

Education for sustainable development in the perspectives of “Information society”

Mykola Lipin¹, Nataliia Husieva^{1*}, and Olena Krasilnikova¹

¹Kyiv National University of Trade and Economics, 19 Kyoto St., 02156 Kyiv, Ukraine

Abstract. Sustainable development aims at transforming existing way of development, which is gradually moving towards our planet’s ecosystem destruction and hypertrophied economic growth at the cost of other social life areas. In this paper, we prove that sustainable development of society implies changing methods of development themselves. The aim of this paper is to study possibilities and prospects for implementing principles of sustainable development in education sector, which essence is understood as developing ways of development and thinking themselves. To achieve this goal, dialectics is used as general theory of development, specifically its distinctive ability to differentiate qualitative, essential development from quantitative growth, quantitative transition within one essence. This paper proves that sustainable development is impossible without radical transformation of ways of activity, production, thinking and world perception. In this context, alternative potential, represented by “information society” models, is analyzed. Considering that desired model of sustainable development of society should not be only abstract ideal, it is proved that it might and should be embodied in daily practical activities today. Education as an area for intersubjective interaction where development of human subjectivity takes place has always been not only sector fulfilling existing society demands but also anticipating future society opportunities.

1 Introduction

Current situation of globalized world is characterized as ongoing, chaotic, uncertain and risky. This is a situation of various threats, risks, opportunities and prospects for humanity development. Uncertain present causes uncertainty of future, which calls for human action, activity and thinking to participate in its constitution. According to I. Wallerstein, modern world system is undergoing structural crisis and enters period of chaos, which is followed by systemic bifurcation and transition to a new structure, whose nature is currently not only unconditional but cannot be predetermined in general. It remains open to human intervention and creativity [1]. This openness simultaneously creates situation of danger, uncertainty of our future, and opportunities to change it for the benefit of all people on our planet.

* Corresponding author: n.gusieva@knute.edu.ua

The aim of this paper is to study possibilities and prospects for implementing principles of sustainable development in education sector, which essence is understood as developing ways of development and thinking themselves. In this perspective, development is understood as interruption of continuousness, as ability to become different keeping yourself, but not infinite improvement of one and the same at the expense of another [2, 3]. Theoretical basis for the research is such understanding of human existence when individual and social contradiction is overcome and personality is considered as personification of socio-historical development, ability to overcome limits of Self-existence is practically embodied. Based on the fact that human being is always something more than what is represented empirically, we should recognize involvement of utopia phenomenon of human existence and possibilities of social transformation [4, 5]. In fact, human being is not only what he or she is himself or herself, but also what he or she *might be*.

To carry out analysis of “information society” potential in implementing education for sustainable development, we rely on J.-P. Lyotard and M. Castells’ works, which reveal education and knowledge place in information and digital reality [6, 7]. Special attention is given to identifying prospects for knowledge informatization and exteriorization learning and cognition process from development of personality. In our paper we rely on theoretical understanding of education as area for human subjectivity development (Bildung) [8, 9, 10, 11], in other words such specific intersubjective interaction, which not only reproduces existing society demands, but also anticipates and becomes realization of alternative opportunities for human and society development, realization of “necessary utopia”. Justifying abilities to understand education for sustainable development as embodied utopia, the term-metaphor “heterotopia” introduced by M. Foucault is used [12].

2 Methods

The means to achieve aim of the study is dialectics as general theory of development. Using this method allows to analyze social and individual development integrity in its contradictions. Implementation of laws and principles of dialectics enables to define equivalence level and content of personal and socio-historical development, logic of transition from abstract to concrete not only as theoretical but also as sensitive-practical transformation of abstract-general socio-cultural content into concrete-universal pragmatist personality’s abilities, as well as preconditions for transition from quantitative growth to qualitative development.

3 Results and discussion

Modern society’s unsustainable growth transferring to implementation of strategies for sustainable development of humanity involves problematization of its traditional basement and emergence of *qualitatively* new type of society. Quite often concepts of “knowledge society” or “information society” claim for the status of new paradigm of social development [13]. Moreover, these particular concepts are connected with prospects for transition to sustainable development. From some scholars’ point of view results of using “international experience confirm that digital technologies have become a driving force of socio-economic development, economic recovery of many countries and determine the basis for sustainable development in future” [14]. In the Law of Ukraine “On Basic Principles of Information Society Development in Ukraine for 2007-2015” the main task of information society development in Ukraine is to help everyone on the basis of widespread use of modern ICT opportunities to create information and knowledge, use and share them, produce goods and provide services, fully realizing their potential, improving their lives’

quality and *contributing to sustainable development of the country* [15]. In the Declaration of Principles “Building information society – global challenge in the new millennium” [16], information society is understood as precondition for people’s interests realization and sustainable development of society.

Based on above mentioned, “education for sustainable development” acquires characteristics of education designed to satisfy information society’s demands. However, based on a large number of scientific papers, it can be argued that “information society” (“knowledge society”) can hardly be defined as qualitatively *new paradigm of humanity development*. Basically, it continues to be determined by capitalist principles of existence. Obvious constant acceleration of current socio-political, cultural and economic transformations is a logical continuation of capitalism expansion that has been started during art nouveau period. Growing curve of acceleration of socio-economic growth and technological development is nowadays acquiring catastrophic, abnormal nature [17], although it expresses traditional (market) mode of society existence, which is aimed at economic growth. Thus, we can assume that “knowledge economy” or “information society” are results of using market methods of management. “Today’s global economy is the result of using and spreading capitalist ways of activity: increased use of market mechanisms, private rather than public production, making a profit as the main reason for functioning organizations, use of hired labour and commercialization of all services. Thus, “global network society” in which we find ourselves today is a more complete embodiment or, in other words, a transmutation of the long-known principles of capitalism. Thereby, “global network society” in which we currently find ourselves is fuller adoption or, in other words, transmutation of long-known capitalist principles” (That is, today’s global economy represents the spread and growth of capitalist ways of behaviour – witness the increased use of market mechanisms, of private rather than public provision, of profitability as the *raison d’être* of organizations, of wage labour, and of the ability-to-pay principle as the determinant of goods-and-services supply. In short, the «global network society» in which we find ourselves today expresses the continuation – transmutation if one prefers – of long-held capitalist principles) [18]. Therefore, reasons for increasing current socio-economic, political or cultural processes must be sought in the principles of market capitalism functioning. Eventually, we can agree with compromise conclusion of M. Castells that modern society is both capitalist and information [6].

And if the main principle of “information society” continues to be economic growth, then this should be directly reflected in education and knowledge. In this regard, we can refer to J.-P. Lyotard’s paper “The Postmodern Condition” in which he highlights consequences of information and communication technologies prevailing for culture, education and cognition. According to J.-P. Lyotard, knowledge takes the form of goods and information in order to be freely spread through information channels and be sold. Knowledge in the form of information – is ready-made knowledge, suitable for use without questions regarding subject of cognition, the knower. Estimating criterion for such knowledge is its effectiveness, not truth. In these conditions, the main task of education is formation of professional, competitive in the labour market specialist. Issues on personality development, development of the whole human individuality in these conditions, is declared obsolete, redundant, and ineffective. “We may thus expect a thorough exteriorization of knowledge with respect to the “knower”, at whatever point he or she may occupy in the knowledge process. The old principle that the acquisition of knowledge is in dissociable from the training (*Bildung*) of minds, or even of individuals, is becoming obsolete and will become ever more so” [7], – wrote J.-P. Lyotard. So, as we might see, prevailing form of knowledge in “information society” can function successfully without personality and does not require education aimed at its development.

Before that time T. Adorno defined learning process, which is intentionally limited by providing only restricted professional knowledge and competencies, as “half-education” (German “Halbbildung”). T. Adorno believed that “half-education” is the climate for survival of reification commodity contents of education, which occurs due to their true content and living attitude to living subjects [10]. Thus, reducing education to the environment of forwarding ready, useful knowledge (information) opposes it to culture as space for cultivating common humanity nature, which becomes confident in rough contradiction between identity and difference, individual and social, local and universal. According to T. Adorno, real education (Bildung) is nothing but culture in terms of its subjective manifestation [10]. If we assume that education without culture is like a body without a soul, then in the world subordinated to imperative of competition and infinite profits growth, there is a spread of education that does not need soul, put it another way, soulless education.

Since “information society” is presented like hypertrophied spread of economized civilization’s imperatives, we can assume that corresponding education will continue to reproduce basic principles and criteria of traditional education. Main differences between education for sustainable development and traditional education are presented in (Table 1).

Table 1. Differences between education for sustainable development and traditional education.

Criteria	Education for sustainable development	Education of “information society” / traditional education
Essence	Social wellbeing	Market service
Function	Education as life	Education as training for economic activity
Aim	Development of the whole human subjectivity	Formation of a professional specialist
Method of implementation	Human adaptation to the world	Human adaptation to current requirements of environment
Thinking	Rational thinking	Instrumental thinking
Goal-setting	Creating strategic goals	Choice of effective means
Knowledge	Culture of “ignorance”	Ready to use “useful” knowledge / information
Time	Involvement in the past, present and future	Involvement in the “tyranny of the moment”
Area	Heterotopia	Dystopia
Creativity	Imagination	Arbitrary fantasy
Worldview	Looking at the world through human race’s eyes	Looking at the world through personal interest

Education refusal to form personality and its focus on formation of professional knowledge and competencies seem to permit leaving in the past practice of using training and education as means of developing “useful person” according to the scale defined before. Hence, we might make an assumption that education is only teaching of ready and useful knowledge, and personality development does not seem to fall within its jurisdiction. On the contrary, education always deals with all ways of personality manifestation, and not only with his or her professional competencies. For example, displacement of human personality beyond the bounds of education also leaves behind the task of educating citizens, issues of ethical and aesthetic education, as well as all issues related to human responsibility. Not willing to be an area for representation and self-expression of universal principles of human existence, education becomes a *model* of absence of common human image, it practically becomes *imageless*. Reduction of education exclusively to profit-oriented economic process is gradually displacing not only necessity of human being

presence, but also thoughtful, general cultural meanings of educational material. As a result, ability for effective adaptation to empty intersubjective interaction is quietly becoming the main goal and content of pedagogical activity [19].

Sustainable development of society is impossible without appropriate human development. It is carried out through personality and continues in him or her, affecting all his or her integrity. Therefore, sustainable development is related to classical tradition of education, which in ancient Greece was defined as *παιδεία*, and during the Enlightenment period took the form of *Bildung*. If sustainable development is aimed at creating conditions to realize all people's well-being, then education for sustainable development should be aimed at identifying all sides of human existence, not just those manifestations that are currently in demand in labour market [11, 20]. Thus, there is a demand to rethink education purpose: either it is just a market service, or something more – society wellbeing.

Discourse of education for sustainable development unfolds in the context of simple alternative: either humanity learns to use knowledge and abilities to be careful with the planet, or ecosystem destruction will lead to human race destruction [21]. In this perspective issue of sustainable development becomes radical, which requires reflexive understanding and transformation of principles of tools to develop globalized world itself. Therefore, sustainable development cannot be achieved by improving or modernizing existing development strategies of our world. *Development is demanded by the way of development of modern society itself*. If sustainable development involves integrating demands of economic, social and environmental problems, it is obvious that current trends of socio-economic or technological growth, which encourage hypertrophied economic growth at the expense of all other areas of social life are incompatible with *the concept of sustainable development*. The fact is that the type of development based on market economy does not imply achievement of declared goals of this concept, because sustainable development is not just development that will not harm the environment, it includes both improving living conditions of people on the planet and improving ecosystems condition [22].

According to widespread definition of sustainable development, it is determined as the way of satisfying current people's demands, which gives possibility for future generations to satisfy their needs [23]. Implementation of sustainable development of society on the basis of market economy is problematic due to the fact that modern consumer capitalism operates through *a loan from the future*. Principle of constant acceleration and growth is the basis of modern society and market economy, which use future like *"fuel"*. Y. Harari points out that credit enables us to build the present at the expense of the future. "It's founded on the assumption that our future resources are sure to be far more abundant than our present resources. A host of new and wonderful opportunities open up if we can build things in the present using future income" [24]. In these conditions, economic growth becomes irrational, because today we consume things on credit that we have yet to make. Due to the mechanism of "loan from the future" consumption of things seems to be ahead of their production [25]. Therefore, the future with its resources and capabilities has already been disposed today.

It means that in order to preserve the future for future generations, it is necessary to change the way of development radically, to move from extensive to intensive development. Without this transition, the accelerated growth of civilization logically becomes catastrophic. In turn, sustainable development of society is impossible without corresponding development of human subjectivity. Important criterion for society development should be development of all its members. Economic and technological development make sense in case they create preconditions for personal development. In our opinion, beyond personification of social development in human thinking and behaviour, it acquires an abstract-no-one's form, which means that it becomes such an

external force that opposes separate individual. In this case, criterion for real development of society should be considered its compliance with the objective logic of human development [26]. In other words, sustainable development of society, in contrast to the existing trends of growth of “financial civilization” (V.V. Ilyin) or “information society” must acquire human nature. This means that society development must happen within the horizons of ideals of human existence.

It is known that human being is determined by cultural and historical development of humanity, which adopts laws of nature (world) development for its own development in an ideal form. Development of human history, in one way or another, represents universal laws of world development. Development reaches its own purity and universality in thinking, which in V.S. Wozniak view, becomes development of development itself. “Formation of human subjectivity in ontogenesis (that is, in educational process) – becomes both embodiment (implementation) of entire development of social and human culture, and at the same time – continuation of this development, developing development of world substance in unique-individual (that is – indivisible) form. Each human subjectivity is not just a unique universe, but – unqualified (individualized) Universe (both universe of social and human culture, and the whole existence integrity)” [2]. Thus, thinking is an area of self-directed pure development, which means development that problematizes its own principles.

It should be noted that the term “sustainable development” refers us to problem-thinking. The fact is that meaning of the word “sustainable” in accordance with laws of formal logic contradicts meaning of the word “development”. Using the word “sustainable” means something unchanging, inviolable, self-identical. Conversely, using the word “development” means something ongoing, changeable, non-self-identical. Therefore, real sustainable development might be possible in case *stability of change and development* has been identified itself [3], which is carried out in thinking and through thinking. Holistic society development becomes possible when society develops itself to the thinking way of its implementation, to the development of development itself, where it reveals its uniqueness and universality, where concept development becomes the idea and principle of everyday life [2].

Any development contains contradiction. Consequently, it is not possible to consider it only like progress, because development is constant solution and contradiction between *progress* and *regress*. Any realized opportunity opens new trends, new perspectives, but at the same time it destroys other perspectives and trends. The same applies to the sustainable development of society, which cannot be oriented only on the future or be focused solely on progress in order to remain really sustainable. Narratives of the future, progress in this case show their fundamental insufficiency. It should be noted that unidirectionality, linearity and progressivism are inherent in the progress of civilization, which is carried out on the basis of traditional unsustainable growth. Real sustainable development of society – is not so much creation of something new, but continuation and extension of world culture and existence in human behaviour, thinking, experience. In this context, development is “movement from objective to subjective and into subjective, by means of movement of objective into subjective. From existence to us and into us, through us and by us” [2].

This understanding of development in its relation to thinking allows us to interpret it like continuation of world potential by means of culture. This understanding is inherent in the whole classical philosophical tradition, which defined thinking not as a subjective psychological ability, but as an objective socio-historical process. In objective thinking, person expresses, speaks not about himself or herself, but about the world. Through thinking, in thinking, meanings of the world are manifested and acquire completeness. Carried out in this way, thinking becomes not only effective means of achieving certain goals, but a way of cultural goal-setting. That is, such goal setting that takes into account

holistic context, other people's and even other generations' views and opinions. In this perspective, thinking is *the ability to look at the world through other people's eyes, through human race's eyes*. Therefore, the crisis of rational thinking, which increased in the XX century, became also crisis of goal-setting social development, alternative strategies for its implementation. In the middle of the last century, M. Gorkheimer described this situation as follows: "Since ancient times, the mind has been defined as listening and absorbing eternal ideas that should serve humanity's purposes. Today, mind's task and even its essence lies in searching the ways corresponding to already established goals" [27].

Thinking that is limited to finding effective means is *instrumental thinking*. Society development determined by uncontrolled economic growth cultivates instrumental form of thinking and corresponding type of education. Therefore, we believe that transition to sustainable development involves change in thinking and education. Among the goals in area of sustainable development, education is defined as key element in overcoming poverty, improving people's socio-economic living conditions and contributing to the formation of more tolerant society [28]. However, in our opinion, if "education actualization" [29] so much talked about today, will be carried out on the basis of preserving traditional methods of teaching, education and organization of educational area, it will not reply interests of sustainable development of society, but interests based on "instrumental mind" of improvement existing ways of unlimited human domination over nature.

Importance of education for sustainable development of society is emphasized in many UN documents dedicated to issues of ensuring a decent future for all inhabitants of the planet. In this context, we highlight necessity to rethink education place and possibilities of its potential realization to ensure general well-being [29]. Accordingly, education is considered to be a necessary element in constituting the way to sustainable development of society (there is a generally accepted abbreviation ESD – education for sustainable development). Such attention to education is due to the fact that sustainable development cannot be ensured solely through political, economic or technical tools and means. Achieving sustainable development of society is impossible without transformation of ways of thinking and perception of the world, so education which is enable to integrate problems of society, economy and nature, might help transform norms and goals of sustainable development into effective principle of daily activities [30].

In our opinion, formation of education for sustainable development cannot be realized by simply supplementing existing educational system with additional courses that will contribute, for example, to its environmentalization. Changing human attitude to the environment cannot be done only by informing public about negative effects of production and consumption on planet's ecosystem. Transformation of worldview and behavior requires corresponding transformation of thinking. Ethical, responsible attitude to the world does not take place beyond appropriate transformation of ways of thinking, but, on the contrary, presupposes it. A. Schweizer, a famous scholar, Nobel Peace Prize winner, author of the concept "reverence for life" insisted on this idea. In his view, forming ethic of responsibility involves going beyond worldviews, which are limited to human-to-human relations. Principles of ethics "reverence for life" formulated by him [31] take into account human's attitude to the whole world. Therefore, ethical position is considered position that takes responsibility not only for people's lives, but also for life in our world in general. Scientist believed that only in this way human being is able to comprehend himself or herself and understand his or her attitude to the world.

It should be emphasized that according to A. Schweizer, ethical or ecological attitude to the world does not require abandonment of thinking and rational consciousness, and their fundamental transformation [32]. Traditional, anthropocentric, based on Cartesian philosophy worldview puts aside the will to live and puts a focus on abstractions of cogito.

Instead, really meaningful principle from which human being can derive personal attitude to himself or herself and universe is awareness of Self-belonging to life: *I am a life that wants to live, among lives that want to live* [32]. Life aims at affirming itself at the expense of another life, and only human is a being who is able to be in solidarity with all living things. It is important that he or she is capable of this only as a *thinking being*. A. Schweitzer wrote – “Only in the thinking man has the will to live become conscious of other wills to live and desirous of solidarity with them” [32]. Thinking will to life combines ethics and self-affirmation, while unthinking, thoughtless life affirmation becomes a threat to oneself and others. Awareness of solidarity with all living things can be the result of appropriate training and education, but it is not given to us as a natural guide. In order for “reverence for life” to become one day a general principle of our daily existence, it is necessary to practically implement its imperatives today. We might agree with A. Rudd, who believes that if we want reverence to become part of human life in our society again, then the best place for its implementation is the school [33].

We might say the same about basic principles of sustainable development of society: even if we cannot change the economy and politics today, if we cannot quickly turn our societies into space of tolerant attitude to each other and to nature, we can still start from education, from change of thinking and consciousness already today. From our point of view, at the moment, the goals of sustainable development offer more guidelines to make existing world fairer and safer than the real goals and ways of its fundamental transformation. Based on them, we might start researching alternatives to existing socio-economic system, which in the “world without alternatives” (TINA, acronym for the phrase There Is No Alternative [9]) is not little. According to Z. Bauman and L. Donskis, current socio-economic system “offers single reality and considers crazy – or, at least, eccentric – anyone who believes that there is an alternative for everything, including even the best management models and the smartest ideas (not to mention business or technical projects)” [34].

In the “world without alternatives” attitude to education acquires substrate nature [8], it is perceived as a resource, material or substance with which you can create “useful person” in accordance with predetermined scale. In this case, human development begins to be determined by prevailing principles of existing society, and education is strictly determined by its needs and interests. In a non-alternative world, education cannot anticipate future world’s structure. On the contrary, it becomes a tool for producing labour and legitimizing existing socio-political regime of existence.

Thus, education as a substrate has finite nature and is perceived as a means. This type of education is cultivated in conditions of economization of all public life areas, which leads to the dominance in educational and scientific areas of management principles, types of rationality and norms of market economy. This situation Lewis R. Gordon called market colonization of academia and knowledge: “The hegemony of those practices, which also assert themselves as the bases of intellectual and professional legitimacy, is a form of colonizing rationality. Since it has an impact on how academics behave and aims to determine what and how academics think and what they produce, I call it the market colonization of the academy. Its correlate is the market colonization of knowledge.” [35].

In our opinion, alternative strategies for society development encourage deployment of education system, especially higher education, as an area for development of *human subjectivity*. For being able to train personality for the future, education must already today incorporate this future into the daily practice of teaching and education. In such conditions, ideas and principles of sustainable development can be manifested in interpersonal relationships, in the lives of members of educational community. To do this, education must stop trying to adapt personality to existing dominant principles of social system. In order to train human being not only for professional activity but also for life, education

itself must become an area which enables integral personality to live a full-fledged life with all his or her intellectual, volitional and sensory manifestations.

In the conditions of accelerated world transformation, narrow adaptation is not effective. Knowledge and skills adapted to certain conditions lose their value with emergence of qualitatively new environmental conditions and demands. According to *Bildung* principles, education is realized as an embodied utopia, as an area where different places coexist practically and virtually. M. Foucault defined an area of embodied utopia as *heterotopia* [12]. In turn, education subordination market economy principles define it as an environment of *dystopia* (anti-utopia) [9, 36] which is claimed as an apology for existing.

Idea of heterotopia constructiveness for education development for sustainable development has been simultaneously “the greatest reserve of imagination” [12] and embodied utopia, “place without a place” [12]. If we take education not only in its spatial dimensions, but also as a historical process, as a practice of reproducing human race’s cultural and historical memory, then educational heterotopia becomes a place where existence of other times and places takes place. Education as heterotopia is social area for human being not to be involved only in a particular local environment, and to realize himself or herself not as a partial, one-sided individual, but on the contrary, be involved in the whole world development. That is, he or she realizes his or her own needs, bringing himself or herself in line with other people, generations and the world in general. In this case, human acts as a personification of historical development of society into his or her personal development. Of course, such “educational place” is spatially defined and localized, but at the same time, it forms a network of intersubjective connections that takes it beyond the defined place. Through real education, something bigger than what is recorded in the curricula and programs, shines and speaks. Based on above mentioned, education is “*place without a place*”, a realized utopia.

Freedom, thinking, creativity and productive imagination are not just possible, but become standard for educational area, provided it even partially stands off regulatory determinations of social hierarchies, environments, statuses and roles. Corresponding disengagement from education (especially university) or based on rational thinking autonomy, give opportunity to produce alternative strategies for society development, reflexive criticisms of existing socio-economic and political regimes. “This development of new, alternative perspectives defines utopia’s most basic function. May we not say then that imagination itself-through its utopian function-has a constitutive role in helping us rethink the nature of our social life? Is not utopia – this leap outside – the way in which we radically rethink what is family, what is consumption, what is authority, what is religion, and so on? Does not the fantasy of an alternative society and its exteriorization “nowhere” work as one of the most formidable contestations of what is?” [5].

Thus, education is an area where we acquire ability to contemplate all other places, spaces and other times. Education – is development of ability to look at the world through other people’s eyes, through human race’s eyes. Such sublimity over “here and now”, education unusualness make it fundamentally metaphysical. It is “necessary utopia” [37], which reveals perspectives of alternative ways for sustainable development of society. This “place-which-doesn’t-exist”, this “placelessness” open opportunities to contemplate spaces in which we exist as something unnatural, unsustainable, amazing, and therefore something that is result of spontaneous and creative work.

Opportunity to be simultaneously at different places is realized by such human ability as imagination. Therefore, education for sustainable development must return productive imagination to that place in the process of learning and education, which it naturally occupies among human abilities. Imagination allows human being to resist unalterable pressure of *environment* and realize ability to transcend into the *world*. Imagination allows you to be not only in different places, but also in different eras.

Such “rootlessness” ensures unity of both universal history and personal biography. That is why role of critical imagination power hidden in utopia is important for sustainable development. From W. Davis’s point of view, it is very essential today to demonstrate that utopias can be implemented both in future projects and in modern realities. “In that sense, it isn’t only the fictional expectations of orthodox financial instruments – credit, business model, discounted cash flow – that can render the imaginary real, but other paths between imagination and practice are possible. It also suggests that moral commitments to the future and to future generations can be acted upon in ways that are not only channeled via risk and credit” [38].

Since sustainable development of society goals intend to real world transformation, they must necessarily be based on utopia as the basis of political imagination. The critical impulse contained in utopia allows us to diagnose symptoms of our time disease. In order to transfer these impulses energy into action, it is not enough to expect favourable circumstances in the future, they must be implemented in educational practices today, to turn abstract utopias into embodied heterotopias. Education for sustainable development cannot seek to preserve existing system of social relations. Rejecting utopia, it automatically becomes sign of dystopia emergence. In the situation of uncertain and complex world, education becomes an area of being at the boundaries of different cultures, traditions, epochs and identities.

Belonging to this plural world enables reflexive attitude to personal identity, social role, culture, customs or ideology. Since certainty and completeness of dystopia marginalizes productive imagination, energy of utopia is decisive for the formation of political life entity. We disagree with G. Arendt’s point of view, who insisted on necessity to separate education area from public area, and believe that education (especially higher education) should create conditions for constitution of political entity. After all, according to J. Ransier, political entity’s place is “a gap: existence-together as existence-between: between names, identities or cultures” [39]. Thus, human’s ability to take care about welfare of future generations requires formed ability to look at the world through other people’s eyes, ability not to be identical with his or her (even successful and comfortable) social position, his or her place in social hierarchy. This ability to be simultaneously in different places, to be involved in different spaces without belonging to any of them, is provided by productive imagination work inseparable from thinking.

Thinking development as a *real sphere of pure development* makes education for sustainable development a practice existing *on the border*, because idea never occupies a certain place, its existence – is embodied intersubjectivity, dialogue. Its existence area is constant development.

Due to this metaphysicality, it becomes embodiment of universal on the side of special. Invisible meanings of human coexistence dissipate along with cessation of thinking. Essence of thinking, as well as development, is to be a place that does not exist, to avoid traps of sustainable reproduction of one and the same thing. Variability gives it constancy, which relates it to heterotopias. “As long as I think, I’m not where I really am. I am surrounded not by sensory objects, but by images that are invisible to everyone else. It seems as if I had brought them into some utopia, unknown land I wouldn’t know anything about if I did not have this ability to remember and imagine. Thinking destroys both temporal and spatial distances. I can predict the future, think about it as if it already exists, and I can revive a memory of past, as if it did not disappear” [1]. To sum up, as long as education is able to support development of thinking, it preserves potential to become education for sustainable development, to become a model of community that provides its own sustainability and duration through creative problematization of principles of its own existence.

4 Conclusions

Implementation of principles of sustainable development requires radical change in the ways of modern society activity and thinking in general and education in particular. Transformation of existing method of development, which is carried out on the basis of uncontrolled economic growth and occurs at the expense of other areas of social life, requires serious discussion of alternative to capitalism strategies of civilizational progress. Sustainable development of society is possible only in case methods of development are being developed. Society development acquires sustainable nature if it continues, personifies into personality development. Human being continues this development, gives it duration and sustainability. Human, like society as a whole, is able to remain individuality, save sustainability only in case of his or her qualitative development, but not just expanding existing condition. Based on the essential (but so far, unfortunately, not real) definition of education as an area for development of human subjectivity, it becomes an area of permanent development, creative problematization of principles of personal and socio-historical development. Education as interaction of individuals, as a meeting place of different cultures and generations forms autonomous community able to become alternative to existing society model of interpersonal coexistence. In this case, it becomes “necessary utopia” that is practically embodied, that is heterotopia. Education for sustainable development should not just improve existing social and pedagogical practices, but become an area for their fundamental transformation, an area for creative thinking. Only in this case it will not be an apology for “world without alternatives”, adaptation of live child’s soul to requirements of current existence, which opposes utopia and thus only increases embodied in ecological crisis dystopia.

References

1. I. Wallerstein, *International Sociology*, **15** (2000)
2. V.S. Wozniak, *World of Great Altai*, **2** (2016)
3. H.V. Lobastov, *Dyalektyka razumnoi formu i fenomenolohyia bezumyia* (The Dialectics of reasonable form and the phenomenology of madness). (Russkaia panorama, Moscow, 2012)
4. H. Arendt, *Zhyzn uma* (The Life of the Mind). (Nauka, St.Petersburg, 2013)
5. P. Ricoeur, *Lectures on ideology and utopia* (Columbia University Press, New York, 1986)
6. M. Castells, *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*. (GU-VshE, Moskow, 2000)
7. J.-F. Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (University Of Minnesota Press, 1984)
8. M. Lipin, *Osvita v modyfikatsiiakh suchasnoho svitu* (Education in the modifications of the modern world). (KNUTE, Kyiv, 2018)
9. L. Donskis, I. Sabelis, F. Kamsteeg, H. Wels (ed.), *Academia in crisis: The rise and risk of neoliberal education in Europe* (Brill-Rodopi, Leiden, Boston, 2019)
10. T.W. Adorno, in *Soziologie und moderne Gesellschaft: Verhandlungen des 14. Deutschen Soziologentages vom 20. bis 24. Mai 1959 in Berlin*, ed. by A. Busch, *Theorie der Halbbildung*, pp. 169-191 (Ferdinand Enke, Stuttgart, 1959)
11. J. Rowson, *CUSP essay series on the Morality of Sustainable Prosperity*, **9** (2019)
12. M. Foucault, T. Miskowicz, *Of Other Spaces*. *Diacritics*, **16**, 2 (1986)
13. L.V. Lopa, V.A. Kozurev, *Globalni ta natsionalni problemy ekonomiky*, **17** (2017)
14. N. Lytvyn, *Visnyk Natsionalnoho universytetu «Lvivska politechnik»*, Serie: *Yurydychni nauky: zbirnyk naukovykh prats*, **876** (2017)

15. Legislation of Ukraine (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2007), <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/537-16#Text>. Accessed 27 March 2021
16. Legislation of Ukraine (Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, 2003), https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/995_c57#Text. Accessed 27 March 2021
17. A. Toffler, *Shok budushcheho (Future Shock)*. (AST, Moskow, 2004)
18. F. Webster, *Theories of the information society*, 4th edn. (Routledge, London, 2014)
19. P. Sloterdijk, *You Must Change Your Life: On Anthropotechnics* (Polity Press, Malden, Cambridge, 2013)
20. L.R. Andersen, *Bildung: Keep Growing*. Report to the Club of Rome (Nordic Bildung, 2020)
21. E.U. Von Weizsacker, C. Hargroves, M.H. Smith, C. Desha & P. Stasinopoulos, *Factor five: Transforming the global economy through 80% improvements in resource productivity* (Earthscan, London & Stirling, VA, 2009)
22. P. Kuenkel, *Stewarding Sustainability Transformations. An Emerging Theory and Practice of SDG Implementation* (Springer, Brandenburg, 2019)
23. S.A. Evteev, R.A. Perelet (ed.) *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development – Our Common Future*. (Progress, Moskow, 1989)
24. Y.N. Harari, *Sapiens: a brief history of humankind* (Harper, New York, 2014)
25. J. Baudrillard, *The System of Objects* (Verso, London, New York, 1996)
26. H.V. Lobastov (ed.), *Evald Vasylevych Ylenkov v vospomynaniakh (Evald Vasilievich Ilyenkov in his memoirs)*. (RHHU, Moskow, 2004)
27. M. Horkheimer, *Krytyka instrumentalnoro rozumu (The Critique of Instrumental Reason)*. (PPC-2002, Kyiv, 2006)
28. *Quality Education: Why it matters* (2017), https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/4_Why-It-Matters-2020.pdf. Accessed 27 March 2021
29. *Rethinking Education. Towards a global common good?* (UNESCO, France, 2015), <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002325/232555e.pdf>. Accessed 27 March 2021
30. UNESCO World Conference on Education for Sustainable Development, 10-12 November 2014, Aichi-Nagoya, Japan: draft programme. (UNESCO, Japan, 2014), <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco-world-conference-on-esd-2014/>. Accessed 27 March 2021
31. A. Schweitzer, *Blahohovenye pered zhyzni (Ehrfurcht vor dem Leben)*. (Progress, Moskow, 1992)
32. A. Schweitzer, *Out of My Life and Thought: An Autobiography* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, London, 1998)
33. A. Rud, *Albert Schweitzer's Legacy for Education: Reverence for Life* (Springer, New York, 2011)
34. Z. Bauman, L. Donskis, *Liquid Evil: Living With TINA* (Polity Press, 2016)
35. R.L. Gordon, *The Market Colonization of Intellectuals* (2010), <https://truthout.org/articles/the-market-colonization-of-intellectuals/>. Accessed 27 March 2021
36. M. Geppert, G. Hollinshead, *Signs of dystopia and demoralization in global academia: Reflections on the precarious and destructive effects of the colonization of the Lebenswelt*. *J. Critical perspectives on international business* (2017). doi: 10.1108/cpoib-07-2016-0026
37. J. Delors (ed.), *Learning: the treasure within: report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century* (Unesco Pub., Paris, 1996)
38. W. Davies, *CUSP Working Paper Series*, **5** (2017)
39. J. Ranciere, *On the edge of the political*. (Praxis, Moskow, 2006)