Representing "University Education" in the Horizon of the Concept of Sustainable Development and Security Discourse

*Konstantin Maltsev, Larisa Binkovskaya, and Anni Maltseva**

Belgorod State Technological University named after V.G. Shukhov, 308012 Belgorod, Russia

Abstract. The relevance of linking the concept of sustainable development and the security discourse reveals the possibility of believing that education is a prerequisite for ensuring that "sustainable development" goals become a reality. The university has a twofold task: first, to produce knowledge that meets the demands of our time, i.e. technical knowledge, and second, to form human capital, to train specialists capable of the practical application of instrumental knowledge. The initial orientation of the concept of "sustainable development" towards a global perspective: the representation of reality in an economic paradigm, i.e., totally determined by the "logic of capital", "monocausal economic logic", determines the criteria by which the quality of human capital, its price, and efficiency of production of a standardized product are evaluated, the production of which is undertaken by the university-corporation that has replaced the classical "university of reason", whose ontic foundations - the "Hegelian science", the romantic "education of humanity" - are no longer valid in what is called modernity. The article demonstrates how modernity, constituted concerning a certain self-representation of the New European subject and presented in the liberal economic paradigm, predetermines both the goal-setting in determined by its representation of the development and the content and methods of the reform of the university. It is concluded that "sustainable development", "security" and "university-corporation" are essentially connected with the representation of reality in the liberal version of the economic paradigm.

1 Introduction

In recent years, the "concept of sustainable development" has increasingly been interpreted in relation to, and within, the security discourse: security is assumed to be a condition of possibility for what is called "sustainable development". The possibility of such an interpretation, conditioned not so much by the content (it has changed several times over the past fifty years), as by the supposed purpose of the political programs and practical actions undertaken to implement the concept, should be studied in the aspect of its becoming reality. In this regard, a distinction must be kept: the connection between sustainable development and security as a condition for sustainable development must be

* Corresponding author: pavic69@mail.ru

methodologically distinguished from its representation in multiple ways of constructing/representing the conceptual unity of "sustainable development" and "security". The subject of our consideration is one of many options: one in which education, and especially university education, are in the focus of discussions about development (education, if we recall, for example, Fichte [1], is the formation of "humanity", goodwill and citizenship, and not only teaching special knowledge - but modernity suggests that this Fichte position should be removed as a "harmful prejudice of the past") and about security (the interpretation of which should also be made from the context - not only as a "set of technical measures" in the sense police measures but, according to Heidegger [2], as the need of a new European subject in guarantees of its validity - when the necessity is not taken into account in modern reasoning about security). The meaning should be revealed: firstly - why development and security are not only essentially connected in modernity, but this connection is interpreted precisely as "technical"; secondly - why and which university education is seen as one of the ways to ensure the validity of the named connection, presented as a technical connection. Thus, it is a question of the modern representation of the connection between "sustainable development", "security" and "university" in the dominant liberal version of the economic paradigm and the specific meaning that the named "concepts", presented in this way, acquire; the subject of our research is thematized by the aspect of what happens to the university in the "global educational space", organized as a network [3]

2 Research Methodology

Scientific research is carried out from the perspective of discipline-organized science; being subject-oriented, it aims at explaining the given, i.e. represented in a certain way; the way of representation is subject to philosophical interpretation. Heidegger wrote: "Any science as such, i.e. as science as it is, remains inaccessible to its basic concepts and what they absorb; this is because no science, with its own scientific means, can say anything about itself" [4]; and further: "It is never mathematically possible to conceive of what mathematics is, it is never possible to discuss on the philological level what philology is, it is never possible to determine from the biological point of view what biology is" [4], the pre-concepts in which the present as already delineated and ready for thematization into a subject of scientific research are in the domain of philosophy without regard to whether positive science itself accounts for it. The task of this research is defined as interpreting a representation in which "sustainable development", "security" and "university" are given a certain meaning and connected in a way that we have called technical: i.e. we must not only explain, but also understand/interpret the nature of the necessity of this way of representation and connection in the perspective of what Heidegger called modernity, as defined together by the idea of technology and the self-assurance of the subject that requires security guarantees. Philosophical interpretation (and partly hermeneutics insofar as representation is defined by "concept" and "discourse") is a method of inquiry.

Methodological significance for the present research are: M. Heidegger's statements about what is modernity and, in connection with this, what means the need to replace "classical university of mind" - "higher technical school" [5]; definition by K. Schmitt of the essence of "liberal metaphysics" [6], the foundations of which are the foundations of the modern order represented in the economic paradigm; the concept of "economic paradigm", introduced by J. Agamben [7], the definition of the "intersectional consensus" by J. G. Gillard [7], the definition of the "intersectional consensus" by J. Roles [8] as a basis for "coordination of interests" and compromise of interest management policy and as a way to "organize truth" by F.R. Ankersmith [9]; the "pioneering" study by B. Riddings [10], who

defined the modern university as a corporation, which allows the university to "fit" into the globalizing and fundamentally market "educational space".

3 Findings

Ontical foundations of the classical university of reason: free self-determining according to the internal law, the absolute subject; preparation for knowledge as Hegel's "absolute science"; the education of humanity, so that "with each step of education, the whole person as a whole is formed" [1], i.e. as "a reliable and deliberate art of forming a strong and infallible goodwill in a person", are absent in modern times; the emergence of a modern innovative university - a corporation as a "higher technical school" - a factory for the production of technical/practical knowledge and human capital is due to: a radical concept of modernity ("radical" or "metaphysical" are the concepts that combine the real and the actual according to one of four schemes, known to Western metaphysics, in modern times - subjectively, according to the "Kantian scheme": Heidegger [11]); meaning, in the context of other, related meanings, in the notion constituted in relation to the foundations of "liberal metaphysics" in the economic paradigm; interest, i.e. the demand of the market ("the logic of capital" as the global and universal logic of the modern order).

Modernity is constituted subjectively: "The subjective character of the man - as New European - is the most profound historical force," [2] "An epoch that strengthens its own essence the more it conceives only of what it does. But "it does" only what the fullness of subjectivity should do - self-preservation in the absence-of-thought-perhaps to the point of self-destruction" [2]. In fact, the unproven certainty of "Western thought" is that "individuals exist in and of themselves: neither networks of relations nor comprehensive hierarchies are the primary source of identity. This modern idea of the individual as a locus of indivisible identity - at least potentially self-sufficient, autonomous, and self-developing..." [2], is based on the liberal interpretation of the Kantian idea of the autonomous subject, freely self-determining according to internal law. It is enough to "close the transcendental perspective" for the subject to become "his own and only space and time" [2], i.e. the human being "knows that he is human" and aims at ensuring his humanity in its present givenness: "The man with all his available and own humanity reduces all human commonness and inherited humanity - into an underlying measure and purpose and planning as a domain" [2]. "The closure of the transcendent," i.e. question-lessness culminates in the triumph of "life assurance (Lebenssicherung)," [2] that is - the politics of security provides a mode of existence for the New European subject: "life assurance," "question-lessness," is security, and it is conceptualized from the very "essence of subjectivity." Security, i.e. calculation and planning, calculability of existence, is how the subject guarantees his reality, with a predetermined outcome/objective: "The New European man aims at the preservation of his essence to one day become part of the machine and, in the service of the expediency and calculation of its work, to gain his own easily given security, his motives, and his lust. This introduction into the machine essence is nothing essentially other than the mere use of "technical" possibilities; here, there is an extreme likening of the essence of man to the calculating (Rechenhaftigkeit) of being. It is through all this that the spirit (i.e., the reasonableness and calculating nature of animality) comes to its highest power." [2].

"Sustainable development" is usually defined as a growth model in which the use of resources is aimed at meeting human needs while preserving the environment in such a way that these needs can be met not only in the present but also for future generations [13]; the UN Civil Defense Declaration adopted on September 25, 2015, and titled "Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development", considers guarantees of prosperity and security in the interests of people and humanity (in the "information society"

[14]). The keyword here is interest, through which "sustainable development", "security" (as the "normalization of violence" [15, 16]) and "prosperity" are defined - the obviousness and unquestionability (for the vast majority of specialists, this is true [17]) of this way of defining needs philosophical interpretation.

Liberal representation of society as a civilian: mutual legal recognition of the private interests of autonomous individuals-citizens and civil associations, membership in which is determined through the free, motivated by interests, choice of an individual (as an "indecomposable locus of reality") pursuing his goals; politics as the management of interests to maintain a spontaneous harmony of interests is based on a specific interpretation of Kant's moral and political philosophy (it is customary to refer to Kant, as, for example, J. Roll and continues - F.R. Ankersmit). Man is rational, this is his distinctive characteristic (the rational animal is the "transversal" definition of man in Western metaphysics); everything in which men differ is derivative, and with respect to rationality is secondary; the rational subject self-defines itself along with reality - in its representation. "The Intersecting Consensus" by G. Rolz: the common is always more primordial and its domain more extensive than that which distinguishes individuals, is constructed precisely in the perspective of the "Western metaphysics" provisions defined above.

The essence of "liberal metaphysics" by K. Schmitt defined "endless public discussion," the "denial of truth," and the aiming at "organizing the truth" (F.R. Ankersmith) through a series of compromises; and Ankersmith specifically stipulates that what "distinguishes us" is precisely interests that are different but always comparable based on what we all share, reason; the reason of the New European subject is "planning calculating," ensuring and providing, technical. The representation of order in the economic paradigm of the political is the reality of the representation of the rational New European subject; the necessity of "development", "security" and their connection are thus conditioned by the subjective way of representing reality in the liberal version of the economic paradigm.

Education is the formation of such a subject as it is and what it is; specifically, university education is called to form a conscious readiness to be the basis of the order described above, its center, - to integrate into the machine to implement in it the idea of technology - to become human capital [18]; being human capital means simultaneously being the constitution of modernity and ensuring security and sustainable development in perspective calculation and planning, - managerial coordination of the interests of the human capital. "Mission" of a modern university is the production of human capital; the university becomes a factory for the production of technical knowledge, which specialists produce; the university - corporation trains specialists with a set of competencies demanded by the market, i.e., capable of being embedded in the reality whose order is determined by the universal logic of capital, which is ultimately what human capital is: "two sides" of the same technical product.

Education "for sustainable development". [19] is not a "slogan", not an "external goal", but the essence of what education is in the "conditions of modernity": at the same time, this is how the political program is defined: to remove "residuals" (V. Pareto [20]), or "vestiges" (E. Durkheim [21]), leftover from the past "university of reason", i.e. to bring into reality the new idea of the "modern innovative university - corporation".

4 Research Results

"The decisiveness of the fate" of the classical university becomes clear, gradually and to a few, as early as the early twentieth century: M. Heidegger was the first to state its "death by 1890". Then, in the 30s of the twentieth century, he wrote: "There is now a fear that the university will be transferred to the rank of a professional school (Fachschule), i.e. a set of such vocational schools. But fundamentally, people are wary of seeing what is already -

namely, inherently - there. In this transition, one sees the humiliation of the university, i.e., people arrogate to themselves the right to attribute to it a dignity it hardly ever possessed. But this rather late enthusiasm for the high purpose of the university is only the latest offshoot of the aspirations that the former "spiritual" and "educated" cultural production wished to preserve." [2] He explained efforts on its reanimation by the interest of "the scholarly estate" in preserving its exclusive position in the distribution of power and prestige: "They would still like to preserve for the university as if in the public and "public" sphere, the appearance of a "culture-determining" and even "spiritual" power, they would still - for all their connection with the people - want to belong to the "higher" school together and, employing such belonging to the "higher", to provide this otherwise still too obvious activity for trivial benefit also with a certain "sanctification" of the "higher" school. [5]. For him, the futility of such efforts was obvious and indicated only an inability to comprehend what was already there: the essence of modernity is that "comprehension cannot venture into these spheres, since comprehension, in general, is becoming increasingly alien to the given epoch" [2]; consequently, "all attempts to "save" and "renew" the university is stuck in continuous rhetoric and jabber" [2].

The classical university is replaced by a "higher technical school" engaged in the production of specialists: "The system of professional schools is conditioned and justified not by the disconnection of learning, but precisely by the 'orientation' of learning towards utility" [2]. To be clear, Heidegger even argues that "a few years of military service" is a "better school" than "university training."

Attempts to modernize the classical university were made at least as long as those representatives of the "corporation of professors", whose vision of the university was formed before modernity became a reality, remained professionally active. Of paradigmatic (or "model") importance were two conceptually elaborated programs: an updated "idea of the university" by K. Jaspers [22] and the concept of the "university of culture", the "university mission", Ortega y Gasset [23]. Jaspers, contrary to Heidegger, believing technique to be "neutral", i.e. "instrumental", believed that the university should continue to be a "place of science", i.e. a fundamentally elitist institution; he made some concessions to "democracy" and "mass", but only those that did not destroy the "essence of the university". Ortega y Gasset goes further: he believes that "training to know", i.e. to do research, is not the main task of the university and even interferes with its main task: to train specialists, but as cultural people, i.e. able to orient themselves in the world, and from this to carry out their professional activities. In this connection, Ortega pays a lot of attention to the development of methods of training specialists, shaping of competencies that he already divided into professional and cultural, a division that is generally accepted but transformed, in the modern discourse on the tasks of training specialists in the university.

Modern authors [24] for the most part consider the issue settled: the university should train specialists demanded by the market and, in the apt expression of the Russian education reformer, switch from training "creators" to training "qualified consumers", in other words, the matter always concerns the formation of human capital (this is how this issue is posed for the periphery of the global order as well [25]).

"The logic of capital," as we have repeatedly noted, is universal: it is the logic of the order of modernity as represented in the liberal economic paradigm. Human capital is a commodity, with all the characteristics of a commodity: it has a market price, which is formed competitively, and ideology requires that this competition be as free and fair as possible, i.e. "pure". This presupposes the formation of a single global "educational space", with uniform standards for training specialists, in which universities will try to acquire and maintain their "competitive advantages": education is also a product that needs to be sold to the consumer, and the market price of which depends on the market demand for trained specialists (of particular importance are the issues related to the financing of science and

education and the "justification of costs" [26]: technicalization as a specialization and "practical orientation" does not leave room for what was previously called "education of humanity"; moreover, we have a completely different "coordinate system" (or "conceptual framework"): "humanity" as the goal of romantic (and classical) education is the duty, not profit or "competitive advantage" - and it is outside the market. In the same vein is the idea of "continuing education": to the extent that capital is concerned, it must grow, "become obsolete" from time to time, and continually change structurally in line with market conditions.

Finally, the slogan of "humanizing education" is an instrument of public policy: it legitimizes the widespread reform of university education and the necessary (by the logic of the market) segregation, which is an expensive commodity not accessible to all. Mass training at "free science departments" is a way to make acceptable, from the standpoint of declared "equality of opportunity," the essential difference, which is widening, in the levels of specialists. In essence, however, "humanization" means nothing, especially since (and there is also no reason not to believe Heidegger) the "humanities" have long been defined by the idea of technology (e.g., replacing history with "historiography" as technical knowledge in the specifically Heideggerian sense). [27].

Higher vocational-technical school, which replaced the university, and in its "idea" and its "tasks" is a factory for the production of technical knowledge (directly useful: "Sciences are increasingly merging with everyday life and thus become at the same time unimportant and useful, like bakeries and sewers" [2]) and human capital, built into the market and determined by its logic, is a corporation (the first to call it so-called by Readings [10]), aimed at making a profit and, therefore, evaluating the efficiency of its production by calculating "benefits" and "costs": in this coordinate system, let us repeat once again, ultimately and despite the public rhetoric, the goals and content of what is also called "education" are determined.

5. Conclusion

The UN CS Declaration adopted on September 25, 2015, titled "Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" [28] defines the goals for education; their meaning is to politically limit "monocausality" (U. Beck [29; 30]) of the universal and global economic logic of capital and thereby ensure the democratic legitimacy of the contemporary modernization of education defined by this logic - the ultimate goal is the security of a global order threatened by deepening inequalities (at all levels, from individual capabilities to regional differences) [31] - the purpose of the article was to interpret the view in which the named goals matter and are necessary.

Heidegger's definition of modernity as the becoming reality of a New European subject preoccupied with guaranteeing the security of its "infinitely long" existence provides a horizon for interpreting the meaning of the changing meanings undergone by "education" and the "university" becoming modern. Modernity, represented in the liberal version of the economic paradigm, defines the goals and content of the named changes.

The idea of technology ("postava") and the New European subject are essentially connected - development and security in modernity are presented as a technical (in a certain sense above) task (for example, in education); the university-corporation as a "higher technical school" is a factory for the production of technical knowledge and human capital and thus appears as a necessary element for the existence, development, and security of the modern order.

References

1. I. G. Fihte, *Rechi k nemeckoj nacii* (Nauka, 2009)
2. M. Hajdegger, *Razmyshleniya VII-XI (CHernye tetradi 1938-1939)* (Institut Gajdara, 2018)
3. B. Rowan, M. White. The Common Core State Standards Initiative as an Innovation Network. *AERJ*, 24 (2021).
4. M. Hajdegger, *Nicshe*, **1**, (2006).
5. M. Hajdegger, *Razmyshleniya II-VI (CHernye tetradi 1931-1938)* (Institut Gajdara, 2018)
6. K. SHmitt, *Duhovno-istoricheskoe sostoyanie sovremennogo parlamentarizma in K. SHmitt. Ponyatie politicheskogo* (Nauka, 2016)
7. Dzh. Agamben, *Carstvo i slava. K teologicheskoy genealogii ekonomiki i upravleniya*. (Institut Gajdara, Fakul'tet svobodnyh iskusstv i nauk SPbGU, 2018).
8. J. Rowls, *Political Liberalism*. (Columbia university press, 1996).
9. F.R. Ankersmit, *Esteticheskaya politika. Politicheskaya filosofiya po tu storonu fakta i cennosti* (GU, 2014)
10. B. Ridings, *Universitet v ruinah* (Vyssh. shk. ekonomiki, 2010)
11. M. Hajdegger, *Osnovnye problemy fenomenologii* (Vysshaya religiozno-filosofskaya shkola, 2001)
12. K. Kalhun, *Nacionalizm* (Territoriya budushchego, 2006)
13. A. Lazim, Causal Relationships Among Multiple Criteria of Sustainable: *IJSESD*, **11** (3) (2020)
14. M. Lia, *Management Intercultural*, **17** (34), 509 (2015)
15. M. G. Musso, *Int. Rev. Sociol.*, **30** (2), 171 (2020)
16. Lomako L.L., K.G. Mal'cev, A.V. Mal'ceva, *Gumanitarnyj vestnik*, **6** (2020)
17. A. Calderon. *Higher education and the Sustainable Development Goals: THE Impact Rankings*, (2021)
18. K.G. Mal'cev, A.V. Mal'ceva, *Izvestiya YUgo-Zapadnogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, **10** (5), 242 (2020)
19. F. Leal, Viewpoint: accelerating the implementation of the SDGs, **21** (3), 507 (2020)
20. V. Pareto, *Kompendium po obshchej sociologii* (GU VSHE, 2008)
21. E. Dyurkgejm, *Sociologiya. Ee predmet, metod, prednaznachenie* (Kanon, 1995)
22. K. YAspers, *Ideya universiteta* (BGU, 2006)
23. X. Ortega-i-Gasset, *Missiya universiteta* (BGU, 2005)
24. H. Tweddell, Ch. Willmore, Measuring education for sustainable development, **16** (4), 507 (2015)
25. J. Ozigbu, Exploring the Nexus Between Foreign Aid and Human Capital Development in Nigeria: *JEDS*, **10** (7) (2019)
26. C. R.Montenegro de Lima, Th. C. Soares, M. A. de Lima, M. O. Veras, J. B. Salgueirinho-Osório de Andrade, A. Guerra, *Int. J. Sustain. High. Educ.*, **21** (3), 441 (2020)
27. K.G. Mal'cev, A.V. Mal'ceva, *CHelovek. Kul'tura. Obrazovanie*, **4** (38), 46 (2020)
28. Preobrazovanie nashego mira: Povestka dnya v oblasti ustojchivogo razvitiya na period do 2030 goda <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/ru/about/development-agenda/>

29. U. Bek, *Kosmopoliticheskoe mirovozzrenie* (Centr issledovanij postindustrial'nogo obshchestva, 2008)
30. U. Bek. *CHto takoe globalizaciya* (Progress-Tradiciya, 2001)
31. A. Duta, B. Wielgoszewska, C. Iannelli, Adv. Life Course Res, **47** (2021)