

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v11i1.3131

Citation: Sizov, V., Slavka, Y., & Alforov, O. (2022). Professional Worldview as a Determinant of The Slavic Cultural Archetype and Its Transformation in Pedagogical Forms. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 11(1), 13-26. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v11i1.3131>

Professional Worldview as a Determinant of The Slavic Cultural Archetype and Its Transformation into Pedagogical Forms

Vitaliy Sizov¹, Yanina Slavka², Oleksandr Alforov³

Abstract

In the article, the problems of educational methodology from the sociocultural perspective are considered. The main task of the study is to analyze the characteristic manifestations of the cultural archetype of Orthodox-Slavic society and their reflection in the sphere of practical pedagogy. The elements (features) of the cultural archetype that determine social behavior, including pedagogical practice, are generally highlighted in the research. The article covers some of the features of pedagogical theory and practice in comparison of «West-Orthodox East», and the authors attempt to relay socio-cultural models on the pedagogical model. The pattern of this retransmission is beyond doubt because the education system itself, firstly, naturally copies the social and cultural system in the present and secondly, tends to reproducing of existing socio-cultural relations in the future. The second thing is the most important one. There can be changes in society only if there are changes in education because education is one of the few social institutions that shape thinking in the long view.

The analysis of the sources characterizing the cultural archetype of the Slavic-Orthodox society and its reflection in the system of pedagogical processes shows the direct and logical interdependence of the two phenomena. The cultural archetype of society in many ways passionately determines the pedagogical forms and the pedagogical process itself regardless of its organisational forms which are sometimes directly borrowed from a foreign cultural pedagogical system. This is where the problem of methodology in organizing pedagogical approaches to organizing the education and upbringing system is manifested. Hence, the theme of cultural relativism (poly-culturalism) is actualized which essentially defends the position of the uniqueness of the cultures of particular countries and at the same time does not reject the system of world progressive development.

Keywords: Cultural archetype, Orthodox-Slavic society, spiritual values, cultural archetype in pedagogical forms.

¹ M. Glinka Dnipropetrovsk Academy of Music, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0679-8602>

E-mail: vitaliydnpr59@gmail.com

² M. Glinka Dnipropetrovsk Academy of Music, <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2498-33023>

E-mail: yanina19771@gmail.com

³ M. Glinka Dnipropetrovsk Academy of Music, <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4921-323X>

E-mail: aalforov75@gmail.com

Introduction

The globalization process in the modern world is an inevitable and in some manner objective process. There is no resistance to this phenomenon in the spheres of science, economy and in the political process. However, the penetration of globalization processes into the cultural tradition (the social and cultural environment of the national society) can lead to social imbalance. In this case, the positive achievements of globalization become meaningless. It is important to see objectively future problems and be able to confront them. One of the factors of this confrontation is the educational system, not only in form but also in fact. The integration of society and culture, creates a special social and cultural environment which is able to withstand foreign cultural expansion.

Any attempts to replace national values with supranational ones lead ultimately to the loss of national identity. The transfer of supranational values into pedagogical processes is most likely to lead eventually to the appearance of phenomena that could be called a "chimeric culture," where new values would not be understood, and the former ones would be distorted or lost. In this case, a moral catastrophe of a general social scale is inevitable; and we already can observe the signs of this phenomenon in Ukraine.

Modern globalization processes are unidirectional and therefore have an ideological expansive character, the so-called cultural diffusion occurs. Hence it is important to find the correct algorithm for opposing these processes, to start looking for mechanisms of education and training in new socio-historical conditions. Today it is necessary to pay attention to the formation of such a pedagogical environment that can withstand cultural-diffusion processes (Shevchenko, 2020, p. 98-110). On the other side, the model of pedagogy should preserve cultural and historical values as a natural pedagogical environment.

The purpose of the article is to analyze the sources, characterise the cultural archetype of the Slavic and Orthodox society and its reflection in the system of pedagogical processes; and emphasize the connection of the cultural archetype and pedagogical form.

Basic research methods include historical and comparative methods, generalization and interpretation of the conclusions by authors, retrospective and comparative analysis.

In order to maintain the objectivity of the issues considered, the sources of different historical periods and dominant ideologies have been used in the article.

The methodological basis of the study includes the work, scientific ideas and conclusions by the following authors: M. Weber (1864-1920), K. Aksakov (1817-1860), S. Bulhakov (1869-1944), V. Zenkovsky (1881-1962), I. Ilyin (1883-1954), L. Karsavin (1882-1952), I. Kireevsky (1806-1856), N. Berdyaev (1874-1948), N. Danilevskiy (1822-1885), P. Kapterov (1849-1922) and others.

The problem of the cultural archetype of society, consistent patterns of its formation and development, manifestation and influence are reflected in the works of modern authors such as D. Zapesotsky, D. Polyakov, A. Bulkin, I. Hryshchenko and others.

Since the church and its values prominently occupy the basis of socio-cultural archetype, which have been shaping the social sense of global consciousness for centuries, and, following the method by M. Weber, the ideas of Archpriest, Professor V. Zenkovsky, and Archbishop S. Starogorodsky have been used in the article. And if M. Weber's method (stated in the work "Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism") is based on the dogma of soteriology, the nature of the Slavic archetype has been

studied from the point of view of the value approach to Orthodoxy in social and pedagogical discourse in this work.

It should be noticed that the social and cultural crisis has always caused a need for rethinking. Appeal to the significance of socio-cultural identity, the desire to preserve historically established social values, made researchers again turn to the concepts of “national mentality” and “cultural archetype”. Famous cultural philosophers, such as N. Danilevsky, N. Berdyaev, O. Spengler, N. Ilyin, etc. created their theories during the times of social upheaval, when social and cultural traditions collapsed and the threat of foreign cultural expansion or a deep crisis of the social and cultural state of society had been approached.

Considering some features of pedagogical theory and practice in the West-and-East comparison, the authors attempt to relay social and cultural models to pedagogical ones. The pattern is undeniable here, for, at-first, the education system itself naturally copies the social and cultural system in present, and at-second, contributes to the reproduction of existing social and cultural relations in the future. The second important issue is that society can change only when education changes.

Considering the historiography of the problem of the article, the concepts “cultural archetype”, “mentality”, and “national character” have been used. We will study the definition for each of these concepts.

“One should distinguish between such concepts as cultural archetype, mentality and national character. The cultural archetype acts as an unconscious form of perception of the fundamental structures of social life. Cultural archetypes, therefore, are developed out of consciousness and are sustainable. Mentality is a way of expressing knowledge about the world and a person and acts as a way of thinking of an individual and a social group. The worldview of the mentality is formed depending on traditions, culture; in other words, the cultural archetype precedes and seriously affects the mentality of any people. National character is mostly determined by a combination of genotype and culture. It is clear that only cultural archetypes that K. Jung classifies as collective unconsciousness, do not obey direct observation and awareness, but cultural archetypes can be studied indirectly, mainly through understanding the symbolic basis, where the symbols of faith play an important, if not leading, role” (Hrishchenko, 2001).

1. ELEMENTS OF A CULTURAL ARCHETYPE: "EAST AND WEST." ORTHODOX AS A DETERMINANT OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Here we summarize the following elements (features) of the cultural archetype that determine social behavior.

The first element is the role of the Leader. A feature of the Orthodox and Slavic social system is a model that, in its development, unlike the West, undergoes self-regulation with difficulty. Therefore, the internal and especially external influence on its functioning with great probability, historically, led to unpredictable results. The subjective factor in the Orthodox and Slavic social model plays a decisive role, the laws of social development at such level and in such a similarity as in social models of the Western world are not applied here. The history of the development of the Orthodox world in many respects depended on a specific person (Leader), his beliefs, ideology, upbringing and goals. In a Slavic and Orthodox society, power is always personified.

Often the natural laws of social development, the need for social and political changes had nothing to do with the opinion of the Leader. This is the subjectivity of the development of the state. Society,

as a rule, adapted to the leader or was forced to take his position (sometimes temporarily). This is the conformism of Orthodox society and its penchant for mimicry in relation to political power (state). It was not the society that formed the power, but the power shaped the society (as opposed to the West). It has always been this way; everything else is an illusion. Even if a revolution took place, everything eventually would return to its own circle in the end. In addition, the slogan "Down with the bad king! Long live the good king!" characterizes in a literal and figurative sense the attitude of power and society. Society allowed such course of history, therefore the history of Slavic and Orthodox states is not the logic of consistent development, but the alternation of periods of "leaps of progress" and "stagnation in development".

Orthodox and Slavic society is poorly self-regulating; its functioning must be directed. Historically, this function naturally is taken, on the one hand, by political power (state), and on the other, Orthodox ideals, as the limiter of the first one.

The concept of "state" and the concept of "society" in the social consciousness of the Orthodox society form a unified whole, but at the same time, they function separately.

The second element is spiritual and existential. Since the state (political power and power in general) acted, as a rule, as an instrument of organization (coercion) because of the passivity of society, in the Orthodox Church the society saw some kind of spiritual protection from the arbitrariness of power (because of the spiritual and moral principle, and therefore some "fair" one. History remembers that Orthodox monasteries had the right not to extradite runaway peasants or criminals to a prince). Hence the sphere of masterful and social - mundane, church and Orthodoxy - godly, spiritual. In this way, the mundane and the divine are separate and function separately. The spiritual is the sphere of the hermit, monk, church-ritual, and this, in its turn, is a mundane ideal worthy of worship, etc. The mundane is a social sphere. In the minds of the average person, they exist separately and independently (sometimes they come into conflict), the spiritual is weakly determined into mundane and does not become a decisive factor in determining social behavior, but it is a model of "social and ideal" (unlike Catholicism, Protestantism or East Asian religions.)

The third element is soteriological. Orthodoxy is an instrument of state influence, it has never been an organizationally independent phenomenon and did not strive for political power (especially after the reforms of Peter I), but, due to its soteriological specificity, it acted as a spiritual mediator between the government and society. The credo of Orthodoxy is "to endure, wait and believe" (the credo of Protestantism is "to act and believe in yourself." "Each for himself, one God for all!"). At its top, Orthodoxy understands the task of life as acquisition, acquiring the grace of the Holy Spirit, as a spiritual transformation of the creature.

Against the backdrop of spiritual sense of Orthodoxy, the desire for universal salvation arises. Salvation is understood not only individually, but also collectively, in conjunction with the whole world (Berdyayev, 1952).

The fourth element is the attitude to the Law. The formation of social and personal values through the prism of pragmatism and rationalism, through the strict

"legalism" of the Catholic and Protestant churches, creates a special system of social relations more capable of self-regulation (including political power and its control by society). This system is streamlined, its requirements are concrete, understandable and easily explainable, aimed at the result, this is the system of the Western world, it is pragmatic because it always appeals to the rules (right, law).

As researcher D. Polyakov impartially notes: "One of the key disagreements of Orthodox theologians with their Catholic and Protestant colleagues lies in their open rejection of the legal or judicial aspect of justification. The role of law and legal institutions, in general, is minimal in the countries of the East. This is clearly seen in the example of the cultural and political life of a society in which the majority of the population is always sceptical of the law and the legislative system, preferring to believe in a "good" king or ruler rather than injustice" (Polyakov, 2006).

In the Orthodox and Slavic tradition, a special place is occupied by the concept of "conscience" as a regulator of intra-group relations. A sense of conscience and appeal to it is a necessary condition for the functioning of an individual in a social group. The category of "conscience" is not an element of the relationship between the individual and the state. The Orthodox will not feel remorse for the state, because "Conscience" is associated with the understandable "justice", "duty", "responsibility", and all this in relation to a certain social group, justice is above the concept of "Legality".

Justice and conscience are phenomena of the spiritual, social sphere; "legitimacy" is the sphere of rationality, the sphere of power. In Orthodox social psychology, "justice and conscience" often come into conflict with "legitimacy". In public consciousness, the law is not always fair, therefore, it can be not executed. Hence, the Orthodox society is not law-abiding (Ilyin, 2006).

Society perceives a crime against the state sometimes indifferently. And only a crime against a person causes conviction. "Orthodoxy is the least normative form of Christianity (in the sense of normative rational logic and moral juridism), and its most spiritual form. And this spirituality and secrecy of Orthodoxy was often the source of its external weakness. External weakness and lack of manifestation, lack of external activity and realization were striking to everyone; its spiritual life and its spiritual treasures, however, remained hidden and invisible. And this is the characteristic of the spiritual type of the East, in contrast to the spiritual type of the West, which is always relevant and comes to light from the outside, but often, it is spiritually draining of oneself in this activity" (Berdyayev, 1952).

With the legal tradition of the Orthodox and Slavic state, the norms of "duties" prevail; they prevail over the norms of "human rights" ("orthodoxy of life") (hence, traditionally, there is a powerful state apparatus (the need for coercion) and a natural tendency to authoritarianism, as from the state, and within society). The Orthodox and Slavic state is an authoritarian state in its nature and manner; it cannot be otherwise. It takes either this way, or goes out of existence, or the crisis becomes its natural state. And such relations between the government and society are inherent in nature. K. Aksakov points this immanence of power and society: "State power with such principles, with no interference of its people, should be unlimited. What exactly should such an unlimited government have? The answer is not difficult: a monarchical form. Any other form: democratic, aristocratic allows the participation of the people - one to a greater, another to a less extent - and an indispensable restriction of state power, therefore, does not meet either the requirement of non-interference of the people in government, or the requirement of indefiniteness of the government "(Aksakov, 1996, p.159).

The Russian people, having separated the state element from themselves, having granted full state power to the government, granted themselves life, moral and social freedom, the lofty goal of which is Christian society (Aksakov, 1996, p.157). In these words, the writer fully reflects the essence of Orthodoxy (the attitude of society to power indirectly through Orthodoxy), its role and place in the public consciousness and the social unconscious.

The fifth element is the Unity. N. Berdyaev makes the notifications in his work “The Truth of Orthodoxy”: “The freedom of the Church in relation to the state has always been in danger, but freedom within the Church has always been in Orthodoxy. In Orthodoxy, freedom is organically combined with collegiality, unity, particularly, with the action of the Holy Spirit on a religious collective, which is inherent in the Church not only at the time of Ecumenical Councils but always. The unity in Orthodoxy, which is particularly the life of the church people, had no external legal signs, it had only internal, spiritual signs. The recognition of conscience freedom makes the Orthodox Church very different from the Catholic one. The understanding of freedom in Orthodoxy, however, is different from the understanding of freedom in Protestantism. In Protestantism, as in a Western way of thinking, freedom is understood individually, as the right of the individual, protecting itself from the encroachment by any other personality and defining oneself autonomously. Individualism is alien to Orthodoxy; a unique collectivism is peculiar to it. A religious person and a religious collective do not oppose each other as being foreign to each other. A religious person is inside of a religious community and a religious community is inside of a religious person. Therefore, a religious collective is not an external authority for a religious person who imposes the doctrine and law of life from outside ” (Berdyaev,1952).

The sixth element is the Orthodox doctrine. N. Berdyaev points: Orthodoxy is, first of all, the orthodoxy of life, and not the orthodoxy of teaching. According to his idea, heretics are not those who profess a false doctrine, but those who have a false spiritual life and follow a false spiritual way. Orthodoxy is, first of all, not a doctrine, not an external organization, not an external form of behavior, but a spiritual life, a spiritual experience and a spiritual way to go. Orthodoxy did not have its time of scholasticism; it survived only the time of patristicism. And the Orthodox Church nowadays relies on the ideas of the Eastern Church teachers. The West considers this to be a sign of Orthodoxy backwardness, the freezing of creative life in it. But another meaning can be given to this fact: in Orthodoxy, Christianity was not as rationalized as it was rationalized in the West in the Catholic Church... Doctrines has never acquired such sacred meaning, and dogmas were not confined to obligatory intellectual theological teachings, but were understood primarily as mystical facts. On the basis of Orthodoxy, the way of thinking remained ontological, familiar to genesis, and this was revealed by all Russian religious, philosophical and theological thought of the 19th and 20th centuries. Orthodoxy is alien to rationalism and juridism, alien to any normatism. The Orthodox Church is not definable in rational terms; it is understandable only for those, who live in it, for those who are involved in its spiritual experience. Hence the frivolity of the laws and norms (Berdyaev,1952).

The seventh element is the Orthodox theology. Although Orthodox theology is quite separate from the rest of the religious world, it did not develop in a vacuum. The culture and philosophy of the eastern peoples with their traditions and worldview significantly influenced the formation of Orthodox theology. This perception also influenced the formation of an experimental approach in Orthodox theology, which underestimates the role of legal relations between people and magnifies the ethical and moral component, contrasting this with everything else (Kolomiytsev, 2012).

In his approach to the theological understanding of salvation like most Orthodox theologians, Sergius Stargorodsky says that real salvation should grow out of a person’s internal moral change in the process of attaining righteousness as an inherent property of his soul. Instead of looking for external righteousness, a person should work hard to change the inner essence, starting with the making of good things, that are familiar to everyone, and trusting that the grace of Christ will provide all the necessary help in this process (Kolomiytsev, 2012).

Considering only some elements characterizing the eastern Slavic cultural archetype through the prism of traditional Orthodoxy, it is interesting to turn to the work of the Russian philosopher I. Ilyin. In his work "On Orthodoxy and Catholicism", the author makes key comparisons between the two churches. And in this comparison, the particularity of each of them is visible, and by transmitting this peculiarity to the political, social and economic, cultural relations of each of the parties, one can see the specificity of the cultural archetype in both philosophical and everyday meanings.

According to I. Ilyin, missionary differences are the following: Orthodoxy recognizes freedom of conscience and rejects the whole spirit of the Inquisition; extermination of heretics, torture, bonfires and forced baptism ... It observes the purity of religious contemplation and its freedom from all extraneous motives, especially from intimidation, political calculation and financial assistance ("charity"); it does not consider that help of the world to a brother in Christ proves the "faith" of the benefactor. According to Gregory the Theologian, it "does not seek to win, but to acquire brothers by faith". It does not seek power on earth at all costs. These are the most important missionary differences.

The political differences are the following: the Orthodox Church has never attracted either secular domination or the struggle for state power in the form of a political party. The original Russian and Orthodox resolution of the issue is the following: the Church and the state have special and different tasks, but help each other in the struggle for the good; the state governs, but does not command the Church and does not engage in forced missionary work.

The moral difference is the next. Orthodoxy appeals to a free human heart. Catholicism appeals to blindly obedient will. Orthodoxy seeks to awaken a living, creative love and Christian conscience in a person. Catholicism requires a person to obey and be subordinate to a precept (legalism). Orthodoxy asks for the best and calls for gospel perfection. Catholicism asks for "prescribed," "forbidden," "allowed," "excusable," and "unforgivable." Orthodoxy goes deep down, seeking sincere faith and sincere kindness. Catholicism disciplines an external person, seeks outward piety, and is satisfied with the formal appearance of doing good. The primary and the main awakening of faith for the Orthodox is the movement of the heart, contemplating love, which sees the Son of God in all His goodness, in all His perfection and spiritual strength, worships and accepts Him as the real truth of God, as his main treasure of life. In the light of this perfection, the Orthodox believer learns his sinfulness, strengthens and cleanses his conscience with it, and enters the way of repentance and purification. They consider the power to be a tool of establishing the Kingdom of God on earth. And this idea has always been alien to both the gospel teaching and the Orthodox Church (Ilyin, 2006).

The list of elements and comparisons covers only the key characteristics of the cultural archetype. In fact, the list of these elements is quite large, especially in the existential example. However, the named ones are sufficiently transformed into the field of pedagogy and, due to this, spontaneously relay to the field of education, with one of the functions of indirect reproduction of elements of the cultural archetype in other mechanisms or other forms (taking into account the specifics of a particular stage of historical development).

2. A DETERMINANT OF ELEMENTS OF THE SLAVIC CULTURAL ARCHETYPE AND ITS TRANSFORMATION INTO PEDAGOGICAL FORMS

The first element is the role of the Leader. The Orthodox state is the authoritarian one. Well-known educational models of famous Soviet teachers (A. Makarenko, V. Sukhomlinsky) are authoritarian models of education, based on sociocentric methods of personality formation. The authoritarian methods of managing the teaching staff, the personal authority of the leader, reliance on the collective consciousness and the ability to manage it are the basis for success in solving pedagogical goals. Back in the day, the desire of the USSR Ministry of Education by administrative methods to introduce commonly the experience of A. Makarenko and V. Sukhomlinsky into the practice of school education had a very small result and did not make the expected effect. The analysis of the activities of both A. Makarenko and V. Sukhomlinsky immanently contains the key components: formal and non-formal authority of the conductor (leader); the mechanism of collective pedagogy (the formation of the collective and its educational role in the formation of the ideological qualities of the individual); spiritual values, as a pedagogical goal and a condition for the existence of a collective (society). Three components determine: authoritarianism; community; Orthodox spirit, expressed in Orthodox moral values. In other words, the pedagogy of A. Makarenko, V. Sukhomlinsky - immanently corresponds to the Orthodox and Slavic social and cultural traditions. This explains not success of the teaching practice of A. Makarenko and V. Sukhomlinsky as their personal success, as much as the significance of their pedagogical heritage is not possible to overestimate.

The second and third elements are spiritual and existential, soteriological. Turning to the pedagogy, in this regard, it is necessary to notice the most important circumstance of its functioning - the theory and practice of upbringing and the theory and practice of education. The mere fact, the division of the educational process into two interrelated areas shows its specificity and difference from the Western models.

The reason for this phenomenon, to our opinion, lies in two features: 1) in the subjective manifestations of social development mentioned above. The importance of the component of upbringing in learning is caused by the need for a constant intergenerational correlation of public consciousness in the areas, necessary for power; 2) the existence of Orthodoxy determining socially conscious and socially unconscious at the level of historical memory and tradition, as something not material, spiritual and valuable, in need of constant "nourishment", instruction, reminder, suggestion. In this way, the inter-generational formation (through education) of certain human qualities, necessary for the implementation of intergenerational functioning (for example, community psychology, etc.) is ensured. When the "educating" factors weaken or suddenly change their direction, the inter-generational connection breaks and the process of changing or substituting "values" become observed in society, which in its turn causes a moral or spiritual crisis. It is especially acute during periods of influence of foreign cultural values.

Together, these features form a certain environment for the functioning of public consciousness, when there is an often (in historical meaning) tendency to interrupt inter-generational communication (for example, in connection with a change in the course of political power), but the Orthodox and valuable worldview maintains its position, as if hindering or slowing down dissonance processes in social consciousness, they come into conflict with "new" values and at the existential level form cognitively dissonant phenomena of a personal and social nature. These phenomena, in its turn, form inter-generational contradictions. According to its characteristics, this is what is manifested in what we call the "spiritual crisis of society", investing Orthodox and Slavic meaning in this concept. It should be noted that the disorder can occur both during the "leaping" and during the period of social stagnation.

In such conditions, the upbringing function of education, and especially pedagogy of upbringing, as a force of formation, always remains relevant and important. The “inertia of tradition” acts here, which is manifested in the unconscious inertial desire to preserve the “former” values. That is why the education sector is the most conservative field of the social structure of society, as a subconscious way of maintaining intergenerational (sociocultural) communication.

Due to such specifics, the educational factor traditionally and very often gives priority to the educational factor, sometimes the element of knowledge, and professionalism occupies the second place. It is the personal qualities of a person that prevail over other social requirements. The professionalism of the employee, the level of his personal qualification is “dissolved” or unclaimed in the social environment, provided that he is not directly related to the wellness of the team. Hence the weak motivation to increase the level of proficiency in the profession. Often the level of personal professional skill is replaced by organizational abilities of a formal and informal nature. The logic of this situation is explained by factors of the cultural archetype, where the social is higher in importance than the individual one, where the sensual is wider than the rational one (the famous triad of Count Uvarov, the Minister of Education of the Russian Empire in the mid-19th century, called “Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality”). The Soviet education system retained this triad by changing the form: “Ideology, Partisanship, Internationalism”, but not its semantic content. The Soviet system of education, in our opinion, could not “break” social existentialism and in the public mindset a concept of a “good person” is more valuable than the concept of a “good specialist”, and the ideal of upbringing takes “a good person and a good specialist” in one person.

The fourth element is the attitude to the Law. The traditional government control of the educational system, its regulation and standardization through a system of normative acts and specific authorities, designed to control their implementation. In the circumstances, democracy is declarative in nature or some of its visible forms but does not affect the essence of the educational process. Society perceives this as a completely natural state. Any attempts at real democratization and liberalization of the educational system spontaneously lead to anarchy, permissiveness and nihilism (in latent or open forms).

The first consequence of this is authoritarian methods of managing the educational process within an educational institution, as the most effective form of its functioning. The second consequence is the authoritarianism of forms and teaching methods, as the most productive option for achieving pedagogical goals. As shown by many years of research in this field, this idea is approved by all subjects involved in the educational process (Sizov, 2018, P.181-189).

For example, the so-called student-centrism, being a form of manifestation of liberalism in pedagogy, hypertrophies the feeling of students' “rights” and underestimates their opposite side, which is “duties”. Such a “distortion” of consciousness is a characteristic in the conditions of substitution of social tradition when new rules created in the conditions of a different cultural archetype are imposed on the old mentality. The Western world has been forming its democratic principles for centuries, the concepts of “rights and obligations” are interiorized and form an element of the cultural archetype. This idea is embodied in a system of respect for human rights, and its duties are realized by citizens through respect for the law. This system of worldview in Slavic-Orthodox societies historically has not developed. The positive principle of “personal sovereignty” in Western countries is distorted into the negative principle of “primacy of personal interests” in eastern countries.

Under the circumstances, when the law is an abstract phenomenon, and the authority of a teacher is negligible, the rules of action are conventional. Hence, the learning process is formal and the result

is not clear. In such conditions, the student learns for the sake of grades, but not for the sake of knowledge.

In addition, the failure of the juridic principle in the pedagogy of relations between the subjects of the learning process, often manifests itself in ignoring the rules or not clearly expressing them. Hence, on the one hand, there is a teacher's subjectivity in assessing student knowledge, and a reassessment of his abilities by the student himself on the other hand. In any case, we are talking about the emotional component of the process of educational communication of subjects. Often, the personal likes or dislikes of subjects determine the nature of their learning relationship. Very often, the student's attitude to the discipline is formed through the personality of the teacher. This feature is a characteristic of the Slavic type of pedagogical process. Here, juridism can be replaced by emotion or some indistinctly expressed internal moral form. It sometimes does not allow the teacher to assess the knowledge of a student objectively.

The primacy of private property in Western Europe, since the time of Ancient Greece and Rome (Roman private law), has formed a special type of social mentality, where the concept of "private property" is a sacred concept. "Intellectual property right" is its element (even if it is commercialized), hence plagiarism is a crime (both by law and by conscience).

In the Orthodox and Slavic tradition, such a belief is absent (in conscience), therefore, writing off the answers to exam questions from a deskmate and getting a good grade is not considered to be a violation in a student's mind, sometimes it is even a merit ("innocent until proven guilty"). I am not sure if the concept "a cheat sheet" lives in any of the European languages. The concept of "plagiarism" is frequent even in the scientific community, but not a critical phenomenon, the attitude of society towards such facts is more emotional than legal.

The fifth element is Unity. Dependence on society forms a special system for regulating the relations of people within it. Not the spirit of collectivism, as much as the collective spirit sometimes determines the success and productivity of the activities of any team, which means the success and productivity of each of them, but not vice versa.

In education, this is materialized through the establishment and implementation of a hierarchy of values: spirituality as the basis of a person's moral life, his worldview, orientation toward collegiality in all spheres of life; economic life as a sacrificial service to one's relative, professional, social and charitable activities, as an active participation in serving the homeland.

Education with a focus on unity is distinguished by national embeddedness, on the one hand, and by its openness to the world, by the search for common ground, opportunities for coexistence, interaction and cooperation, on the other hand. Education in the spirit of Orthodox unity implies a critical, demanding attitude towards itself and a benevolent attitude towards others, especially those, who is different in religious confession, culture, and lifestyle. Conciliarity creates natural prerequisites for democracy, including in the educational system, but a democracy of spirit, based on continuous spiritual growth and moral self-improvement, harmony of interests and altruism (Plyakov, 2006). A similar approach in Slavic pedagogy was expressed in the teaching of A. Makarenko "On the collective"; and a Western pedagogical theory, for example, formed the concept of "Individual educational trajectory". The psychological crisis of the individual in the context of Slavic mentality is allowed in communication (while a westerner appeals to a psychotherapist).

The sixth and seventh elements are Orthodox doctrine and Orthodox theology. The Orthodox Slavic value system is different from the Western one. The field of the sensual and spiritual, turned to emotions and values not tangible, is the sphere of subjective, transcendental, with difficult process of

objective analysis in here. This sphere can have different methods of interpreting values, it is often aimed at the process, and since the process itself is endless, it can only be interrupted; the result is not important, because it is not achievable at this particular stage of the process of upbringing.

Such a society is hardly a subject to self-regulation (on the part of society), but very often needs to be enforced (state, power of an authority, power of a superior, not a formal leader). Such social relations are determined in pedagogy. There is a need for existence of special tools in the education system. Although it is contemplated that the educational process itself undertakes an educational function, but this is not enough in the process of forming of "humanity" (the role of Orthodoxy). The system of "upbringing" acts as such an instrument, as a conditionally isolated concept from "education" (as well as spiritual and existential, i.e. church and mundane). Even if there are clear goals and objectives for the formation of specific qualities in students, the "upbringing" system does not have universal mechanisms, but it requires the subjects of the educational process to form specific philosophical positions of a spiritual and moral nature (proximity to Orthodox spirituality). It should be emphasized that the process of the formation of moral qualities is sometimes not associated with vocational training (subject to weak motivation of subjects of educational activity), hence the certain differentiation of the process of upbringing from the educational process. It reflects the social concept, two parallel lines: the spiritual (irrational) and material (rational) in the mundane existence, which is reflected in training, where the duality of the process is also observed: training and education.

Hence, the credo of traditional Orthodox pedagogy in the words of V.V. Zenkovsky, a prominent representative of Russian foreign pedagogy in his work "The main problems of education", he emphasised: "Not the child's adaptation to life, but the development of positive force in him, ensuring the connection of good and freedom should be the purpose of education: adaptation (functional, social, etc.) to life has a purely instrumental character. Good in the soul is not born either from physical health, or from good social skills, or even from the development of creative forces (...) " (*Zenkovsky, 2002*).

In comparison, according to Comensky, the goal of education is to prepare a person for eternal life, the ability to see the path to eternal blessedness in the knowledge of the outside world, the ability to own things and himself. Here lies the meaning of the profound difference between the two systems. The first is the formation of good in the soul; the second is the knowledge of the external world.

Western humanistic pedagogy, from the theory and practice of Y. Komensky to the pedagogy and philosophy of D. Dewey, is pedagogy of learning aimed at gaining knowledge, disclosure and direction of human abilities, orientation towards cognition of the outside world and skillful integration into it. Here we have the rationalism, pragmatism, individualism. The interests of society are mediated through the interests of an individual. Personality is sovereign.

Zapesotsky notes: "Thus, the faith, but not the knowledge, was considered to be the basis of the spiritual world of Russian people. Accordingly, priority was given not to education (in its western version), but to enlightenment (the essence of which N. Gogol formulated as follows: "To enlighten does not mean to teach, or to instruct, or to educate, or even to illuminate, but to thoroughly lighten a person in all his powers, and not in one mind, to carry all its nature through some kind of cleansing fire"). Therefore, the educational system (from concept to content) should take into account and reproduce the specificity of spirituality as fully as possible. Only in this case can she effectively solve the problem of forming a moral and socially responsible person" (*Zapesotsky, 2002, p. 96*).

In this regard, it is very revealing that the advanced pedagogical mix of the Orthodox and Slavic world, starting with the "Preachment of Yaroslav", pedagogy and philosophy of G. Skovoroda and ending with the humane teacher

S. Amonashvili, is an idea aimed at the spiritual side of the human being, the cultivation of justice, morality, kindness and beauty, the primacy of the public, and if the individual is for the good of the

public. In general, this is the sphere of valuable and spiritual education in the first place. Even the term and concept of "education" is historically interpreted here as the "formation" of any human qualities. Today, the pedagogical meaning of the concept of "education" is lost. It is interpreted in the sense of "training" as an echo of globalization processes designed to standardize the "production" of universal workers.

Thus, the foregoing can be summarized by the words of I. Kirievsky, "In addition to tribal differences (the national ones - author's note), three more historical features gave a distinctive character to the entire development of enlightenment in the West: a special form through which Christianity penetrated into it; a special form, in which the education of the ancient classical world came over to it; and, finally, the special elements that formed the nationhood in it" (Kirievsky, 2008).

Nowadays, attempts to "adapt" Slavic and Orthodox pedagogy to Western models have a very small result, and sometimes even a negative one. The reason lies in the methodology. The nature of the current level of globalization does not allow ignoring the principle of pedagogy, which is cultural diversity. In past times, A. Dysterweg emphasised, "Aborning, every person finds his environment, his own people, among whom he is destined to live and at least be brought up at a certain level of culture. All humanity, every nation, every generation, etc. is always at some particular stage of culture, which should be considered as the heritage left by the ancestors, as a result of their history and all the factors influencing them. Each nation has become what it could become under the influence of these circumstances (Dysterweg, 1956). The modern nature of globalization, its goals and one-sided orientation do not always reflect the current problems and needs of many states ("cultures" in a civilizational sense). Within this meaning, it would be appropriate to refer to the scientific heritage of N. Danilevsky. The research of V. Sorokovs "Pedagogical potential of N. Ya. Danilevsky in the context of the Russian philosophical and educational search". The author considers the theory of "local civilizations" (typology of cultures) by N. Danilevsky in the discourse of problems of the philosophy of education, from the standpoint of a new version of civilizational interactions in the field of education. In the global and biosphere context of the modern philosophical and educational search and the most pronounced tendencies towards westernization or ethnicization of world education, the legacy of N. Ya. Danilevsky navigates pedagogy towards the reproduction and restoration of the planet's cultural and civilizational polymorphism, allows it to determine adequately both national and supranational ("typological" and civilizational) meanings of education in the pedagogical systems of cultural worlds as the largest educational phenomena, "not intended on created by someone else, but by natural ones" (...). As for the pedagogy itself, the significance of N. Ya. Danilevsky also emphasises the fact that the pedagogical interpretation of the results of his legacy relieves pedagogical technologies of the emerging prospects of turning them into technologies of world chimerization ("human resource management", "changing the mentality of the people", "passing the lethal point", etc.), and thus, retains their fundamental educational and, in fact, the pedagogical character (Sorokovyh, 2005).

Conclusions

Thus, the analysis of the sources, characterizing the cultural archetype of Slavic and Orthodox society and its reflection in the system of pedagogical processes shows a direct and logical interdependence of the two phenomena. The cultural archetype of society in many ways passionately determines pedagogical forms and the pedagogical process itself is independent of its organizational forms borrowed from foreign cultural pedagogical systems. This is the problem of the methodology to the question of the organization of pedagogical approaches to the organization of the educational system. Formal copying and introduction into the pedagogy of elements of a non-cultural nature, according to the principle "like theirs, because they are Europe", is a possible and progressive phenomenon, but most likely it will not lead to the effective achievement of pedagogical goals. Today there is a contradiction between form and content. In this case, those goals, being set before the education system as a whole and pedagogy in particular, are most likely not to be achieved (Sizov,

2019, P. 73-87). Here the goals and technologies do not match. If pedagogical technologies of a foreign-cultural nature are perceived by society in an incorrect way (it cannot be even in a correct way, as mental conformity is necessary for this) or formally (this is exactly what happens: the need to comply with a legal norm). As a result, pedagogical goals will not be achieved, but most likely they will form an axiologically amorphous personality in the person of the object of pedagogical influence, without clearly expressed interiorized values. It is the internalization of social values in the consciousness of an individual that is the main basis for its successful functioning in society and society as a community of such personalities.

References

Aksakov, K. S. (1996). Note "On the internal state of Russia" provided to the sovereign Emperor Aleksandr II / Essays on Russian philosophy. Anthology. Moscow. http://www.odinblago.ru/aksakov_zapiska

Berdyaev, N. A. (1952). Truth of Orthodoxy <https://azbyka.ru/istina-pravoslaviya>

Gryshchenko, I. A. (2001). Russian cultural archetype and Orthodoxy. Gomel State Technical University named after P. O. Sukhoi, Republic of Belarus. <https://elib.gstu.by/bitstream/handle/220612/9801/%D0%93%D1%80%D0%B8%D1%89%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%BA%D0%BE%2C%20%D0%98.%20%D0%90.%20%D0%A0%D1%83%D1%81%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%B8%D0%B9...pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Diesterweg, A. (1956). «About nature and culture congruity in education» /A. Diesterweg F. Selected pedagogic works. [Electronic source]. - Access mode: www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Pedagog/galag/17.php

Zapesotskii, A. S. (2002). Education: philosophy, culturology, politics. M.: Science. 456 p. P. 96. Москва.

Zenkovskiy, B. B. (2002). Problems of education in the light of Christian anthropology. Foundation «Christian life». http://www.odinblago.ru/problemi_vospitania/

Ilyin, I. A. (2006). About Orthodoxy and Catholicism. <https://3rm.info/publications/61735-ia-ilin-o-pravoslavii-i-katolichestve.html>

Kolomyitsev, A. (2012). The doctrine of salvation in the Russian Orthodox Church. <http://propovedi.ru/resource/doctrine-of-salvation-in-the-russian-orthodox-church/>

Kireevskiy, I. V. (2008). On the nature of Europe's enlightenment and its attitude to the enlightenment of Russia (The letter to Count Ye.Ye. Komarovky). http://dugward.ru/library/kireevskiy/kireevskiy_prosv_evrop.html

Polyakov, D. D. (2006). Collegiality as the basis of philosophy education of F.Sergius Bulgakova. Dissertation abstract. <http://www.dissercat.com/content/sobornost-kak-osnova-filosofii-obrazovaniya-o-sergiya-bulgakova>.

Sizov, V. (2018). Processes of globalisation and dynamics of the European pedagogical system: from antropocentrism to sociocentrism. Spirituality of personality: methodology, theory and practice: Collection of research papers // Chief editor H.P. Shevchenko. Issue 5 (86). Severodonetsk: Publishing House of the V. Dahl East Ukrainian National University, 2018. p. 181-189.

Sizov, V., Slavskaja, Ya., & Sheviakov O. (2019). Educational system and cultural archetype. Modern world tendencies in the development of science. Volume 2. P.73-87. Sciemcee Publishing, United Kingdom. A catalogue record for this publication is available from British Library. [Greate Britain]. London

Sorokovykh, V. V. (2005). Pedagogical potential of N. Ya. Danilevsky in the context of Russian philosophical and educational search. Dissertation abstract. <http://www.dissercat.com/content/pedagogicheskii-potentsial-naslediya-nya-danilevskogo-v-kontekste-rossiiskogo-filosofsko-obr>

Shevchenko, H.P., Antonenko, T. L., Bezuhla, M.V., & Safonova, I.O. (2020) Students' Spiritual Security Education. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 9(4), 98-110. <http://193.140.9.50/index.php/ilk/article/view/2799>