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Abstract:
An analysis of the contemporary social life (ethical subjectivity and axiological awareness) allows to ascertain many interesting observations considering the balance of transformations that have taken place within it, which probably arise in the nearer or longer term, and finally - the changes that are currently in in statu nascendi. Evolution indicated here is a derivative of passing of our society into the sphere of industrial societies and of the predicted transformations into post-industrial society.
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Introduction
Ethical subjectivity and axiological awareness seem to bound different parts of pedagogical discourse, even those which we excluded, in our superficial vision, from their adherence to the range of philosophy of education.
It turns out that a multitude of their reflections – actualized more implicitly, nonstraightforwardly, very rarely - named, worked out into the form of a fully conscious paradigms - creates a colourful mosaic of deliberations of the manner of pedagogical subjects.
J. Kostkiewicz emphasizes that the anthropological assumption does not have to penetrate the self-knowledge of the theoretician, in order to resonate in his offer - although the state of such a lack of reflection should be considered, of course, as negative one, indicating the theoretical immaturity[1].
Axiological awareness and ethical subjectivity are parts of the same notional field, to which classified are also arbitrariness of educational anthropology. To talk about the student, pupil, means to decide about the entity of instantiations endowed in the world of ethical values – and entity's obligations are understood in two ways: of one's own and others[2]. If we make an add that the measure of humanity is so conceived ethics, the subject of education is a man only when he is able to take his own obligations and be a part of the obligations of others [3]. Ethical subjectivity reaches then the rank of the fundamental concept, determining the substantive scope of the theory of education.
Any attempts, other than described in the paragraph above, of the human thought of being-in-the-world, being-for-the-world - being a man in general – inevitably are pushing us into the potholes implemented on the ground of educational praxis and psycho-social technique. Manipulation of a man – even if there are good intentions behind it - is nothing but dehumanisation: the reduction of awareness and autonomy, prevention from subjective disposition of oneself. It is not surprising that educators are setting themselves – possibly also because they want to remain loyal to the definition of education as an oriented action, not as an object of training, but as ethically understood
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human being. Such a theoretical workout of the status of ethical subject causes the fact of its merging with this one that comes out of ethical ground. Axiological awareness refers to the category of values that man embodies towards himself and the others, and earlier – he internalizes the structures of his personality. It seems that it is not a separate subtype of consciousness, but rather the human aspect of psychics, which permeates all the other aspects. We observe then how the values administer different spheres of subject's activities: its thinking, acting in a professional role, family role, towards friends, acquaintances, enemies, in actions oriented for both: short-term goals, as well as the long term, etc. It is impossible to trace all grounds of reception of valuable beings, so we can establish their omnipotence: the ability to impact on all areas of human manifestation. A significant rank of value is something on the Grodnun pedagogy unquestionable, proof of which is abundantly conceptual tropes made especially in the empirical approximations of social pedagogy. The very status of the value is rather omitted – there is applied, usually unconsciously, sociological definition. Methodological directives of M.Ossowska are based on the theory of value as beings of variables, socially constructed, relativized to various characteristics of groups and parameters of personality. Different from this view on the matter is attributed to philosophical thinking. Plato's vision of value – presenting valuable entities as a static matter, liberated from human impact of arbitrariness – does not adjust to the empirical perspective already on analytical level. Repeating after M. Ossowska, if values would be of the variable elements non-relativised to the variable instantiations of social subject, the object of analysis would not stepped out beyond the pale of assumptions. This is what was anticipated at the time of conceptualizing the research problem would be in other words, something already founded: the hypothesis would be recognized as assumption and the result at the same time. For this reason, descriptive study of morality do not agree to take as the basis Plato's noetic proposals – they can, at most, accept the concept of value as objective entities, but also mental [4]. The elements of presented thinking we can find, for example, in F. Znaniecki proposal [5]. Studies on the axiological consciousness were reduced to measuring the reception of values [6]. Applied, though not everywhere [7], were proposed by I. Kant distinction between the declared and realized values. Kantian distinctions were taken over by Denka K. and S. Ossowski. The latter used a different nomenclature: he described, respectively, about the values acclaimed and perceived (experienced) [8]. In the scope of consideration was not placed the natural bond between the values of internalisation and achievement, the material of axiological awareness - and the entity actualizing values and taking them as a basis for their own personality [9]. A clear omission had been made, resulting in the theoretical gap that must be filled. As Z. Mysłakowski mentioned long before the mechanisms governing the recognition of the values – that way followed H. Muszynski in his research H. went Muszynski research – he mentioned also psychological genesis of values and philosophical thinking [10], but the issue of axiological awareness remained constantly, at best, in passing. The highlighted gap between values and subject is contained in the Cartesian opposition between man and the subject [11]. The easiest way to express it is in a dichotomy I - the subject of the values as the elements of reality. The axiological qualities became elements of the world outside the subject, undeniably permeating to human activity: motivating and stimulating it with valuing effects of the actions, but perceived as the structures separate from human being. The solution to an emerging theoretical deadlock can be Marxist interpretation of social activism and rationality [12]. Subjectivity - regardless of the level at which it is being considered: degree of the generality on which it is taking place - means ontological and operational self-sufficiency of the being. The use of structuralist paradigms would eliminate the second
part of this definition and allow to say just about autotelic ontology - because the activity is a correlate (a derivative emanation) of the fact of being. It forces the activity: we learn about the existence of things on the basis of its manifestations, the thing that is the hallmark of at least the possibility of action. The very action means, in turn, to be oriented on oneself or the environment: to create, modify, process, etc. There are many forms of human activities that are certifying the existence. If the act of acting depends on the fact of being, ontological differences (Structure of being, its material) must imply a specific activity, such which is not found in objects of different levels. The things organized on a higher level manifest activity not available to subjects with less complex structure. At the same time the activity of these objects is not - to paraphrase one of the central thesis of structuralism - a simple synthesis of activity of simple things. The structure is constituted not only through items but also through the relationship - it seems that they just decide about specific properties of complex objects[13].

The concept of ethical subjectivity would refer – according to the idea presented in the previous paragraph - a typical human ability (competence) to act according to ethical sense: namely, those that belong to normative ethics. Clear classification of the action is a problematic issue, so it is better to agree that there appears inability to build a comprehensive and exhaustive catalogue of such acts. Note that the qualifications in question decides sooner situational context than ousia of activity. Subjectivity, which we ascribe ethical dimension must be understood not as a monolith - it is possible to make structural analysis and interpretation[14]. This assumption formed the foundations of T. Czezowski concept. The author mentions a rich tradition of F. Brentano's descriptive psychology, methodological requirements analytical conceptualizing of research problems – but clarifies the proposal formulated by him, in contrast to listed, by using the terminology of logic[15]. According to T. Czezowski, assessment of value is necessary and sufficient condition for their emotional experience. This approach contrasts with the psychological, the one which determines the assessment of survival [16]. Czezowski T. proposal deserves attention because of the value of organising the ethical: by determining the causal relationships between speculatively distinguished assessments and experiences - components of ethical principles of assessment of subject[17].

The rulings of other content - pointing to the inability of analytical ethical treatment of space - we meet on the basis of the concept ethical way of being J. Filka. Founds mentioned on the Assumption that reflection of the deed there is always within the immanence of the subject. It manifests itself in an empirically identifiable action, the reflection always takes place in and on the use of the name of a man named - non-anonymous man, and therefore most of the non-participant research of the instantiations[18]. Ethical reflection is therefore generally not available to the external cognition, or even impossible to be exhaustive verbalized by the entity himself. As such, it remains so on the edge of science episteme. It therefore appears that the sociology of morality, using the available conceptual apparatus and the research can not capture the essence of ethical manners - the same, which expresses the sense of ethics. The latter denotes namely, as a specifically human relationship with the world liabilities, relationship of responsibility[19]. Sociology of morality can only investigate reification in actions, and therefore available to inter-subjectivity, moral facts. These, if undesired valuation, comply with the scientific methodology[20]. To sum up the existing arrangements, ethical subjectivity would be perceived as an intra-psychic structure biased to act in an ethical sense. As such a structure, it would determine different structure - a category of human right activity. Its necessary conditions would express in the subjective awareness and voluntariness, and the differentia specifica - in the concept of liability, as bringing up-to-date the ethical form of interpersonal interaction.
Constitutive being so conceived subjectivity would consist of axiological awareness, that is - as S. Dziamski is prone to perceive it – non-substancial, Relationally relativized property to the historical facts of social practice [21]. It seems that the modern theories of education can not forget the topic of ethical subjectivity [22]. They must accept it as an axiom, directive, the criterion of fairness formulated ethical and teleological decisions [23]. According to the thoughts already made in the introduction, pupil is the first place the subject of ethics - his humanity lies in the capacity for action bringing up-to-date moral values. For this reason, subject should be taught to be an active and passive subject of ethics: the ethical action of bringing up-to-date the structure and be the object of this type of activity on the part of others. This in turn requires intropection of values [24], thus deepening the axiological awareness. Acquiring ethical performance is, according to, some authors explicit goal of education[25]. Other definitions – exposing modification of personality parameters, adjusting to socio-cultural conditions, etc. - they can be successfully reduce to the appropriate axiological qualities. Then the world beyond good and evil seems to be pedagogical nonsense.

The task of shaping in the pupil ethical attitudes, and earlier – the sense of subjectivity within the realization of values in post-modern era it takes on special significance. In the presented post-subjective reinterpretation identity: „(...) The identity of the entity - its indication, definition, interpret -not connected (in postmodernity - editor. M.K.) (...) with the discovery and descriptive empirical formulation of a truth (or, and the law and associated with this rule, or rule for determining the functional relationships, and even axiological preferences), which allows to define subjectivity in importance of intersubjective validity, but is realized in new perspective: the notion of opportunity or opportunities here-being as stage prop, or more precisely: similarly to the role of a stage prop”[26]. Man of liquid identity is faced in axiological pluralism: multiplicity and mutuality excluding of valuing options. What consumerism suggests, do not fit with the identity of modernism petrified by modern identity Christian's philosophy of life. Concise anthropology of scholars - entity of transparent, absolutized structure – is lost in the post-modern game of ephemeral faces, kaleidoscope incarnation which, although relative, casual, exercise emphasized by the existence necessary forms.

The identity woven of material of uncertain provenance roars between various philosophies of value, not finding any lasting support in any of them. The identity is put to the test, the worse when entangles the simplest choice in dialectical tension least two axiological preferences. The trouble with the choice appears like a mantra question without an answer. Alas, the resolution is realised in the realm of activity instead of the realm of reflection thereby becoming the realm of chance. The man not taking side of any of the fundamentalisms from those offered on the market of ideas is doomed to lack of reflection. It is not about the necessity to get involved to solve the problems of daily life the baggage of philosophical fundamentalism - there is no such need, life reflects that – it is about the possibility of bringing those fundamentalisms the justification of even the daily routines. Even if not fulfilled by majority, it remains a actual possibility, at the same time, a responsibility of consistency and self-aware entity. There is no doubt, however the relation between routine and fundamentalism is not evident, going deeper we are reaching the latter one. Values are the only constant that subject can find on its way. The ethical attitude of life becomes the most adequate: asking about the good is the first inner criterion of rationality. Axiological awareness is a necessity of a reasonable approach to the reality of life defined in such a way. Axiological awareness in itself - as a denial of unawareness – assumes the sense of ethical causation, subjectivity. It seems that only a man aware of his own axiology, convinced of the possibility of active participating in the world of obligations, negating post-modern inertia, submitting the creative change over indolence caused by
stagnation - should be a parenetic model of education. The concept of subjectivity meshes, as it seems, with considerations of the axiological matters. On the basis of classical philosophy the ethical subject is, simultaneously, obliged and equipped with the ability of the actualisation of axiological triad: alignment of most fundamental values, on which the main part of human history and the human world-view was built. The hegemony of classical philosophy – labelled with multiple arbitrary provenance: not only ethical, but also ontological, epistemological, religious, within the concept of common good – it underwent literal and metaphorical deconstruction in the twentieth century. It is not exclusively about character J. - F. Derrida – an intellectual who began the postmodern way thinking explicitly started the idea of defundamentalisation we would be willing to perceive in a much broader historical and social context. A deeper analysis of the works by Z. Bauman tells us to demythologises the role of philosophical manifestos and attribute the real causation of evens to trends of global society, cultural processes and the activity of individuals. Attempt at thinking of human actions as the result of intellectual capabilities of even the greatest minds of the era, that attempt dooms itself to falsehood.
Far more convincing vision is the concept of continuum of a multivariate change which would take part in socio-cultural formation of global society, the changes filtered through ethnic and religious relativism transposed in such a re-modified shape onto the ground of particular community.

Conclusion
We think that priority of importance and genetic originality should be admitted not only to new cultural patterns, liberal tendencies of groups that were discriminated against before, structural and functional transformation of family etc. - not so much as to the model of the subjectivity of individual which breaks away from the previous ones. It is specifically redefined man in statu nascendi – being constructed (not being constructed) from the very beginning, being constituted (not being constituted) within the new anthropology – was the basis of the majority of processes and phenomena labelled as cultural transformations.
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The author writes: „In the work on the role of values in social process ‘Rola wartości w procesie rozwoju społecznego (1979)’, professor Dziamski criticized those axiological beliefs which try to settle the problem of value in the context of human labor, particularly its ideal point, i.e. mentalistic point. He opposed the idea, according to which objective status of value is accepted, entitled only to human practice and in this sense to social reality, ie. cultural reality. So understood the value has a historical character, which is relativized to a variable practice way of existence” - and in the next part author writes – „(…) values exist neither in the world of things, nor in the world of practice objects. Their only reality - the area of the reference – creates special a subset of social subject. What constitutes for instance, the subject of the reference of court ruling nobility, justice, Or good understood in the sense of moral values is reduced to a system of relational properties, constituted directly by the existing structure of social practice. Values, in ontological sense, exist always as a social state of being, which are distinguished global properties of relational systems, which are defined qualitatively social subjects. Depending on the diversity of structures of social practice and from their historical processes of transformation, still remains the variation of world values and its historical volatility” (ibidem, pp. 14, 17).
[9] Activity towards values was attributed simultaneously to a human being. However they (values) were internalized by him from the socio-cultural environment and under the influence of the latter, the entity alone was recognized as autonomous. Levinas proves, however, that such thinking is not the only possible – he shows that a man can be described as a fully dependent of the Other. (B. Korzeniewski, Separacja nie jest samotnością. Levinasa koncepcja autonomii podmiotu, [in:] Meandry podmiotowości, P. Orlik (ed.), Poznań 2001, p. 311).
Within the phenomenological–hermeneutic thinking, ethical subjectivity is classified as an entity beyond the theoretical being, escaping from empirical approximations. Its extra-subjective intantations are therefore impossible. This view of issues of subjectivity seems to be convincing, however, it brings little to the diagnosis of the problem. In the book, we lean towards the analytical model of ethical subjectivity.
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