

UDK 13 + 316.7 + 37.0

**THE HAPPINESS PEDAGOGY IN TSUNESSABURO MAKIGUTI
(A TRIP THROUGH THE UNKNOWN REVOLUTIONARY
JAPANESE PEDAGOGUE)¹**

Angela Santi (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil)

***Abstract.** The goal of this essay is to analyse the theory/practice relation with the help of Tsunessaburo Makiguti's thought. Makiguti is a Japanese pedagogue who was thinking against the objectives of the education in his time associated with military training. To Makiguti, the meaning of education should be dissociated from technical training or knowledge transmission, but should be connected with happiness and self-fulfillment of the students. Overcoming the theory-practice dichotomy is achieved when education is linked to life, and there is no theory without its being filled with life and its needs.*

***Key words:** Pedagogy of happiness, theory, practice, self-fulfillment, value, truth, meaning.*

**ПЕДАГОГИКА СЧАСТЬЯ ЦУНЕССАБУРО МАКИГУТИ
(ПУТЕШЕСТВИЕ С НЕИЗВЕСТНЫМ ЯПОНСКИМ
ПЕДАГОГОМ-НОВАТОРОМ)²**

Ангела Санти (Рио-де-Жанейро, Бразилия)

***Аннотация.** Цель статьи – проанализировать соотношение теории и практики с помощью идей Цунессабуро Макигути, рассматривая его как представителя новаторского педагогического мышления XX века, что приближает его к таким мыслителям, как Дьюи и Паоло Фрере. Макигути – японский педагог, выступивший против официальных целей современного ему японского образования, связанных с военной подготовкой. Согласно Макигути, смысл образования должен быть отделён от технической подготовки или передачи знаний, но должен быть связан со счастьем и реализацией детей и студентов как личностей.*

-
- 1 This essay was originally presented at the 12th International Congress of Philosophy of Education, in Bogota/Colombia, July 2010. Afforded by Faperj.
 - 2 Данное эссе было представлено впервые на 12-м Международном Конгрессе по Философии Образования в Боготе (Колумбия) в июле 2010.
-

Angela Santi is a Doctor degree in Philosophy by PUC/RJ (Rio de Janeiro/ Brazil). Adjunct Professor of Philosophical Foundations of Education.

E-mail: am-santi@uol.com.br

Ангела Санти – доктор философии Католического Университета, адъюнкт-профессор философских основ образования (Рио-де-Жанейро, Бразилия)

Ключевые слова: Педагогика счастья, теория, практика, самореализация, ценность, истина, смысл.

The goal of this essay is to analyse the theory/practice relation with the help of Tsunessaburo Makiguti's thought, setting him in the vanguard of the revolutionary pedagogic thought of the XX Century, approaching him to thinkers like Dewey and Paulo Freire. Makiguti is a Japanese pedagogue who was thinking against the objectives of the education in his time associated with military training. To Makiguti, the meaning of the education should be dissociated from technical training or knowledge transmission. Its meaning should be linked to happiness and fulfillment of students. Overcoming the theory-practice dichotomy is achieved in the works of all these authors when the education is linked to life, and there is no theory if it is not filled with life and its needs.

So, this thinker, practically unknown outside Japan, plays a significant role in the history of the world pedagogy and, therefore, should be rescued from oblivion and his ideas be widely disseminated. His teaching's concepts try to ponder about the deepest meaning of education; they become a reference, adding efforts to build a free and legitimate space of thinking about education, beyond its goals associated with useful service to the State and Market.

In order to study Makiguti's thoughts and his world pedagogy history, through inclusion of these new elements which have been purposefully lost by the official pedagogy, we will have the voices of Nietzsche, Dewey, Paulo Freire, and Makiguti himself.

* * *

Historically, we observe a certain exclusive process in education followed by democratization motivated not by conviction, but to justify new configuration of modern society, from the industrialization on. This new "place" needs people minimally educated and literate to operate the machines. It is about the education focused on production, on work. Concerning this issue, Nietzsche presents an amazing reflection that can help us understand and rebuild the context which is the source of the contemporary education's problems and limitations: the difficulty of disengaging education, production and efficacy, education focused on work. (On the contrary, Makiguti thinks education as an element sided to happiness and fulfillment in the present time).

In his texts *About our teaching institutions* and *Schopenhauer-educator*, both 1870, Nietzsche wrangles the academic and university education. According to him, this education has the utility-related dexterity as its meaning. To Nietzsche, the modern education is based on what he calls three egoisms. Firstly, the State egoism that needs the hand labour to have people to serve the bureaucracy; the traders egoism that needs people able to handle exchange,



T. Makiguti

where they learn the price of things; and the scholar one. Concerning this last one, the university needs people that can hold the Chair, the knowledge, inside an organized structure and under control.

Nietzsche criticizes the utilitarian aspect of education, which builds a system claiming to grade the individual, level his/her peculiarities. There are two aspects of this grading that associate themselves to the opposite elements, but equally mistaken: specialization and universalization. The universalization is inspired by the Enlightenment thoughts of the XVIII century (based on the “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity” ideal), it becomes a quantitative element that makes everyone to reach a poor and flat culture to provide fairly educated people to the Market able to execute tasks. As far as specialization is concerned, it works with knowledge and culture segments and the formation of people in specific areas, ignorant of culture and knowledge in their totality, impoverished. Summarizing, Nietzsche’s critique about education emphasizes its “use”, its utilitarian meaning. He says in *Twilight of the Idols*: “What the German higher schools” know to do, in fact, is brutal dexterity to turn useful, exploitable under the State service, a legion of youth with as minimal time lost as possible. “The best education” and legion – here is a primordial contradiction”³.

To Nietzsche, university, scholars, scientists and, consequently, knowledge and culture lose their ties with life and betray them. The work of academies and universities provide grading of people, killing their singularity and their vital meaning. Thus, “the major scientists’ characteristic is the insatiable eagerness for knowledge (...) The people myopic to all that is outside their magnifying lenses are unable to look beyond their boots (...) transform their own knowledge into a leech that scarifies and mutilates its own life”⁴.

For Nietzsche, the education should boost life, ensuring each individual reaching his/her specific potentiality through the master’s example and not through the transmission of contents. Nietzsche believed education should feed the creative potentialities in everyone and convince to live fully. To educate consists in a “unique experience where the first potencies of an individual are awakened, convoked.” The men’s formation is not related to the external requirements, Market’s, State’s or Erudition’s. To be educated is related to the capacity to give up exclusive ownership of oneself. You are educating yourself against your own self⁵. In this context, the master would be the one that promotes the conditions where and when the student “turns out to be who he is” (Pindaro), so that he himself convokes the generating potency set asleep by the external requirements.

3 Nietzsche, F. *The Twilight of the Idols or how to philosophize the hammers*. São Paulo: Escala, 2005, p. 61.

4 R. Nietzsche the educator. In: MARIA EUGÊNIA. *The Education in Nietzsche: Come to be who you are*. *Morpheus Magazine*, available in http://www.unirio.br/morpheusonline/Maria_Eug%C3%AAnia.htm Accessed in 19/11/2009.

5 Idem, *ibidem*, p. 4.

Tsunessaburo Makiguti was an elementary teacher and a school principal during the first half of the XX century in Japan. Due to his not having a conventional academic graduation⁶, he was not much heard in his pedagogical proposals. Nevertheless, his critique and proposals are deeply significant now and this is the reason for trying to rescue his work. Makiguti forced himself to think about education as directed to the students' happiness, as a process focused on the present time, opposing the official teaching that was associated with military training and preparation of students to fight war.

Makiguti treated the objective of education as the general objective of life which is happiness which, according to him, means the "union of public and private wellness and takes origins through the whole commitment to the life of the society... sharing the efforts and successes of other people and the community"⁷. Makiguti struggles with the common sense in his age and until today: education being directed to memorizing, to preparing to the adult life and to professional activity. In his opinion, the opposite should take place: the objective of education should be to prepare children to become responsible and healthy cells in a social organism, to contribute to society's happiness and, likewise, meeting meaning, purpose and happiness in their lives⁸.

There is, in Makiguti's concepts, a strong accent on moral, not on technical and dead knowledge. The happiness is one target that brings together the recovery of the meaning of education, and a meaning that shall recover the value of the experience of a child in its time, reconnecting the man to the society, individual to its community. To the pedagogue, the education can and shall take the individual to recognize his commitment to the society and the State to whom he belongs, not only concerning with the satisfaction of his basic needs and security, but also concerning all that comprises his happiness (...) Some have no conscience of the benefits they get from the society and only worry about their private lives (...) The objective of education, however, is to transform the unconscious social living into a well-planned and conscious one.⁹

In Makiguti's opinion, the main role of education is to guide the individuals toward this socialization. He carefully considered the process through which education would

6 Makiguti did not have a specific education to work as a teacher, but he was a laborious autodidact and critic of the educational system of his age. Makiguti was born in Japan, in 1871. He graduated from a regular school, becoming later the principal of the Tossei Elementary School for 20 years; he was a teacher and principal of a number of schools in Tokyo. He wrote the books "The Human Life Geography", "Education to a Creative Life". Later, frustrated with the conservative ways of education in his country, he turned to religion, becoming associated with the Nitiren Daishomin buddhism and founding the SCV (Society of the Creators of Values), nowadays with the representation in more than 150 countries, oriented to spreading buddhism and acting for peace and education.

7 BULLOUGH, R. In: MAKIGUTI, T. *Education to a Creative Life* 5th. Ed., Rio de Janeiro, Record, 2002, p. 18.

8 MAKIGUTI, T. op. cit., p. 39.

9 Idem, *ibidem*, p. 45–46.

turn unconscious into conscious¹⁰, as well as establish an essential relation between individual and society. Makiguti compares the society with an organism within which each individual lives, while being dependent on it, not being able to survive without it. Education is responsible for making this passage possible, making individuals aware of their bond with the society, as well as engaged with its appreciation and improvement. There is, in his proposal, encouragement of individuality, but not setting it as opposition to collectivity: “the interests of others and myself, when correctly conceived, are so closely bonded that they are inseparable (...) The real objective of an individual engaged with self-fulfillment is to manifest the world objective value”¹¹.

According to Makiguti, one of the most important points to build a project and system of education focused on happiness and on the present time is the disqualification of the question of truth as the biggest target of education, becoming settled in another group of elements that guide to the targets of education. To Makiguti, the truth is the “what is, how is”¹². To him, the truth is “the object’s expression exactly like it is”¹³, it is about the object in its invariable characteristics. Here we can see that Makiguti gets associated with a classical tradition of the comprehension of the question of truth – as a direct correspondence, “without noises”, between the object and the subject. The subject “ascertains”, discovers what the object is necessarily, what the object is independent of the subject and of the “categories” that the subject knows. The subject is not active in this process. For him, there is no production of meaning, of value at this merely cognitive level. Thus, he will say that the awareness of the facts shall be in the books, assuming that the information about the truth will not bring any important element to the formation of the student, as well the way he sees it.

Such vision differs deeply from the other directions of the philosophical thoughts that see knowledge just like a part of the production of meaning, of value, many times reactive (sophists, Hume, Nietzsche). Such other trends see knowledge like interpretation, like something inaccessible in its essence (Kant) or not like existing as essence, that shall be evaluated from its utility and comprehension (Dewey and Habermas). The way of comprehension of what is knowledge in Makiguti refers to a specific tradition, but it also refers to a choice, an elective affinity: he makes it clear that, to education, the question of knowledge is not as much significant as the question of value and meaning. This choice, election, breaks harshly with all and any justification to the teaching (such as it was built

10 Makiguti talks about three kinds of human behaviour: unconscious, conscious and self-reflective (individual and social conscious life). Concerned human activity, he presents a classification in three categories: life, dependent on the efforts of others; self-confident life by own efforts, with self-consciousness and definition of the self; cooperative life by expanding the self toward the others, being aware about a bigger self and social self-determination.

11 NORTON, D. Posfácio. In: MAKIGUTI, T., op. cit., p. 230.

12 MAKIGUTI, T. op. cit., p. 74.

13 Ibidem, p. 79.

from the modern era on – keeping itself in its essence, until today), restricted to the question of the transmission of knowledge, reduced into “data” that shall be assimilated objectively, seen like value within themselves. This strong aspect in Makiguti’s thought is extremely important and actual, because of the radical way used by him to present and sustain it.

Such way of comprehension of knowledge and meaning enhances the differentiation between the state of fact and the state of value – the difference between statements like “it rains” and “the rain is beautiful and good”. We will have a difference of two kinds: one judgement relates to objects and another relates to subjects, to subjective evaluation, not by object in terms of “clearness and discrimination”. To Makiguti, the man does not create the truth, but creates the value, so that his focus is in value: the focus in the apprenticeship of yourself and of life, in the present time, is the maxim of teaching to Makiguti and reverts itself to a potent lantern that illuminates the search of other teachers.

Focused on value, Makiguti wants to create an “educational system that makes sense to human being”. According to him, “human life is a process of creation of values; the education shall guide us toward this purpose¹⁴”. In his opinion, life sees the truth but is related to the value. The value comes up from the relation of the man with the objects and this relationship is deeply creative. So, his creative system of value is a creativity system of creative men in their essence. Though we cannot agree with his “theory of knowledge”, his vision of knowledge like a passive discovery, we can still see his contemporaneity when we observe his linking human education to the value building – oriented to individuals and to the development of autonomy and self-fulfillment.

Makiguti and Dewey

The purpose of Makiguti, focused on the individual (interacting with another ones), on his happiness and fulfillment, less than on the cognitive aspect, takes his thought very close to Dewey. Thus, through his refusal of the transmission of knowledge as the education’s focus and meaning, Dewey is seemed to present affinities with Makiguti’s thought, but these affinities fit beyond Makiguti’s, that denies some of the bases of pragmatism.

In pragmatism, there is a rupture of the metaphysical vision that points out to correlation and objectivity of knowledge – knowledge as the correct representation of the nature of things. According to this philosophical trend, such process and tradition fuse themselves into a “belief” and not in some sort of objectivity. To oppose itself against such tradition, the pragmatism sets the thought as activity that has a similar task to solve problems. To the pragmatism or utilitarianism, an idea is a true one when it can work as a guide to the human action and not because it has a theoretical value, a value in itself, as a photograph of the reality. The utilitarian meaning associates itself to the necessity of subtracting from the truth a metaphysical position, placing

¹⁴ Ibidem, p. 72.

it in the mundane, associating it to what is useful – which measure is given by the capacity of being universal, to become itself “value” to a community, a group in a specific moment.

Makiguti states that in pragmatism, “the more universal the validity of a certain truth is, the bigger is its applicability, the more we approach to the ‘theoretical value’ of a nominated truth. Considering truth and value equal in their essence, differentiating them only in degrees and not in category (...)”¹⁵, the pragmatism would be in a very deep mistake. To him, it is impossible for something to be considered true by showing itself useful. Truth as a value would not have disappeared in the pragmatism, the value of truth would appear associated to what is useful. The comprehension in Makiguti embraces the comprehension in producing reductionism that has in what is useful the measure of what is true or valid.

Makiguti and the theory of value

Makiguti does not treat utilitarianism as an advance, in the meaning of abandonment of the tradition of metaphysics, but sees in this movement the chance of misunderstanding between truth and value, while differentiating them by degree and not by their nature. Makiguti, when distinguishing the question of value and setting it as the centre of the question of education, does not intend to mess up the question of the metaphysics of truth, but to relocate knowledge and education’s meaning where it would really be of interest: the question of value, the question of the relation between man and world (this will ever produce a value). To Makiguti, it does not make sense to turn truth into a value, measured by quantity or utility.

Misunderstanding truth and value restrains our going into what makes sense to the man: the meaning; the value that build itself in the effective relation between man and world – here, yes, is no metaphysics, because it is open to being built in the relationship, in between. It would be here where would be located the meaning of human investigation and the meaning of education.

Makiguti builds a scheme demarcating the difference between cognition and evaluation:

Truth - spatial concepts - recognition of the inherent nature of the form, substance and reality;

temporal laws - recognition of the inherent nature of the changing and the permanent;

value – Aesthetics – judgement of the beauty

Advantage – private earning – judgement of the benefits

– public earning – judgement of the good¹⁶

In this scheme, we have the truth being associated to the “recognition of the inherent nature” of the objects, in their “forms a priori”, space and time, while the

¹⁵ Ibidem.

¹⁶ Ibidem, p. 81.

universe of the value embraces fundamentally the “judgement” (the unfolding of value, benefits and good will be analysed later). We have the summary of Makiguti’s thought: the education oriented to the mind, shifted to the entire person, from the question of recognition to the question of apprenticeship, evaluation that demands a “trained” individual. The focus, then, is on the individual as a whole and what is the object of training is the creation of value, creativity.

The question of creativity is, then, the central element in the reflection of our Japanese author about education. The education is not a specific question, but the process of life, of education itself. The capacity to create... values, life... is the central element, and it is always presented in the human being and in the educational process. In Makiguti, it is about the replacement of the question of the facts and truth by the question of the development of abilities – of recognition, of evaluation and of creation of values¹⁷. The role of the school is to identify, to incite and to guide the individual creative potential. The teacher would orient and would be aside of the students, supporting their experience of apprenticeship. The motivation power of this process is in the interest¹⁸.

The objectives of education, according to Makiguti, are relied on what he called a theory of the creation of values. His theory of values relies, in turn, on three pillars (presented before): the benefit, the good and the beauty. He tries to put them very clear, these pillars, against the traditional philosophic trinomial (and Weber’s), which tries to associate good, beauty and truth. It happens because the Makiguti’s trinomial is totally located in the field of value, while the traditional trinomial would associate value to truth, what to Makiguti is a great mistake of the education. To our Japanese pedagogue, a simple relation of cognitive objects with mundane things is not enough to constitute value. It needs a subject-object relation before the value is created. Only the relations in which the influence of an object tends to reinforce or to diminish, to prolong or to shorten the vital being can be considered beneficial or prejudicial, good or bad.¹⁹

To Makiguti, the value is inherent neither to the subject nor to the object; it “manifests itself in the strength of attraction and repulsion between both.”

In his system of pedagogy of value creation, Makiguti takes out the question of knowledge and introduce the question of benefit. According to him, we define benefit like values of direct importance to the individual’s life as a whole. The benefit is absolutely personal and reacts to the individual as a whole. On the contrary, the aesthetic values go toward and exclusively to the meanings, enhancing the entire life of the individual only superficially (...) In opposition, (...) where the importance is not centered on the individual, but on the influence of the society’s life, the collective moral values of the group constitute a good. So, we can compose a hierarchical system of values, like a pyramid, with the aesthetic values in the base and the moral ones at the top.²⁰

17 NORTON, D., in: MAKIGUTI, T. op. cit., p. 225.

18 Ibidem. Here we can allude to the tradition that sees in the interest the central element of education, from Herbart to Dewey.

19 MAKIGUTI, T. op. cit., p. 91.

20 Ibidem, p. 94.

In the body of his pedagogical system, some levels of appreciation are presented, with no consideration to the nature of the objects to be studied. The focus of the pedagogical system of Makiguti is concentrated on the appreciation dimension, where the man has the conditions to interfere and to expand it, becoming its creator, an active party in the educational process, subject.

To Makiguti, the beauty associates itself to the “sensory values bonded to isolated parts of the individual’s existence”, the benefit “talks about personal values united to the individual’s existence guided to itself” and the good associates itself to “the social value united to the group collective existence²¹”. The aesthetic dimension makes justice to the sensory dimension, to the experience of meanings; it is important but does not consolidate a global experience of an individual. Such dimension forces the individuals to try adoration or admiration, pleasure and beauty – dimension that is constituted by the importance given by the subjects that evaluate it. When it is about a consideration over the intimacy or utility of an object, we have its economic and personal value and we get into the benefit. At last, when it is about a value evaluation united to the collective good, we have the dimension of good, the highest and most important, by Makiguti’s view.

The benefit attaches the value to the individual dimension which is not swallowed by the social dimension and points to the necessity of perceiving the individuals in differentiated and independent ways – the system of the creation of values can provide that. The good embraces the collective dimension, in which all the individuals are interlaced – it restrains the fake isolation of the individual in his own and make effective its relations of connection, as a net, with all others individuals, searching for good of the collective.

The aesthetic dimension works with the evaluation of beauty, an elective evaluation of pure appraisal. It is not an objective dimension and, because of this, it cannot happen at any level – objects can be beautiful and so can be actions, ideas and principles. To Makiguti, the aesthetic reports itself to the interest, or better saying, to the interesting. It includes the beauty (the aesthetic) into his system of creation of values, causes the beauty (or the ugliness) to take out from the man the position of neutrality, indifference. The beauty incites the man, despite its not being a “part” of the object; that is why, it exists as a value. This is because it is created inside the relation between man and world, and not obligatory. The universe of the aesthetic, likewise of the value, is beyond its own necessity to the world of knowledge, thus it is opposed to the observer impassiveness. They are about feelings of enchantment or wonder that would turn things into something interesting for us.

Makiguti and Paulo Freire

Like Makiguti, Paulo Freire criticized the mainstream education (in Brazil) in his age. He criticized what he called the bank education²², where the student is considered as passive and an object, and the teacher as someone who knows, who “transmits knowledge” in a mechanical and hierarchical relation. To Paulo,

21 Ibidem.

22 FREIRE, P. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 13. ed. Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 1983, p.68.

the educational procedure shall be a liberating process, political, where the man is a subject and the education is a process of the world signification and resignation, suffered by some of these subjects. Its focus is not the contents, but the springing of a new form of being related to the experience, the internalization of the education in life and in the net of its relations.

Paulo Freire has inherited from Dewey the idea of active teaching, in front of a working society, that wants to fulfil demands from the state or from the market, before an ideological veil that hides deep differences and injustice among the men. The Paulo Freire's motivation to search for a way that transforms the education process in his age is deeply united to his search for social and political transformation. The transformation in the educational field is associated to his project among the depended subjects, the ones that do not have ways to express themselves, the oppressed ones. To oppose such scenery, Paulo Freire purposes a pedagogy of the dialogue that supposes that the subjects are able to read the world, occupy it, build and rebuild it. To know is not a passive act, it is an act through which the man knows the world and itself, transforming them. Because of this, to learn is a process of assuming concrete reality, it is an action and an activity that transforms the one taking part in it.

His comprehension of knowledge as internalized knowledge in the concrete reality, guided him to elaborate a method that encloses and participates. In *Education as the practice to freedom*, Freire purposes five movements.

- 1) investigation of the vocabulary universe;
- 2) choice of selected words from the vocabulary universe;
- 3) creation of existential situations;
- 4) card-index elaboration;
- 5) card-index elaboration with the phonetics families decomposition²³.

In the process of adult education, instead of going through the grammar and throwing the contents without any meaning to the students, Paulo Freire takes part of the student's routine to the process of selection of vocabulary and phonetic universe. Calling it "circles of culture", "they wrote down literally the words from the interviews related to their own experiences, family, work, religion, politics..."²⁴. After these interviews, there are selected what Freire used to call "generator-words" and "generator themes", this process justly "destroys" the grammatical knowledge process, by the meaning and the involvement of these words and the themes provoked. Allied to the "technical" knowledge, the students could discuss the social and effective reality and, through the conscious need to evaluate it, search for transformation. This process sets the lettering at the "classroom" outdoors, the technical books and closed methods get to the ground. The circles of culture show us that the local reality is essential to the comprehension of education within a more open meaning.

²³ Freire, P. *Education as the practice to freedom*. 17. ed. Rio de Janeiro, Paz e Terra, 1979.

²⁴ FEITOSA, S. *The Method Paulo Freire*. Captured in <http://www.undime.org.br/htdocs/download.php?form=.doc&id=34>, in 20/11/2009.

Thus, the Paulo Freire's teaching method involves the teacher immersion in the student's reality, taking from this reality the material to work with. In all these aspects, Makiguti agrees with Paulo Freire. The context search, the student being recovered as a subject, like the center of the process, the transition to the beyond-mechanical education and the search for a reform of the educational system are presented as central goals in the work of these two authors. The search for happiness in Makiguti coincides with the vision of the man like an active subject, the search for happiness sets the man out of the walls of the school (under the instrumental point of view) and guides him to the world, to its transformation, by the interaction and people's transformation. They both see the invisible net of connections between school and world, education and life, both think about expanding the meaning of education beyond a portion of knowledge that is dead and numb, presenting effectively the possibility of overcoming the dichotomy of theory and practice.

Conclusion

In spite of the discussion about the meaning of education being old, its practical realization still remains in a very conservative and dead-like situation and, in many cases, stays in the air a hidden firm belief in what is being taught. Makiguti's thought represents resistance against this way of thinking and, so, remains topical. The objective of this text was to present the Makiguti's thought, to show his lonely work of vanguard in terms of discussion over the meaning of education and, especially, to show his proposals. To Makiguti, the education is alive, as the life itself; it is the central point for the recovering the real meaning of teaching – all about it is essential meaning. The education was the field of militancy to Makiguti, for the reality could be transformed by a deep changing of people in their education, without having any split between the educational theory and practical realization. We considered it important to bring Makiguti's thoughts, because he is a thinker almost unknown outside Japan, despite his being a pioneer in the reflection over the necessity of changes in the education and forestalling many authors and practices that have transformed the ways of educative processes.

By his history, beliefs and purposes, Makiguti reinforces and actualizes the critique performed by Nietzsche of the educational utilitarian face. The utilitarian meaning of education has become itself the dominant point since the modern age until the present days, and the necessity to think and act in order to demonstrate its incorrectness remains a biggest challenge. The process of nurturing the dexterity of individuals and the standardization is still on the move; and this shows that teaching serves to something external – serves to supply professionals to the market, to the state, to the teaching institutions. Education under this view serves to an external project, it does not have worth within itself.

To Makiguti, as well as to Dewey and Freire, the education has its end in itself, holds its meaning in itself and in real time. The objective, considered really naïve to the occidental and modern minds, is to promote the students' happiness, the meaning of all that they learn, the connection with the external reality, the inseparability of education from the social reality, the creative potency of each individual. The focus of

this conception of teaching is the education oriented to the individual, to the present time, and to his/her complete realization and happiness. Such focus would set the professional questions like the one about the aspects that embraces the students' life and the school, but this is not the only one, neither the most important; this is only a consequence. So, here is the importance of this Japanese pedagogue, here is our challenge to promote (to recover) the meaning of education to the young and rip them out of the massacre that has been subduing them since the modernity.

UDK 13 + 316.7 + 37.0

MULLAH SADRA'S IDEA ABOUT "EXISTENCE" AND "MOTION IN SUBSTANCE" AND ITS EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS.

Tahereh Javidi Kalatehjafarabadi (Mashhad, Iran)

***Abstract.** The purpose of this paper is to examine "existence" and "motion in substance" in Mullah Sadra's view and to develop some of its educational implications. Accordingly, first Concept of Existence, Principality of Existence and Motion in Substance are explained and in part of Motion in substance are illustrated that while philosophers previously admitted the possibility of existence of motion in four categories; quantity, quality, position, and place, however; they considered the essence or substance of objects which were the locus of quantity, quality, and position as being fixed and motionless, Mullah Sadra proves that the trans-substantial motion of objects exists in their essence and does not occur to them as an accident. Through the principle of motion in substance, Mulla Sadra proved that the substantiality of substance and the quality of its creation are in the form of addition of a strong degree to the previous weak degree.*

Then, some of useful consequences of Mullah Sadra's theory for philosophy are mentioned. Finally, in section of educational implications are explained that soul needs a materialistic ground for appearance and perfection is obtained by the aid of education. The important point in the educational system based on Sadra's philosophy, is preparing the ground for human development, i.e. in an education system, situations should be created in such a way that the student can understand the subjects in depth and add to his essence of being through active participation in teaching-learning processes. Hence, in Sadra's education system, the most important objective of education is teaching how to learn.

***Key words:** Mullah Sadra, existence, motion in substance, educational implications, Islamic philosopher.*

ИДЕИ МУЛЛЫ САДРА О «БЫТИИ» И «ДВИЖЕНИИ В СУБСТАНЦИИ» И ИХ ПРИЛОЖЕНИЯ В ОБРАЗОВАНИИ

Тәэрех Джавиди Калатехджафарабди (Мешхеда, Иран)