

## La esencia del conocimiento. El problema de la relación sujeto-objeto y sus implicaciones en la teoría educativa

*The essence of knowledge. The problem of the subject-object relationship and its implications for educational theory*

*A essência do conhecimento. O problema da relação sujeito-objeto e suas implicações para a teoria educacional*

**José Nava Bedolla**

Instituto Superior de Ciencias de la Educación del Estado de México, México

[nava5812@yahoo.com.mx](mailto:nava5812@yahoo.com.mx)

### **Resumen**

La dificultad, inconveniente o contrariedad sobre la *relación sujeto-objeto de conocimiento* es un problema epistemológico que puede tener más de una solución.

Dicho inconveniente se puede remediar o enmendar —con conocimiento o desconocimiento del hecho— utilizando distintos *supuestos filosóficos* (objetivismo, subjetivismo o dialéctica).

Dichos supuestos, estimaciones o conjeturas epistemológicas dependen —a su vez— de la *facultad o facultades* (la razón y/o los sentidos) que el sujeto cognoscente ponga en práctica cuando pretenda conocer determinado fenómeno.

La facultad o facultades (razón y/o sentidos) que el sujeto ponga en juego, cuando pretenda problematizar un objeto de estudio, dependerá o dependerán, a su vez, de los *intereses ontológicos* del investigador.

Dichos intereses, haberes o beneficios se refieren —en el ámbito ontológico, existente o real— a pretender *determinar* a los demás (objetivismo), indeterminarlos (subjetivismo) o a

negociaciones entre el determinismo y el indeterminismo (dialéctica) de los otros y de nosotros mismos.

En el ámbito *educativo*, es posible observar —derivado de lo expresado en los párrafos anteriores— que las exploraciones, descripciones, explicaciones, interpretaciones o comprensiones de los fenómenos, hechos o acontecimientos pedagógicos están determinados por los intereses ontológicos, existentes o reales de los sujetos que los elaboran.

Como consecuencia de este hecho, las *teorías de la educación* (conductista, psicoanalítica, humanista, cognitivista, psicogenética, sociocultural, etc.) promuevan discursos diferentes y contradictorios sobre los fenómenos, hechos, acontecimientos o sucesos educativos.

En ese sentido, es posible apreciar que a ello obedece la complejidad del fenómeno educativo y que debido a esto se trata de una cuestión política porque obedece a intereses diferentes y contradictorios.

**Palabras clave:** objetivismo, subjetivismo, dialéctica, teoría, educación.

### **Abstract**

Difficulty, inconvenience or disappointment on the relation subject/object of knowledge is an epistemological problem that may have more than one solution.

This drawback can remedy or amended - with knowledge or ignorance of the fact - using different philosophical assumptions (Objectivism and subjectivism and dialectic).

These assumptions, estimates or epistemological assumptions depend - in turn - of the faculty or faculties (reason or senses) which the Knower subject put into practice when it intends to meet certain phenomenon.

The faculty or faculties (reason or senses) that the subject put in game, when he intends to discuss an object of study, will depend on or it depends, in turn, of the ontological interests of the researcher.

These interests, assets or benefits concerning - in the field of ontological, existing or real - pretend to determine others (Objectivism), indeterminarlos (subjectivism) or negotiations between determinism and indeterminism (dialectic) of each other and we same.

In the field of education, it is possible to observe - derived as set forth in the preceding paragraphs - explorations, descriptions, explanations, interpretations or understandings of phenomena, events or educational events are determined by real, ontological or existing interests of subjects who develop them.

As a result of this fact, the theories of education (behavioral, psychoanalytic, humanist, cognitivist, notice, socio-cultural, etc.) to promote different and contradictory about the phenomena, made speeches, events or events education.

In this sense, you can see that this obeys the complexity of the educational phenomenon and that because this is a political issue because it reflects different and contradictory interests.

**Key words:** Objectivism, Subjectivism, dialectic, theory, education.

## Resumo

A dificuldade, inconveniência ou aborrecimento sobre a relação sujeito-objeto é um problema epistemológico conhecimento que pode ter mais de uma solução.

Este inconveniente pode ser remediado ou alterar, com conhecida ou desconhecida usando diferentes hipóteses de fato-filosófica (objetivismo, subjetivismo ou dialectic).

Essas suposições, estimativas ou pressupostos epistemológicos dependem, por sua vez, faculdade ou faculdades (a razão e / ou sentidos) que o conhecedor implementar se pretende atender determinado fenômeno.

Faculdade ou faculdades (direito e / ou sentidos) que o sujeito colocar em jogo, se ele pretende problematizar um objeto de estudo, ou dependem dependem, por sua vez, dos interesses ontológicas do pesquisador.

Esses interesses, bens ou benefícios relacionam -no nível ontológico, existente ou real fingir determinar outros (objectivism), indeterminarlos (subjetivismo) ou negociações entre determinismo e indeterminismo (dialética) de outros e de nós mesmos .

Na educação, podemos ver derivada de dos anteriores expressas nos parágrafos varreduras, descrições, explicações, interpretações ou entendimentos dos fenômenos, fatos ou eventos educacionais são determinadas pelos interesses ontológicos existentes ou reais de assuntos que elaborado.

Como resultado deste facto, as teorias da educação (behaviorista, psicanalítica, humanista, cognitiva, psicogenética, sócio-cultural, etc.) promover discursos diferentes e contraditórias sobre os fenômenos, fatos, acontecimentos e eventos educacionais.

Nesse sentido, pode-se ver que isso reflete a complexidade do fenómeno educativo e porque esta é uma questão política porque obedece interesses diferentes e contraditórias.

**Palavras-chave:** objetivismo, o subjetivismo, dialética, teoria, educação.

**Fecha Recepción:** Marzo 2017

**Fecha Aceptación:** Julio 2017

---

## Introduction

Is it possible to know reality? What is the source of human knowledge? What is science? How is it classified? On what criteria can it be accepted that certain knowledge is true or false? These questions have not been definitively resolved. What will they do? Will they have more than one solution? If so, are these procedures similar or contradictory? And why, some resource, will be better than the others ?, why?

Through this article some elements are suggested for the exploration, description, explanation, interpretation or understanding of the mentioned questions and the discussion is opened making an invitation to the readers to reflect on the problems of the human knowledge, the faculties with which they are Can solve and, derived from it, the

assumptions that are used for such effect, depending on the ontological and epistemological interests of the researcher.

Since the approach to the above problem is very broad and goes beyond the scope of an article, a general outline of the main problems of knowledge and the assumptions with which they can be resolved will be made, in order to finally concentrate attention on one Only of them: The essence of knowledge. The problem of the subject-object relationship.

In the first part The problems of human knowledge, a mapping is made on the main difficulties of human knowledge: definition, characteristics, elements, function, purpose, causes, consequences, classification and other aspects; With a view to locating the problem of the phenomenon under study.

In second part The assumptions with which the problems of knowledge can be solved, another mapping on the concept "philosophical assumptions" is made: definition, characteristics, elements, function, purpose, classification and other aspects; And the relation between them and the cognitive capacities of the knowing subject is specified.

In the third part How to solve the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge? We analyze the different ways in which the problem can solve the subject-object relationship of knowledge; Through the use of different philosophical assumptions, which derive from different capacities that the cognoscent subject can put into play when establishing a relationship of knowledge with any object of study: his reason and / or his senses. In this part is where the relationship between the problem of subject-object correspondence of knowledge and the philosophical assumptions with which it is and / or can be solved is established; Depending on the ontological interests of the cognoscent subject.

In the fourth part Ontological implications of the subject-object relationship in educational theory addresses the different and contradictory discourses that, on educational phenomena, are elaborated from the different theories of education, when they try to define the concept of student, the notion Of teacher, the idea of learning, setting the goals of education, the role of the teacher, motivation, teaching methodology or evaluation.

If this article succeeds readers' curiosity in exploring, describing, explaining, interpreting or understanding the philosophical problems of human knowledge and its implications for educational theories, it will have accomplished its purpose.

## **Problems of human knowledge**

Human knowledge can be understood as a process in which a cognoscent subject and an object to be known are related. This means that the essential elements of any process of knowledge are the cognitive subject, the object to be known and the relationship that must be established between them for the knowledge to be given.

Before establishing the relation of knowledge, both elements, both the subject and the object, are only entities; Beings that exist independently of each other. Both are in the ontological sphere, in reality, which can be concrete or abstract.

The object of knowledge arises inasmuch as an entity (in this case it is assumed that only the human being is able to know) fixes its attention on any other being (material or immaterial) with the intention of knowing it because:

*"... Objectivity becomes intentional precisely because the object known is not given of itself..." (Polo, 2006: 41)*

And, in turn, the human being who fixed his attention on another entity with a view to knowing it, from simple being that was, before relating to the object to know it, becomes a cognoscent subject by fixing his attention on an object to understand:

*"... Knowledge is an act, spontaneous as to its origin, immanent as to its term, by which a man is intentionally made present some region of being ..."*  
*(Verneaux, 2011:103-104).*

The problem of knowledge arises when the subject tries to establish the relationship of discernment with the object, because both (the cognoscent subject and the object to be known) are found in different, different, and even contrary worlds: the cognoscent subject is the soul Human, their psyche, thought, reason, mind, etc .; And, therefore, is in the

psychological sphere. On the other hand, the object to be known is reality (which may be material or immaterial), belongs to the ontological sphere. Hessen states that:

*"... Knowledge is presented as a relation between these two members - it refers to the subject and the object -, which remain in it eternally separated from each other ..."* (Hessen, 2011: 15).

The fact of being in different spheres makes the relationship of knowledge between the knowing subject and the object to be known is not essential, that is, they merge, literally so that a true relationship of discernment occurs. For this reason the relationship, in essence, is impossible. When the cognoscent subject (the human soul) tries to cross the barrier of the object by knowing (concrete or abstract reality) to literally grasp the object to understand, it also collides, literally, against a barrier imposed by reality. They are different worlds, planes or spheres in which the subject and the object exist; And, therefore, can not be fused, it is like wanting to mix water and oil.

As discernment, in essence, is impossible, arises the problem of knowledge:

*"... The spirit can not leave itself to coincide with things ... a thing can not enter into the spirit ..."* (Verneaux, 2011: 77).

Neither can cognitive consciousness come out of itself to penetrate the sphere of the object, nor can it enter into the mind. Knowledge of reality, in essence, is impossible; It seems that human beings were not born to know reality, perhaps, only come to this world with the necessary faculties to survive in it, but not to know it in essence.

Hessen says:

*"...Viewed from the subject, this apprehension appears as an exit from the subject outside its own sphere, an invasion in the sphere of the object and a capture of the properties of the subject. The object is not drawn, however, within the sphere of the subject, but remains transcendent to him..."* (Hessen, 2009: 16).

The cognoscent subject (the human soul) is unable to penetrate the sphere of the object by knowing (concrete or abstract reality). This is why the relation of knowledge can only be given in the logical world, in the discursive sphere. All that a subject can say about a particular object, will not be the reality of the object, what it is, but only a discourse about it, will be a language about the object, a dissertation elaborated by a subject that does not necessarily match the Reasoning elaborated by another subject:

*"... The human language is not made to speak of knowledge: the linguistic formality is not the cognitive one; There are infra-linguistic and supra-linguistic cognitive levels ..." (Polo, 2006: 14).*

All human beings feel and think differently. It is one of the reasons why cognitive subjects will have to agree on what should be understood by a particular object of knowledge.

If I turn my attention to the following questions: Who am I? Where do I come from? Where do I go? Where am I? What do I do here? In order to solve them, automatically - as I have said so far - I transform myself, simply as I am in reality (ontological sphere), cognoscent subject (psychological sphere) and, by the same act performed - the questions mentioned - simple entities that were before I focused my attention on them. In order to know them (ontological sphere), they become, in turn, objects to be known (but they continue in the ontological sphere, while I pass to the psychological sphere). When this happens, a split occurs of my being, I remain outside the ontological sphere and, therefore, I move to another reality: the psychological sphere, because the one I know is my soul, psyche, reason, thought, brain or spirit. Faced with the impossibility of transferring the reality of the above mentioned questions, it is impossible for me to penetrate its essence and I will never be able to know them, because I find myself - as a cognoscent subject (psychological sphere) - in a different world than the object to be known (ontological sphere). It can be concluded that reality is unknowable in essence, that knowledge of phenomena is a problem that has no definitive solution.



For Verneaux:

*“...The object and the subject are definable only by their mutual relation that is the knowledge. What is an object, a thing, a being? What appears to a subject. What is a subject, a consciousness, a spirit? That in which or to whom an object appears...” (Verneaux, 2011: 72).*

Reality (concrete or abstract) transcends the cognoscent subject, that is, outside it, in another world.

If knowledge of reality (in science, art, religion and philosophy) is impossible, so is knowledge of that knowledge (meta-science). This refers to the problems mentioned in the presentation of this work: is it possible to know reality ?, what is the source of human knowledge ?, what is science ?, how is it classified ?, what criteria Can one accept that certain knowledge is true or false? (Hessen 2009). These questions have more than one solution. To what will it obey that each and every one of the above questions can be answered in many different ways, even contradictory ones? These are the philosophical problems of knowledge (Table 1).

**Table 1.** The Philosophical Problems of Human Knowledge.

Tema		Pregunta
Posibilidad del conocimiento		¿Es posible conocer la realidad?
Origen del conocimiento		¿Cuál es la fuente del conocimiento?
Esencia del conocimiento	Relación de conocimiento	¿Quién determina a quién en una relación de conocimiento, el sujeto al objeto, el objeto al sujeto o ambos se determinan recíprocamente?
	Existencia de la realidad	¿Puede existir el objeto por conocer con independencia del sujeto cognoscente?
	Composición de la realidad	¿La realidad es única, dual o múltiple?
Clasificación del conocimiento		¿Cómo se tipifica el conocimiento?
Verdad del conocimiento		¿Cuáles son los criterios y conceptos de verdad que nos permiten aceptar un conocimiento como verdadero o rechazarlo por falso?

Source: elaboración propia.

### The assumptions with which knowledge problems can be solved

It is possible to establish that the philosophical problems of knowledge that are mentioned can be solved and, in fact, it happens, from different assumptions.

When a cognoscent subject establishes a relationship of knowledge with an object to be known, he uses --consciously or unconsciously - certain philosophical assumptions by which he solves the problems of knowledge and thereby establishes with him a logical but not essential relation. How is this relationship carried out?

For the time being it will be established that human beings come to this world with two great faculties which, although they do not help us much to know it in essence, do allow us to relate to him: reason and the senses:

*"... Knowledge, as such, is an act, and, at least, that act is operation: to the operation corresponds an 'object' ... the operation supposes a faculty ..."*  
(Polo, 2006: 15).

It is understood that all knowledge is a process in which a cognoscent subject (faculty) is related in logical terms with an object to be known.

If human beings can not know the essence of reality, at least we can suppose, estimate, presume, conjecture, attribute, grant or presuppose, what it is, how it is, its characteristics, function, purpose, classification, problem; That is, mapping everything we can say about any phenomenon, fact, event, event or object. In this it is believed that the logical relationship between the knowing subject and the object to be known consists in making a discourse about it using the only capacities we have to relate to any reality, be it concrete or abstract: reason and / Or the senses.

An assumption is that which must be assumed beforehand if a desired result is to be achieved, is a postulate. It is something that is logically necessary, which is involved, of course. It is causally necessary, condition or result. Latin assumptions, put in place of; Is an epistemological expression of any object that is supposed by the spirit without actually occurring in the experience (Runes 1998: 304 and 357).

The main characteristic of a philosophical assumption, based on its etymological definition, is that it is only a term or an idea, which is placed in place of another idea or other term. The assumption replaces the certainty of knowledge. Epicurus contends that:

*"...Every question we can formulate always contains and presupposes certain "anticipations of the spirit". Without such principles, our research could never find a beginning...." (citado por Cassirer, 1986: 169).*

From the assumptions - let's face it or not - begins our "knowledge" of reality.

The important question in this regard would be: what is the need that satisfies an assumption that is used to solve a philosophical problem of knowledge? Answer: to substitute the certainty that would be had, if the philosophical problems of knowledge had already been solved definitively, by an opinion, conjecture, supposition, estimation or presumption, of how they could be solved (Table 2).

**Table 2.** The main philosophical problems of human knowledge and the assumptions with which they can be solved.

Problema		Supuesto
Posibilidad del conocimiento		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dogmatismo: el sujeto sí aprehende realmente al objeto.</li> <li>• Escepticismo: El sujeto no puede aprehender realmente al objeto.</li> <li>• Relativismo: sólo hay verdades en relación a una humanidad determinada.</li> <li>• Subjetivismo: la verdad se limita al sujeto que conoce y juzga.</li> <li>• Pragmatismo: verdadero significa útil, valioso, fundamentado de la vida.</li> <li>• Criticismo: es posible conocer, pero no en esencia, porque cada sujeto siente y piensa diferente a los demás sujetos; porque la verdad cambia en tiempo, espacio y circunstancias; y porque todo conocimiento debe ser útil a quien lo formula y al grupo al que pertenece quien lo formuló.</li> </ul>
Origen del conocimiento		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Racionalismo: la fuente principal del conocimiento humano está en la razón, en el pensamiento.</li> <li>• Empirismo: la única fuente del conocimiento humano está en la experiencia.</li> <li>• Intelectualismo: la fuente y base del conocimiento lo son tanto la experiencia (primero), como la razón (después).</li> <li>• Apriorismo: la experiencia (después) y el pensamiento (primero) son las fuentes del conocimiento.</li> </ul>
Esencia del conocimiento	Relación sujeto-objeto	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objetivismo: el objeto determina al sujeto.</li> <li>• Subjetivismo: el sujeto determina al objeto.</li> <li>• Dialéctica: el sujeto y el objeto se determinan recíprocamente.</li> </ul>
	Existencia de la realidad	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Realismo: además de los objetos ideales hay objetos reales, independientes del pensamiento.</li> <li>• Idealismo: todos los objetos poseen un ser ideal, mental.</li> <li>• Fenomenalismo: no conocemos las cosas como son en sí, sino como se nos aparecen.</li> </ul>
	Composición de la realidad	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dualismo: el pensamiento y el ser, el sujeto y el objeto están separados y en una eterna lucha de contrarios.</li> <li>• Monismo: el ser es materia y forma, pero es único y es un todo indivisible.</li> <li>• Pluralismo: el número de sustancias es infinito.</li> </ul>
Tipos de conocimiento		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conocimiento racional: mediato, discursivo.</li> <li>• Conocimiento intuitivo: inmediato. Conocer viendo.</li> <li>• Conocimiento mixto: racional-intuitivo o intuitivo-racional.</li> </ul>
Criterios de verdad del conocimiento		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trascendente: concordancia del pensamiento con el objeto pensado.</li> <li>• Inmanente: concordancia del pensamiento consigo mismo.</li> <li>• Mixto: trascendente-inmanente o inmanente-trascendente.</li> </ul>

Source: elaboración propia.

As discussed in the third paragraph of the presentation of this research, the five philosophical problems mentioned will only address the drawbacks of the subject-object relationship of knowledge, a difficulty that belongs to a wider philosophical problem: Essence of reality.

### **How to solve the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge?**

How is the relation of knowledge established between the knowing subject and the object to be known? Many philosophers have posed this question and solved it in different senses: for some thinkers the cognoscent subject determines the object to be known (Descartes, 1981; Leibniz, 1991); Others say that it is the subject that determines the object (Locke, 1994, Hume, 1992); The more they think that both elements of knowledge are determined reciprocally with the proviso that indeterminism first occurs (Aristotle, 1992; Thomas Aquinas, 1991) or that determinism first appears (Kant, 1996).

One of the hypotheses of this study consists in estimating that those who have affirmed that the object determines the subject, have done so because - without even knowing it - they have solved the mentioned question with their soul, psyche, thought, intelligence or spirit; While those who affirm that it is the subject who determines the object has resolved it with its senses and; Finally, those who are in the middle, have managed their two qualities: reason and the senses; With the difference that for the third party the senses first intervene and then the reason and, for the fourth, first is the reason and then the senses.

If cognitive subjects only have our reason and our senses to relate to the objects to be known in each and every one of the possibilities of realization of the human spirit (science, art, religion and philosophy), we only have, at first - Mathematically speaking - two possibilities for establishing contact with the question about the relation of knowledge between the knowing subject and the object to be known: reason and the senses. We can suppose-although we never arrive at definite certainty-that in a relation of knowledge it is the object that determines the subject (then we would be solving the problem of the subject-object relation of knowledge with a philosophical assumption that we call "objectivism" ) Or that it

is the subject that determines the object (if we solve the mentioned question with another philosophical estimation to which we denominate "subjectivism").

The cognitive subjects, in a second moment, we have two other possibilities of approach to the objects of study, derived from the two previous possibilities: we can grant that in the relationship of knowledge the cognoscent subject and the object to know are mutually determined, but that First the subject determines the object and then is determined by it; Or that the subject first participates and then the subject (if we remedy the inconvenience about the subject-object relationship of knowledge with another philosophical hypothesis to which we name, in the absence of a better, "dialectic" term).

### **Solving the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge with reason.**

What does it mean to place oneself in an objectivist philosophical assumption when the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge is resolved with reason?

If the cognoscent subject solves the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge by using his mind, rather than his senses, he situates himself - with knowledge or not of the fact - in a philosophical assumption that, throughout the history of epistemology, Has been called "objectivism".

Objectivism is a philosophical estimate with which a cognoscent subject can solve the difficulty on the subject-object relationship of knowledge, granting, from his reason, that in a relationship of discernment is the object of knowledge that determines the cognoscent subject.

What are the ontological needs or purposes that compel the cognoscent subject to solve the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge with reason, locating --consciously or unconsciously - in an objective philosophical presupposition?

For Plato the ideas are objective. They form a substantive order. The sensible world faces the suprasensitive. And as we discover the objects of the first, the sensuous intuition, the perception; So we discover the objects of the second, in a non-sensible intuition; The intuition of ideas (Hessen, 2011: 44-46). One can observe a certain necessity or purpose of

determining, establishing, fixing or decreasing in others the idea of an objective, dogmatic and ideal order that can be "discovered" with reason.

Plato (a, 2001: 145-196) develops the theme of whether or not it is possible to teach virtue. It assumes that virtue is objective, and therefore that it is possible to teach it; Since virtue exists in itself, independently of the subjects. If any subject has it, it is possible that it can be "transmitted" to others; Teach others to be virtuous. From an objective philosophical assumption it can be conceded that the human soul is good by nature and that, based on questions and answers (dialogue), the teacher can help his students to "discover" their virtues in the depths of their soul; Because the human soul comes to this world "loaded" with all the knowledge necessary for its worldly realization. Again it is possible to appreciate in this discourse the purpose of making others believe that it is coming to this determined world in the scientific field of ethics and morals.

Plato attributes a metaphysical reality to essences (objectivism). He defines ideas as suprasensitive realities, as metaphysical entities (Gaarder, 2001: 94-114). It can be concluded that the needs of determinism, stillness and order that can be observed in this discourse have the purpose, purpose or objective of reaching the security of the survival of the object to be known. For this the subject must be determined by the object of knowledge.

### **Resolving the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge with the senses.**

What does it mean to be placed in a sensorial philosophical assumption when the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge is resolved with the senses?

If the cognoscent subject solves the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge using its senses, rather than its reason, it lies - with knowledge or not of the fact - in a philosophical assumption that, throughout the history of epistemology, Has been called "subjectivism".

Subjectivism is a philosophical estimate with which a cognoscent subject can solve the difficulty on the subject-object relationship of knowledge, granting, using his senses, that in a relationship of knowledge the knowing subject determines the object to know.

What are the ontological needs and purposes that oblige the cognoscent subject to solve the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge with its senses, being located - consciously or unconsciously - in a philosophical subjectivist assumption?

From a philosophical subjectivist assumption one can consider, using the senses, that the cognoscent subject determines the object to know, it is a question of grounding the human knowledge in the subject (Hessen, 2011: 46-47). The needs, miseries, hardships, shortages or inadequacies of the cognoscent subject determine the object of knowledge. The objective, purpose or purpose of this discourse is to indeterminate cognitive subjects with respect to the objectifications of which they have been victims and to privilege their emotions, passions, feelings, etc .; Ie the subjective, their personal interests.

A clear example of this is provided by Schopenhauer, according to him:

*"...The will is not only free, but omnipotent; Not only creates his own behavior, but his own world; And as it is determined in its actions and its world is configured, both are the knowledge that the will has of itself and not another thing; And in so doing it determines the other two things, for outside it there is nothing; And the conduct of man and the world itself are will; Only in that case is it truly autonomous..." (Schopenhauer, 1997: 216).*

The object to know is what the will of the cognoscent subject represents. Reality is a representation of the will. The cognoscent subject determines the object to be known.

It can be concluded that the needs of those who are placed in this situation will be to provoke chaos in philosophical, scientific, artistic or religious institutions with the aim of demolishing, destroying, ruining, ravaging, or devastating them. This also implies the purpose of provoking insecurity, hesitation, uncertainty or doubt in the other cognitive subjects, directing attention to the movement, disorder, and indeterminism that presents all reality when it is appreciated through the senses.



## **Solving the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge with reason and the senses or vice versa.**

What does it mean to be placed in a mixed philosophical assumption when the problem of the subject-object relation of knowledge is solved by first using reason and then the meanings or vice versa?

If the cognoscent subject solves the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge by first using its reason and then its senses or vice versa, it lies - with knowledge or not of the fact - in a philosophical assumption that, throughout the history of the Epistemology, has been called "dialectic".

The dialectic is a philosophical estimate with which a cognoscent subject can solve the difficulty on the subject-object relation of knowledge, granting-first using its reason and then its senses or viceversa- that in a relation of knowledge both the cognoscent subject and the Object to know are determined reciprocally.

What are the ontological needs and purposes that oblige the cognitive subject to solve the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge with its reason first and then with its senses or vice versa, locating - consciously or unconsciously - in a dialectical philosophical assumption?

To paraphrase Aristotle (1999), the virtue of courage is a middle ground between two vicious extremes: cowardice and recklessness. Between the fearful (subjectivist) and the imprudent (objectivist), there is the striving (dialectic) who, like the terrified, is afraid of imminent danger (determined); But, like the unthinking, he dominates his fear and seeks the best way to solve the dangerous situation (it can be indeterminate). The need to satisfy is to conciliate the instituted with the institute, that is, the determinate with the indeterminate, cowardice and recklessness, order and disorder, the real and the ideal, stillness and movement, etc. .

Beauchot (1995: 20), based on the Aristotelian theory of the just mean, establishes that - against the extremes of equivocism (subjectivism) and univocism (objectivism) - an analogical (dialectical) model of interpretation is presented; Where equality (objectivism) and diversity (subjectivism) are conjugated, privileging the subject over the object; In virtue of which, in order to become what we want (objective) we must start from what we are (subjective). It is possible to establish the need to reconcile the extremes with the aim of achieving some security in the insecurity that prevails in reality.

Solving the problem of the subject-object relationship with reason and / or the senses has its ontological consequences. Who determines who in a relationship of knowledge, the knowing subject to the object to know, the object to know the cognoscent subject or both are mutually determined? (Table 3):

**Table 3.** The philosophical assumptions with which the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge can be solved.

<b>Necesidad</b>	<b>Capacidad</b>	<b>Supuesto</b>	<b>Discurso</b>
Determinismo	Razón	Objetivismo	El objeto por conocer determina al sujeto cognoscente.
Indeterminismo	Sentidos	Subjetivismo	El sujeto cognoscente determina al objeto por conocer.
Intermitencia entre Determinismo-Indeterminismo	sentidos-razón	Dialéctica	El objeto por conocer determina al sujeto cognoscente y, a su vez, es determinado por éste y viceversa; en una relación dialéctica interminable, debido a que jamás se deja de conocer la realidad.

Source: elaboración propia.

All of the above is reduced to determinism, indeterminism or intermittent states between one and the other. If it is desired to determine the others, reasons will be argued for this; If they are indeterminate, the senses will provide the necessary arguments and; If you want to reconcile opposites, you can use both qualities.

## **Ontological implications of the subject-object relationship in educational theories**

In educational theory, depending on the cognitive faculties (the reason and / or the senses) that the subject who makes them use to solve the problems of knowledge in general and, in particular, that corresponding to the subject-object relationship, Educational phenomena are explored, described, explained, interpreted or understood using rational, sensual or mixed philosophical assumptions; Based on the ontological interests (determinism, indeterminism or intermittent states between one and the other) of the researcher or the group that finances it.

For reasons of space, only the ontological implications of the subject-object relationship on the behaviorist, psychoanalytic, humanistic, cognitive, psychogenetic and sociocultural theories of education regarding the goals of education, the concept of learning, the role of the teacher , The student concept, motivation, teaching methodology and evaluation, based solely on the work of Guzmán, Jesús Carlos and Gerardo Hernández Rojas (1993). Educational implications of six psychological theories. CONALTE - UNAM. Authors who are recognized for their great capacity for synthesis and management of educational theory.

### **Real effects of the deal between the spirit and the thing in the behavioral proposal of the instruction.**

In the behaviorist educational discourse the ontological consequences of having solved the problems of knowledge in general, and in particular that of the subject-object relation of knowledge, can be clearly seen with reason: in these explorations, it is human intelligence that Tries to put order in the educational reality (rationalism) due to the existential necessity - of the cognoscent subject or of the group that finances it - of controlling human behavior.

The soul of the cognoscent subject provides the necessary assumption to solve the problem of the object subject relationship: the object must determine the subject of the educational act: objectivism. It is necessary to modify the behavior of the cognoscent subject, that is, to establish, fix, decree or determine the attitude, but not all, at least of the majority - to

conform, adjust or tighten their habits, skills, abilities or attitudes a Certain orders, dispositions, mandates, precepts, laws or ordinances established or to be implemented.

The teacher is the one who "knows" and the pupil is the one who "ignores" a series of knowledge imposed dogmatically, indisputably and irrefutable by the established order and, to achieve the determination of the subject by the object of knowledge - in such a way That conforms to it - the knowledge must remain static, paralyzed, arrested, stagnant or parked. Knowledge becomes "fixed doctrines" due to the ontological need that the educational reality does not change, change, change, alter or transform, because it does not suit the interests of the prevailing order.

The student is treated as an "object of the educational act", as an "empty pitcher" in which the teacher pours the "waters of knowledge". It is intended an absolute determinism, to the extent of assuming that the student - alone - is not able to know reality.

It is assumed that "excellent" students are those who achieve the highest grades averages (punctuality, attendance, presentation, attitude, participation, obedience, etc.) and motivation is extrinsic in the form of positive incentives or stimuli (Rewards, rewards, awards or laurels) as negatives (punishments, penalties, punishments or convictions) with the intention of strengthening the determination of the students.

The habits, uses, practices or routines that are tried to impose on others have nothing to do with reality (quality, excellence, efficiency, etc.) and are only "inventions of the intelligence" of the cognitive subject (idealism). In this theory existence, presence or objectivity is given to a discourse about an object that, in reality does not exist, nor is it present; Using a teaching methodology based on instructional objectives. It is estimated that one learns by following instructions.

Because the order in which it is sought to determine others permanently is only the illusion of established interests or intended to be established or strengthened, the intelligence of the knowing subject divides reality into two (dualism): approved and reprobated with The intention to find reasons that justify the exclusion, elimination or suppression of the

educational system of those students who, for some reason, could not be determined by the official discourse.

In this way, a theoretical discourse of rational type is elaborated with immanent concepts and criteria of truth: truth is the agreement of thought with mime: "an excellent student is one who gets ten on the scale of qualifications." The term "excellence" is a concept invented by human reason to order and determine others in a permanent way that, generally, has nothing to do with the reality that is experienced.

### **Ideological consequences of the confrontation between reason and the senses in the psychoanalytic offer of formation.**

In the psychoanalytic instructive harangue it is also possible to evaluate the effects of having given solution to the drawbacks of knowledge in general, and particularly that of the relation between reason and senses, from the second of these elements of knowledge: in these descriptions, it is taken Taking into account the disorder of the reality in which the student develops and considering that all human beings think and feel different, the subjective is privileged over the objective (empiricism).

The sensory faculties of the cognoscent subject provide the precise assumption to solve the difficulty of the relation object subject: the thought must fix to the object of the educational act: subjectivism. The student's feelings, emotions, passions or impressions are taken into account in order to begin his / her training process.

The teacher is considered a "counselor" or "consultant" of the student during his or her personal formation process. It is assumed that the educational reality is in constant change or movement (relativism). It is the interests or needs of each student, in particular, those considered to program the learning processes.

The student is treated as a unique and unrepeatable being who needs to be favored in his healthy psychoemotional development. Therefore, the motivation takes into account external (social) and internal (satisfaction of security and achievement needs), from the context, situation, environment, environment or environment in which it develops (realism).

It is estimated that reality is unique (monism) and is in constant transformation. Consequently, processes are privileged over results, teaching methodology, from the operating groups, allows the students to plan the objectives, build the activities to achieve them and evaluate their learning themselves, supported by the teacher.

The truth is supposed to be the concordance of thought with the object thought (transcendence). Therefore, the evaluation privileges the process on the result, it is a group evaluation, preceded by an individual self-assessment; Because it is considered to be the type of assessment that best fits the reality.

### **Positive aspects of the confrontation between the soul and the being in the humanistic propositions of teaching.**

In the humanist educational discourse the results of solving the pregnancies of the judgments in general, and in particular those of the subject-object relation of knowledge, can be observed with the senses: in these explanations, the senses of the cognoscent subject are the Who appreciate the disorder of educational reality (empiricism).

The senses of the cognoscent subject provide the necessary assumption to solve the problem of the subject subject relationship: the subject must determine the object of the educational act: subjectivism. For this reason the aims of the education are personal or individual, it is to promote the self-realization of the student, stimulating its potentialities so that they reach to the maximum height that the human species can reach.

It is assumed that the situation changes and constantly changes (relativism) and, because of this, learning is understood as a process that modifies the perception of reality, derived from the reorganization of self and as meaningful or experiential: cognitive and affective (self - promoted).

It is appreciated that the educational reality varies or changes from one student to another, because it is granted that is in constant change or movement (subjectivism), because of this the teacher is treated as a facilitator of the student's learning, providing the conditions for It learns autonomously, based on its individual potentialities and needs.

It is conceded that the educational reality has its own existence and independent of the cognitive subject (realism), because it impacts their senses, with the exception that each and every individual impresses them differently; That is, we all perceive the same reality, but in a dissimilar way. That is why the student is seen as a completely unique and unequal entity, a being with initiative and personal needs to grow, capable of self-determination and with the potential to develop activities and solve problems, a total person who has affections and has particular experiences.

It is proposed that the environment is unique (monism) and, in that sense, this unit allows to motivate the experiences, occupations and communication, that is to say, the training processes, rather than the positive or negative result that proposes behaviorism.

In this way, the theory in question makes possible the construction of a sensual type of discourse that, in addition to what has been mentioned before, has the virtue of proposing a consistent teaching methodology - among other things - in working with problems perceived as real, Provide resources, make agreements, share classes, do research work and promote encounter groups.

It is estimated that truth is the agreement of thought with the object thought (transcendence) and, in that sense, self-evaluation is promoted, estimating that only the student can know to what extent his self-realization has been promoted.

### **Ontological implications of the subject-object relationship of knowledge in the cognoscitivist theory of education.**

In cognitive-pedagogical allocutions-as well as in psychoanalytic and humanistic-it is possible to consider patently the derivations existing by the fact of having solved the setbacks of knowledge, in general, and in particular that of the subject-object relation of knowledge, of Sensual way: in these interpretations, it is the senses of the knower who appreciate the chaos of the educational medium (empiricism).

The sensations of the cognoscent subject provide the hypothesis required to settle the complication of the object subject relationship: the human spirit must convince the object of

the educational act: subjectivism. For this reason the aims of education are subjective, it is to promote the retention, in the long term, of significant bodies of knowledge; Developing cognitive processes (learning to learn); And elicit the development of the student's curiosity, doubt, creativity, reasoning and imagination.

It is suggested that reality changes and is constantly transformed (relativism) and, because of this, learning is understood in terms of qualitatively restructuring the schemas, ideas, perceptions or concepts that students have about it: meaningful learning.

It is assumed that the educational reality varies or changes from one student to another, because it is granted that is in constant change or movement (subjectivism), because of this the role of the teacher is to foster the development and practice of student cognitive processes: Identifying previous knowledge and relating them to new ones to achieve meaningful learning.

It is conceded that the educational reality has its own existence and independent of the cognitive subject (realism), because it impacts their senses, with the exception that each and every individual impresses them differently; That is, we all perceive the same reality, but in a different way. This is why the student is seen as an active information processor and responsible for his own learning.

It is appreciated that reality is unique (monism) and, in that sense, this unit allows motivating the student causing imbalances so that the search for balance becomes the motor of learning (internal).

In this way, the theory in question makes possible the construction of a sensual type of discourse that, in addition to what has been mentioned before, has the virtue of proposing a consistent teaching methodology - among other things - in promoting the mastery of cognitive strategies , Cognitive goals (knowing that they are known), self-regulation and the induction of more elaborate and inclusive knowledge representations (schemas) through instructional strategies (design of teaching situations: advance organizer, abstracts, illustrations, questions, semantic networks, maps Conceptual, etc.) and induced or learning



(skills, habits, techniques and skills: self-interrogation, imagination, identification and elaboration.

It is speculated that truth is the agreement of thought with the object thought (transcendence) and, in that sense, the students' real thinking and reasoning skills are evaluated.

**Real transcendence of the coexistence mind-reality in the genetic hypothesis of the training.**

In the psychogenetic teaching prayers the epistemological results can be visibly estimated to have solved the difficulties of knowledge, in general, and in particular that of the subject-object relationship of knowledge, with consciousness and sensations: in these understandings, they are reason And the senses of the knowing subject who appreciate that the educational reality is immersed in intermittent states between order (reason) and chaos (senses) (apriorism).

The intelligence and sensations of the cognoscent subject provide the inescapable pretext to dissipate the difficulty of the deal between the subject and the object: being and the being of the didactic fact are mutually determined in a constant and infinite dialogue privileging the first on the second: dialectic. For this reason the aims of education are dialectical, it is a question of helping the students to promote their development and promote their moral and intellectual autonomy in the intention of forming students who are critical, inventive and discoverers.

It is estimated that the educational reality is in intermittent, choppy or discontinuous states of stillness and movement (criticism) and, because of this, learning is understood as a process of acquisition of knowledge, in the sense a series of assimilations of contents that Require accommodation by the subject.

It is conceded that the reality of education varies or changes from one student to another, because it is assumed to be in constant change or movement (criticism), because of this the role of the teacher is to help the student to build their own knowledge, promote their Development and autonomy and an atmosphere of reciprocity, respect and self-confidence.

It is assumed that the educational reality has its own existence and independent of the cognoscent subject but that each subject constructs it in a different way, because it impacts their senses, with the exception that each and every one of them impresses them in a dissimilar way, as a phenomenon in Time, space, and circumstances (phenomenalism). Because of this the pupil is seen as a builder of his own knowledge.

It is appreciated that reality is plural and, in that sense, this plurality allows to motivate the student in an intrinsic and extrinsic way: as a product of the imbalances (cognitive conflicts) caused by the contradiction (conscious thematization) to move to a higher level of understanding . Therefore, cognitive conflicts are promoted to induce states of imbalance that motivate learning.

In this way, the theory in question makes possible the construction of an educational discourse of mixed type (rational-sensitive) that, in addition to what has been mentioned before, has the virtue of proposing a consistent teaching methodology - among other things - in promoting Direct teaching: activity, initiative and curiosity; Propitious conditions are created (logical-mathematical); Situations are designed to be acquired by the experience of discovery or direct (physical) contact; And are taught (socially and conventionally) or through animation for their appropriation or reconstruction (social unconventional).

It is speculated that truth is the agreement of the thought with itself and, at the same time, with the object thought (immanence-transcendence) and, in that sense, are evaluated cognitive processes school that occur both in the ideal as in the real.

### **Philosophical reaches of mind-thing correspondence in the sociocultural assumption of formation.**

In sociocultural teaching knowledge, the real results of having decided the complications of knowledge in a general way and, specifically, that of the subject-object relationship of knowledge, can be considered clearly in a sensorial-rational way: in these theories are the sensations And the thoughts of the cognoscent subject who evaluate that the educational environment is immersed in discontinuous stages between anarchy (senses) and law (reason) (intellectualism).

The passions and the soul of the cognoscent subject provide the precise hypothesis to satisfy the problem of the relation subject subject: the subject and the object of the educational act are mutually determined in a constant and infinite dialogue privileging the first on the second: dialectic. For this reason the aims of education are dialectical, promoting the socio-cultural and integral development of the student.

It is conceded that the pedagogical context is in intermittent, choppy or discontinuous stages of movement and stillness (criticism) and, because of this, learning is understood as the negotiation of nearby development zones, in such a way as to integrate the level of development With the potential, through a dialogue between the child and his / her future.

It is appreciated that the teaching medium is transformed or passed from one student to another, because it is presumed to be invariably permutation or change (criticism), because of this the teacher's role is to create and negotiate nearby areas of development, Teacher as an expert who guides and mediatizes the socio-cultural knowledge that must be learned and internalized.

It is assumed that the pedagogical entity has its own independent presence of the human spirit but that each soul builds it in an unequal way, because it impacts the senses of the cognoscent subject, except that each and every one of them moves them in a different way, As a phenomenon in time, space and circumstances (phenomenalism). Because of this the student is seen as a social entity, protagonist and product of multiple interactions.

It is estimated that reality is plural and, in that sense, said plurality allows the student to be motivated in an intrinsic and extrinsic way: personal and social.

In this way, the theory allows for the construction of a mixed-type (sensory-rational) educational discourse that, in addition to what has been commented on before, has the virtue of proposing a consistent teaching methodology - among other things - to create Areas of proximal development, transferring the learner from the lower levels to the upper levels of the area, providing a necessary degree of cognitive competence, guiding with a very fine sensitivity, from the performances gradually achieved by the students.

Truth is supposed to be the concordance of thought with the object thought and at the same time with itself (transcendence-immanence), and in that sense, evaluation consists of determining the level of potential development (emerging competencies that are put Manifested by interactions with others that provide context).

Solving the problem of the subject-object relationship with reason and / or the senses has its epistemological and ontological consequences. Who determines who in a relationship of knowledge: the cognitive subject to the object to know, the object to know the cognoscent subject or both are mutually determined? (Table 4):

**Table 4.** The educational discourse based on the ontological need of the cognoscent subject, the cognitive faculty used to solve the problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge and, consequently, the philosophical assumption in which the theory is located.

<b>Teoría Educativa</b>	<b>Necesidad ontológica del sujeto cognoscente</b>	<b>Facultad cognoscitiva con la que se resuelve el problema de la relación sujeto-objeto de conocimiento</b>	<b>Supuesto filosófico en el que se ubica el discurso educativo</b>	<b>Discurso educativo (e.g. definición del concepto "Alumno")</b>
Conductista	Determinismo	La razón	Objetivismo	Objeto del acto educativo
Psicoanalítica	Indeterminismo	Los sentidos	Subjetivismo	Ser con necesidades afectivas, de seguridad y logro
Humanista	Indeterminismo	Los sentidos	Subjetivismo	Ente individual único y diferente
Cognoscitivista	Indeterminismo	Los sentidos	Subjetivismo	Activo procesador de información y responsable de su propio aprendizaje
Psicogenética	Determinismo-Indeterminismo	La razón y los sentidos	Dialéctica	Constructor activo de su propio conocimiento
Socio-cultural	Indeterminismo-Determinismo	Los sentidos y la razón	Dialéctica	Sujeto social protagonista y producto de las múltiples interacciones sociales

Source: elaboración propia.

## Conclusions

Which of the definitions of the concept "student" of the different theories analyzed is the best? Answer: None. In epistemological terms they are only conjectures, assumptions, assumptions, hypotheses, calculations, beliefs or opinions derived from reason, the senses or both and, ontologically, the choice will depend on the existential interests of the person or group of people who use them and, In that sense, of the philosophical assumptions in which the educational discourse is located.

It can be estimated that human beings do not come to this world with the necessary faculties to know the essence of the educational reality and that, therefore, the only thing we can do in cognitive terms is to elaborate a mapping of it (Functions, purpose, classification, elements, etc.) using our faculties (reason and / or senses) with which we elaborate certain assumptions to solve the problems of knowledge depending on our ontological interests.

There is a relation of dependence between the philosophical assumptions that are used to solve the problem of the object-object relation of knowledge, the cognitive faculties of every cognoscent subject, the ontological interests of the epistemic spirit and the theoretical discourse that is constructed in each and every One of the theories analyzed.

All of the above is reduced to determinism, indeterminism or intermittent states between one and the other. If it is desired to determine the others, reasons will be argued for this; If they are indeterminate, the senses will provide the necessary arguments and; If it is necessary to reconcile opposites, both qualities can be used.

The problem of the subject-object relationship of knowledge in educational discourses could not have a unique solution because it obeys the interests and needs of its promoters. In that sense, education is a political problem.

## Bibliography

Aristóteles (a) (1981). Ética Nicomaquea. Porrúa (Col. "Sepan cuántos...", núm. 70). México.

----- (b) (1981). Política. Porrúa (Col. "Sepan cuántos...", núm. 70). México.

----- (1992). Metafísica. Porrúa (Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 120). México.

Beauchot, Mauricio (2000). Tratado de hermenéutica analógica. Ítaca. México.

Cassirer, Ernest (1986). El problema del conocimiento en la filosofía y en la ciencia modernas II. Editorial Fondo de Cultura Económica. México.

Descartes (1981). Meditaciones Metafísicas. Porrúa (Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 177). México.

Gaarder, Jostein (2001). El mundo de Sofía. Novela sobre la historia de la filosofía. Patria/Siruela. México.

Guzmán, Jesús Carlos y Gerardo Hernández Rojas (1993). Implicaciones educativas de seis teorías psicológicas. CONALTE - UNAM.

Hessen, Juan (1999). Teoría del Conocimiento. Porrúa (Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 351). México.

Hume, David (1992). Tratado de la Naturaleza Humana. Porrúa (Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 326). México.

Kant, Manuel (1996). Crítica de la Razón Pura. Porrúa (Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 203). México.

Leibniz (a) (1991). Nuevo Tratado Sobre el Entendimiento Humano. Porrúa (Col. "Sepan Cuántos...", núm. 321). México.

- (b) (1991). Monadología. Porrúa (Col. “Sepan Cuántos...”, núm. 321). México.
- Locke, John (1994). Ensayo Sobre el Entendimiento Humano (tomo I) Gernika. México.
- Platón (a) (1998). Diálogos. Porrúa (Col. “Sepan Cuántos...”, núm. 13 A). México.
- (b) (1998). Diálogos. Porrúa (Col. “Sepan Cuántos...”, núm. 13 B). México.
- Polo, Leonardo (2006). Curso de teoría del conocimiento. Tomo I. Ediciones Universidad de Navarra, S. A. Pamplona. España.
- Runes, Dagoberto D. (1998). Diccionario de filosofía. Grijalbo. México.
- Tomás de Aquino (1991). Suma Contra los Gentiles. Porrúa (Col. “Sepan Cuántos...”, núm. 317). México.
- Verneaux, Roger (2011). Curso de filosofía tomista. Epistemología general o crítica del conocimiento. Herder. España.