*, Questions of Philosophy, No 11, p. 71–78.
- Downes Stephen, 2010, *New Technology Supporting Informal Learning*, Journal of Emerging Technologies in Web Intelligence, No 2 (1), p. 27–33. URL: <https://www.downes.ca/cgi-bin/page.cgi?post=51342> (24.04.2009)
- Hacking Ian, 1999, *The Social Construction of What?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press // URL: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261743764\\_The\\_Social\\_Construction\\_of\\_What\\_by\\_Ian\\_Hacking](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261743764_The_Social_Construction_of_What_by_Ian_Hacking) (4.05.2017).
- Hay Colin, 2016, *Good in a crisis: the ontological institutionalism of social constructivism*, New Political Economy, URL: // <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2016.1158800> (4.05.2017).
- Honcharenko Olha, 2017, *Educational Contexts of Constructivism*, Philosophy of Education, No. 2 (21), p. 162–168.
- Gumbrecht Huns Ulrich, 2006, *Presence production: What meaning cannot convey*, URL: <http://www.history-library.com/index.php?id1=3&category=arhiologiya&author=gumreht-hu&book=2006> (4.05.2017).
- Jasiński Karol, 2018, *On the Spiritual Foundation of Europe*, Studia Warمیńskie, No 55, p. 25–42.
- Lectorskiy Vladislav, 2007, *Cognition, understanding, design. Grew up Acad. Sciences*, Institute of Philosophy, IFRAN, Moscow.
- Lee Kwan Min, 2004, *Presence, Explicated*, Communication Theory, Vol. 14, Issue 1, p. 27–50, URL: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2004.tb00302.x> (10.01.2006).



- Lombard Matthew, Ditton Theresa, 2006, *At the Heart of It All: The Concept of Presence*, URL: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1083-6101.1997.tb00072.x> (23.06. 2006).
- Mulkey Michael, 1983, *Science and sociology of knowledge*, Progress, Moscow.
- Ramachandran Vileyanur, 2006, *The birth of the mind. Mysteries of our consciousness*, URL: [https://royallib.com/book/ramachandran\\_vileyanur/rogdenie\\_razuma\\_zagadki\\_nashego\\_soznaniya.html](https://royallib.com/book/ramachandran_vileyanur/rogdenie_razuma_zagadki_nashego_soznaniya.html) (4.05.2017).
- Raskin D. Jonathan, 2017, *Constructivism, Ethics, and Knowing What's Right: A Reply to McNamee, Burr, McWilliams, Osbeck, and Held*, Journal of Constructivist Psychology, URL: // <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10720537.2017.1383956> (4.05.2017).
- Risse Thomas, 2000, *'Let's argue!' Communicative action in international relations*, International Organization, 54 (1), p. 1–39. // URL: <http://rochelleterman.com/ir/sites/default/files/risse%202000.pdf> (4.05.2017).
- Saurugger Sabine, 2010, *The Social Construction of the Participatory Turn: The Emergence of a Norm in the European Union*, European Journal of Political Research 49 (4), p. 471–495.
- Saurugger Sabine, 2013, *Constructivism and Public Policy Approaches in the EU: From Ideas to Power Games*, Journal of European Public Policy 20 (6), p. 888–906.
- Searle John Rogers, 2010, *Making the Social World: The Structure of Human Civilization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press // URL: [http://www.frankfurt-school-verlag.de/rmm/downloads/Review\\_Buehler.pdf](http://www.frankfurt-school-verlag.de/rmm/downloads/Review_Buehler.pdf) (4.05.2017).
- Siemens George, 2005, *Connectivism: A Learning Theory for the Digital Age* // URL: [http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Jan\\_05/article01.htm](http://www.itdl.org/Journal/Jan_05/article01.htm) (4.05.2017).

