

Philosophy and social uncertainty some brief reflections



<https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2023.006-089>

Mario Germán Gil Claros

Bachelor's, Master's, PhD in philosophy. Undergraduate and postgraduate professor at various universities in Colombia. Academic peer of Colciencias. Former president of the Foundation for Philosophy in Colombia. Humanistic Coordinator of the Fundación Hispanoamericana Santiago de Cali - Colombia and Director of Research at Redipe - Colombia.
E-mail: mariogil961@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This writing focuses attention on five major problems of the present that affect philosophy, the philosopher's discourse. This is how we see the school, the ecosystem, technology, politics linked to life, knowledge and subjectivity, become big questions for philosophy today, before addressing its future. It is thinking what is typical of philosophical thought in a social context.

Keywords: Ecosystem, School, Uncertainty, Politics, Subjectivity, Technology, Truth, Life.

1 INTRODUCTION

We live in a complex present, of profound changes and at the same time of unfathomable dangers that question planetary life itself. In the face of this, what does philosophy tell us? First, what does the future hold for you? Rather than prophesying about its future, this paper focuses its attention on five central aspects, which it does not deny others. These are: philosophy and school, philosophy and ecosystem, philosophy and technology, philosophy and politics linked to life, philosophy, knowledge, knowledge, truth, philosophy, and subjectivity. This is what will be highlighted in the following lines as an open invitation to a frank dialogue for our present.

1.1 PHILOSOPHY AND SCHOOL

What can philosophy and education tell us about our present, marked by profound events that have been affecting not only the human condition, but also the natural environment and subjectivity, which cries out for the Homo sapiens species to stop in its process of self-annihilation and extermination of its environment. What role does philosophy play in education and what does it tell us in times of uncertainty such as the one we are experiencing today? The central theme of this paper is uncertainty.

But what does this phrase tell us? According to a basic definition, it means lack of certainty, of doubt, among others. As well as a lack of security in decision-making in the face of what is experienced and especially what may come in the immediate future; because in the face of our current situation, already full of multiple problems, we do not have enough tools and in-depth knowledge to face it; Or if



we do, we find ourselves disoriented by the moment we have lived. A panorama from which the philosophy itself does not escape, as well as education, the school, the pedagogical knowledge of the teacher. Are the doors closing? Is it possible to get out of the condition we are currently living in and build a just world? The questions, like so many others, lead us to others typical of the school world: How important is it to speak in the classroom in connection with the exercise of democracy? Why is it essential to democratize philosophical and pedagogical thinking? What does it mean and how important is it today to learn to think in the world of school, bombarded by competitive tools that overshadow it? Returning pedagogy to the teacher in the classroom, returning the word to the student, is perhaps the great challenge of the school, in which the position of the being-learner is vital in the constitution of what would be a reflective, critical and liberating thought. In this sense, the role that philosophy plays today in relation to the processes of construction of thought in the school curriculum is of crucial importance in the development of the process of appropriation of knowledge and knowledge. Therefore, the reflection revolves around the following ideas: a philosophical critique of school, philosophy and school, subjectivities, education and school, which have to confront abusive policies of the commercial discourse that have invaded the school world and have displaced the formation and reflection of the pedagogical discourse, in the good sense of the word. An example of this are quality management policies that have nothing to do with the spirit of training school subjectivities. This mercantile discourse assaulted the curriculum, didactics, evaluation as the teacher's dissertation in the classroom, leading to a vulgar instrumentalization and formalization of school thinking, leading us to empty curricula, didactics and evaluations; they are only formal shells as these so-called quality management purposes demand; Not to mention the famous rankings of the best educational institutions nationally or internationally, classified by companies that determine which is the best or best educational institutions. The same phenomenon occurs with written production, which is subject to the arbitrariness of consortia that have monopolized the written market of the teaching community. To what extent is what is written really valuable and does it impact and modify the school as well as subjectivities? This is how today we see the blurring of the face of the school for that of the company.

Precisely, what these business policies have done is to open the doors and strengthen the discourse of the market in education, in which the student is seen as a trained user and the teacher has lost both in terms of work and in his pedagogical autonomy; which is monitored by stalking technologies, among others. Accompanied by the fragility and failure of the discourse of face-to-face schooling, inherited from the 19th and 20th centuries. Likewise, the fiasco of the neoliberal, competitive, utilitarian, pragmatic school, with invasive techniques of manipulation towards the school subject, from which every principle of solidarity is uprooted and cultivates an exacerbated and triumphant competitive selfishness of zombie entities, forgetting the human condition, in which the crisis not only of the concept of citizen, but of citizenship in its daily practice, is manifested. quickly



replaced by the figure of the consumer or the buyer. Likewise, the role played today by new technologies and algorithms in education, which tend to displace the classic figure of the teacher, deserves a separate chapter. This discouraging panorama is accompanied by three crises that Chomsky mentions and that affect the curriculum of the so-called social sciences: the possibility of nuclear war, the destruction of the natural environment and the disaster of democracy stalked by authoritarian figures and governments, to which can be added a fourth, the decadence of subjectivities in their ways of life in the world.

What alternative should we choose in the face of uncertainty in a contemporary philosophy of education? This questioning requires a profound change or radical transformation of the school, which breaks with its normality, because it is precisely this normality that has caused its profound crisis. This new gaze implies returning to oneself in relation to the Other, in its otherness, in a context of solidarity, in the cultivation of the being in its formation and not in the cultivation of profit and the commodity as the principle of inequality between men and women. The latter requires the consolidation of the strengthening of subjectivity based on self-knowledge, self-care, self-control and self-government; which implies rethinking not only Pedagogy with a capital P, but also the curriculum, didactics and the evaluation of what the subject would be in its democratic formation as a work of art, without falling into outdated positions for our present and in the face of the problem of power that crosses human life in the political and social spheres. That is to say, it is necessary to go beyond this academic training, it also calls for solidarity and care for the human species and the natural environment. Ultimately, the care of life with a capital V.

1.2 PHILOSOPHY & ECOSYSTEM

It is no secret to anyone the consequences of climate change that we are experiencing today, which has begun to deeply affect peoples, cultures, economies and has given birth to the figure of the climate refugee for our present.

Two pressers tell us about what nature holds in itself in its secrets and that it is not willing to reveal them to the human species. Pierre Hadot, French philosopher and scholar of ancient philosophy, tells us about these secrets in his text *Le voile d'Isis*, in which he highlights the history of the idea of nature, in which she loves to hide, as Heraclitus points out. Well, it is the great contemporary problem, of man, of the economy of capital, determined to unveil these secrets, regardless of the consequences that it brings to him for dominating and exploiting this natural wealth. The Bengali historian Dipesh Chakrabarty, faced with the panorama we are experiencing, proposes four theses on the phenomenon of climate change. One, the collapse of what he calls the ancient distinction between natural history and human history. In other words, human beings are a force of nature in the geological sense. Which brings us to the Anthropocene debate. Two, this new geological force nuances the histories of the



humanities between modernity and globalization. This leads us to human adaptation to these facts of nature and to face critical situations of human misery. Three, the relationship between capital and human history as a species. Therefore, the Anthropocene, at its birth, is linked to capital and its economy, born primarily with the industrial revolution, and affects life itself as a matter of biopolitical order. Four, the relationship between human history and the history of capital, is a framework of the limits of history itself in its understanding. It is the sense of the catastrophic universal that escapes our hands. Resorting in a way to the limits of Kantian reason.

Consequently, the results of climate change and what has come to be called the Anthropocene era as a geological era created by human action are in the debate and in the action. What do philosophers have to say? It's the question of assuming.

1.3 PHILOSOPHY & TECHNOLOGY

It is not surprising that we are experiencing great changes in our episteme, in knowledge, of truth, today forgotten and distorted by post-truth, not only of nature, but in what we are as a culture, which implies a profound transformation and at the same time a new episteme radically different from what we have been until now. The debates around posthumanism versus humanism as we know it have led to profound conflicting positions on human nature itself. What lies ahead for the human species in its future around health, eternity? Likewise, the so-called scientific, technological and technical revolution has generated abrupt and rapid changes in our relationship with it, in our daily lives, which has not given us time to reflect on the matter. Artificial Intelligence has profoundly modified human life and the planet in the not too distant future. What would be its consequences for thought? Would we live in a brave new world? Or the opposite? These are questions among many that philosophers face from an ontology of the question.

1.4 PHILOSOPHY AND POLITICS

In the face of the failure of the great political narratives in their metaphysics and authoritarianism, which today are covered with other discourses and actions of control; It is necessary to rethink or reformulate a political philosophy that defends the principle of freedom, of the urgency of ethics, that seeks solutions to the problems of social inequality and extreme poverty that persist in large regions of the world, that seeks an alternative to the problems of the ecosystem that we live in today that put the human species in danger of extinction. that deepens for everyone and not in its mere discursive or rhetorical form, where the ethical life prevails and not a life subjugated by the juridical, which generate problems of power. Respect for new attitudes of life, which deserve an analysis in this regard by political philosophy. In this sense, life in its singularity and in its collectivity will play a leading role, which goes beyond mere institutionality and any type of political militancy. In other



words, political philosophy must stand out for the defense of life in the face of destructive policies, of merciless exploitation of men and women as well as of the ecosystem and of fear that are intentionally imparted to the population as a whole, strengthened by passive nihilistic discourses, with postures of despair. That is to say, we live in the model of societies of control, characterized, among other things, by consumerism and exploitation to the limit of natural resources, by spectacle and media indifference, by media panic and lies, which seek to deactivate the political action of social subjectivities. In short, philosophy needs a political philosophy for life.

1.5 PHILOSOPHY, KNOWLEDGE, KNOWLEDGE AND TRUTH

Never before have we lived in an age saturated with knowledge, of all kinds and of all taste. Knowledge, proper to the philosopher, to the sage, has been displaced by consumer knowledge, by junk knowledge in the garb of a scientist, as advertised in the mass media, by knowledge of the spectacle, by fragmented and specialized knowledge, as Foucault announced with the specific intellectual, a phenomenon from which philosophers have not escaped. We live in a time where journalism determines true knowledge or not. The truth questioned not as truth, but according to the interest of power or economic, is regulated and controlled by what we are witnessing: post-truth, given in social networks, in television media, in writing, etc. Against this backdrop: What role does philosophical knowledge and truth play? We can affirm that we are witnessing the birth of new knowledge in all areas; But we must also ask ourselves, where is the protagonist knowledge, the knowledge of the philosopher in the face of these changes. At the heart of the discussion is the problem of truth.

1.6 PHILOSOPHY AND SUBJECTIVITY

Throughout history, human beings have been subjected to natural forces that surpass them, to abstract or metaphysical forces of a religious or institutional nature, linked to the exercise of power. Today we are witnessing its decline, its erosion, its disappearance. Now that the subject as One has ceased to be, we are experiencing the flowering of the multiple subjectivities that Socratically explore self-government, an ethic as a principle of freedom.

At the same time, these subjectivities can deceptively fall prey to techniques of subjectivation that make them believe that they are masters of themselves through the desire and consumption of the market, the realm of happiness for the consumer. It is also true that we are witnessing the emergence of subjectivities with differentiated narratives, with lifestyles and worldviews very different from each other, that conservatism reacts vainly to these new changes in subjectivities in a complex way and that the narrative of the market takes advantage of it with a face of change. Two nineteenth-century thinkers had already addressed these changes of the subject in their critique. Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. The



first from singularity, the second in its biting questioning of the subject of obedience.

So we are living hand in hand with technology and knowledge, an ontological change of the subject.

2 CONCLUSION

In view of what has been written in a succinct way, it is necessary to ask the question that welcomes our meeting today: What is proper to philosophy for our present? Today the problems facing philosophy are of great magnitude. We have a philosophy that has to have an inherent language, which has been invaded, abused, denigrated in its media and commercial form.



REFERENCES

- Bostrom, Nick. (2016). *Superinteligencia. Caminos, peligros, estrategias*. Todo está en los libros. Santiago de Chile.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. (2019). *El clima de la historia: Cuatro tesis*. Utopía y praxis latinoamericana. Volumen 24. Número 84. PP. 1 – 21.
- Foucault, Michel. (2007). *Nacimiento de la biopolítica*. Fondo de Cultura Económica. Ciudad de México.
- Gil Claros, Mario Germán. (2015). *Subjetividades escolares*. Redipe. Cali Colombia.
- Gil Claros, Mario Germán. (2022). *Nihilismo y crisis del paradigma occidental*. Studies in Multidisciplinary Review. Volumen 3. # 1 PP 2 – 18.
- Hadot, Pierre. (2004). *Le voile d'isis. Essai sur l'histoire de l'idée de nature*. Gallimard. Paris. France.
- Kierkegaard, Søren. (2007). *El equilibrio entre lo estético y lo ético en la formación de la personalidad. En O lo uno o lo otro. Un fragmento de vida II. Volumen 3*. Editorial Trotta. Madrid España
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. (2011). *La genealogía de la moral*. Alianza editorial. Madrid España.