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ABSTRACT

This article attempts to have a linguistic and philosophical insight into the World a man builds. The World a man builds is the literature embodiment of his ideas about what this World should be. Hence, the spiritual and linguistic development of the concept of the World is always proportional to the person himself. The most ancient artifacts enable us to state that since time immemorial, humanity has fully understood the place and role of man as an active subject of social and linguistic changes, and Protagoras’s famous saying about man as the measure of all things is, most likely, only a peculiar awareness by the ancient culture of the significance of the subjective factor in the life of ancient society and literature. The non-decreasing attention of philosophers and linguists to the role of man, public practice demonstrated the validity of this statement in subsequent eras. The authors of the study focus on the literature and philosophical aspects of a modern person, or rather, the search for answers, first of all, to the following fundamental questions: what is the modern period son like? What should he be and why? In our opinion, an adequate to realities understanding of the problem will allow not only to foresee the future but also, to a large extent to model it so that it would be the embodiment of the will and ideas of a perfect man. In this regard, the work analyzes linguistic and philosophical problems of education to form a person that is most consistent with the nature of this creature.
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1. Introduction

The provision on the active role of the subjective factor in the emergence, functioning and linguistic features of society in various interpretations and formulations is present in all socio-philosophical pictures, essentially starting from the moment of the birth of literature and philosophical as a way of spiritual and practical development of the World by man (DeFranza et al., 2020). In this case, we consider examples sufficient to demonstrate such opposite linguistic and philosophical views as materialism and idealism, classical and non-classical. Plato in his work “The State” deeply and comprehensively argues the thesis of a direct dependence of the state’s present and future on the quality of a person’s soul. In the future, this idea will sound no less justified in the works of such different philosophers as A. Blazhennyy, A. Schopenhauer, K. Marx, F. Nietzsche, M. Buber, A. Camus, J. Lyotard, S. Zizek, N. Berdyaev et al (Marx & Engels, 1969; Buber, 1999; Berdjaev, 1990; Zizek, 2019).

The authors of this study attempted a linguistic and philosophical analysis of the “I” of man in modern society in order to understand the present and future of civilization.
2. Methods

To demonstrate their reasoned position, the authors used, first of all, the method of ascent from the general through the special to the unitary and the method of logical and historical unity. Their use allows (as the authors believe), on the one hand, to get away from the schematization and dogmatization of literature and socio-philosophical ideas about the meaning of "I" in social transformations, and on the other, to see the limits of its capabilities in the mirror of modern realities.

3. Results and Discussion

Emphasizing the intrinsic value and self-sufficiency of man is a leading trend in modern linguistic and philosophical anthropology. Moreover, such a statement is not declared for granted, which must be realized in the future (which was mainly characteristic of the philosophy of the Renaissance), but as a reality of today's culture. Since this position is most fully and consistently held and defended in postmodernism, the authors' research is limited to an analysis of the problem in the space of this philosophy.

Postmodern literature and philosophy is internally contradictory. It is difficult to "cling" to some shore. In its framework rationalism is not held in high esteem, but it claims to be a linguistics and philosophy, there is no place for binary oppositions in it, but its self-manifestation affirms their refutation. Therefore, for example, the postmodern vision of the World excludes narrative and, at the same time, is built around the concept of "rhizome", which is already a narrative - because it has an apology for randomness.

In the light of what has been said, educational programs aimed at raising the principle of orientation toward the formation of an all-conquering intellect turn out to be unclaimed. However, how then to live in such a world? What to teach and learn, is it worth learning at all? In strategic terms, postmodernists instead offer to worship nothing as a deity, neither in science, nor in art, nor in public relations, nor in anything else. Everything is in the hands of man; he is the measure of all things. Man constructs the World, himself, both from the available ones, and from the meanings that he creates from himself. This approach imposes strict demands on a person - everything must be subordinated to the formation of a creative personality in him, which will allow him to be always ready to answer the challenges of fate himself. Nevertheless, he is humanistic, because it allows him to reproduce life in the most desperate situations. And what could be more valuable than life (Khaziev, 2005; Gussell', 1992; Marx, 2020)?

At the same time, it is obvious that such values clearly follow other values, opposing them. After all, the fact is that the postmodern vision of man and his role does not remove, but makes the adoption of the principle "everything is allowed" even more possible. If "every man is the architect of his own fortune", then the other is only a means for him (as Hegel warned, revealing the features of the functioning of civil society): then a person is not limited by the norms of morality and there are no generally accepted truths for him. Since they cannot be in principle, everyone is the creator of the universe. Accordingly, the occurrence of oracles is not ruled out. Moreover, there is no end to those who wish to make humanity happy. In addition, even if happiness is seen in the globalization of history, it is somehow monochromatic gray.

Again we return to the starting point: how to live? What to study and learn? What values should be adhered to in order to remain human and to keep humanity (Habermas, 1992)?

When we speak about education as a way of forming a person, it is obvious that the prospects for education are determined by ideas about the past, present and future of society, and in a globalizing world, by the prospects of all mankind. However, even proceeding from this fact, various images of the future are possible, with which educational paradigms should be reckoned. In postmodern philosophy, with its apology for randomness, the image of perspective has nothing to do with the generalizing picture of the World. Very illustrative in this regard is the report of J. Lyotard on the state of knowledge in the most developed societies, made by him by order of the Council of Universities of the Government of Quebec in the late seventies of the last century. In this report the author ascertains the crisis of scientific knowledge, caused primarily by the internal decomposition of the principle of determinism, which had legitimized earlier almost any discourse, including scientific. In addition, Lyotard questions the classical lines of demarcation between different fields of science, the existence of familiar university faculties and, in essence, considers it necessary to abandon the training of researchers and transfer higher education to the training of teachers (Liotar, 1996). As a result, the goal of education is to form a person who has completely thrown off his background, a person who imagines himself to be God. More precisely, this is not the goal, but the reality of today, when the familiar moral horizon has been replaced by the cacophony of competing value systems. And this cannot, as F. Fukuyama rightly writes, please people, because they "... feel insecurity and alienation, because they don't know who they really are" (Fukujama, 2019). In principle, the roots of the problem are in the past, when it was already noticed that the extreme individualization of society led to the opposition of each to each. A model of education based on this principle, wanting to see a winner in a person always and almost at any cost, demanded from him only qualities corresponding, figuratively speaking, to the "king of beasts", "mortal God". And imperceptibly for himself (though, is it really imperceptible?!), the man was reborn into a beast, although reasonably
acting. Then, people became only a means for each other. The situation can be resolved, as J. Habermas emphasized, only in the discourse by developing a metalanguage, which can lead to clarification of the single meaning of history (Zizek, 2009). Postmodernism, taking a directly opposite position, requires expanding the educational space, increasing its richness and diversity by attracting as many opinions as possible. Other, according to postmodernists, leads to submission to any given or established norm, including the teacher’s power over the student, the power of any educational program. You can understand this position and partially accept it. Rejecting the possibility of a metalanguage, postmodernism is likely to exaggerate the negative aspects of globalization, when the meeting of cultures ends, as a rule, with a conflict or the desire of one of the parties to dominate the other. In our opinion, the point is not in the hierarchy as such (it, in our opinion, is inevitable and necessary), but in the measure of “domination – submission” relations: is it aimed at preserving these relations or is it capable of ultimately raising an independent and creative personality? Hence, a metalanguage is possible and necessary. However, what metalanguage? Who can be a metalanguage carrier? Answering these questions, E. Husserl voted in favor of philosophy and philosophers. The fact is that only “… in philosophy we are the functionaries of mankind, however much we would like to deny this” (Khaziev et al., 2015).

Among the many images of the future, a special place is occupied by those that come, ultimately, from the post-non-classical general scientific picture of the World as an integral part of the new philosophical and literature worldview. It is based on the fundamental principle of global evolutionism, combining the ideas of systemic and evolutionary approaches into a single whole. This principle again actualizes the well-known oriental wisdom that when you tear a blade of grass, the whole Universe trembles. The central idea of universal evolutionism is the provision on co-evolutionary, i.e. the conjugate change of systems or parts within the whole. With regard to building both the image of the perspectives and prospects of education, this idea has a number of fundamental consequences. First of all, the concepts based on the recognition of the linearity of all changes are rejected, thereby making unambiguous forecasts regarding the expected consequences of actions occurring in the systems are untenable. An important aspect of the recognition of the co-evolutionary development of systems is the recognition of the need for a person to be able to understand and accept the wide and even global context of the problem under study through educational programs. Inability to contextualize any problem (in our case, designing images of the future and prospects of education) means closure in one’s own World, where a limited person can feel comfortable. At the same time, the image of another is certainly perceived as the image of the enemy, which has led and continues to lead to the constant extermination of man by man, to a deepening confrontation between man and nature. The result of all this can be only one image of perspective: the absence of the prospects of humanity.

4. Summary

As we suppose, our analysis allows us to argue that the World a man builds is really proportionate to a man. The image of the future and the prospects for education are mutually reinforcing, and in such a way that they include some elements that pass from era to era. Among the latter, the need to combine the interests of the individual and society. In principle, the formula for solving this problem, in our opinion, has been found and it sounds like this: the free development of everyone is a condition for the free development of everyone! Another problem is related to the ratio of objective knowledge about a person, society, the World and moral standards, which a person should be guided by, applying his knowledge. The desire to dispense with “bare” knowledge about the world order, ignoring morality (including extolling the disciplines of the natural sciences to the detriment of the study of socio-humanitarian disciplines) has cost humanity a lot. An important constant project of the future and prospects of education is the issue of the formation of a tolerant attitude towards the image of another. In the context of globalization, this problem is even more relevant.

5. Conclusions

In the proposed work, the authors proceeded from the understanding of the results of human activity as the embodiment of man’s will and language. A tried and tested way to influence the will and perception of a person, forming the image of the World, is education, which makes it possible to control information flows purposefully. Not only the quality of the social project, but also the success in its implementation, depending on the maturity (moral, theoretical, political, cultural) of the human factor, which even today, as in the old days, the one is on a roll who wins the struggle for the minds of people (Khazieva et al., 2017; Zizek, 2019; Lenin, 1920).

However, a victory may turn out to be pyrrhic if the goal and means of achieving it are not worthy of man. Thus, the educational programs of Western civilization are focused on narrow specialization, which is in demand by market relations: the term for commissioning new specialists should be minimal. Nevertheless, technical and technological progress, in turn, requires their constant retraining. Moreover, this is rather expensive even for rich countries. What about Russia? For the last three hundred years, we have been moving along the path of training a generalist, who is able to respond flexibly enough to changing working conditions. After returning to the “pillar road of human civilization” (read - following the path of Western civilization), together with a two-stage education,
we mechanically transferred a paid specialist training system to Russian soil. This has degraded the quality of education. The embodiment of Pyrrhic victory is also a person of a culture of glamor, whose life purpose has become the consumption of material goods to the detriment of spiritual growth. In contrast, postmodern culture is for the fullest disclosure of the essential forces of man. However, the good intentions of postmodernists ultimately lead to a social fiasco, since, in the language of religion, the atheistic aspirations awaken in a person. As a result, not only every man is his own master, but everyone is trying to become master for everyone, for the moral horizon has been replaced by the cacophony of competing value systems. And yet, our criticism of the postmodern model of man does not at all mean its absolute rejection. It seems to us that the literature and philosophical picture of the World of postmodernism as a whole, as well as its linguistic and philosophical anthropology, should rather be interpreted as focusing public attention on the problems of human being and humanity, rather than as an attempt to resolve them finally. Seeing this as his weakness would be wrong. There is a moment of truth in the questions themselves: the one, who puts them, is in doubt, which means he thinks. Thus, humanity once again faced a choice: to find such an educational paradigm that would solve the problem of the relationship between the interests of man and society.
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