

Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku

Odsjek za filozofiju

Odsjek za njemački jezik i književnost

////

Josip Juraj Strossmayer University of Osijek

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of Philosophy

Department of German Language and Literature



Znanstveno-stručni skup »Kant. 300 godina«

////

Scientific Conference »Kant. 300 Years«

**KNJIŽICA SAŽETAKA /
BOOK OF ABSTRACTS**



Osijek, 21.-22. studenoga 2024. godine / Osijek, 21-22 November 2024

Izdavač / Publisher

Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku / Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek

Urednik / Editor

Boško Pešić

Lektura i prijevod / Proofreading and Translation

Damir Sekulić – Karla Pružinac

Dizajn naslovnice / Cover Design

Boško Pešić

Tisak / Printing Office

Krešendo, Osijek

Naklada / Printing Run

70 primjeraka / 70 copies

ISBN 978-953-314-262-3

KAZALO / CONTENTS

Programsko-organizacijski odbor / Program and Organization Committee	4
Uvodna riječ / Foreword	5
Program / Programme	11
Sažeci izlaganja / Paper Abstracts	17
Studentska sekcija / Student Section.....	45
Radionica »Kant kao odgajatelj« / Workshop "Kant as Educator".....	63
Adresar izlagača / Addresses of the Speakers	68

PROGRAMSKO-ORGANIZACIJSKI ODBOR / PROGRAM AND ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE

Tihomir Engler

Sanja Ivanović Grgurić

Ivana Jozić

Marijan Krivak

Boško Pešić (predsjednik/Chair)

Željko Senković

Damir Sekulić

Ivana Šarić Šokčević

Martina Volarević

Pavao Žitko

UVODNA RIJEČ

Boško Pešić

Kantovih tri stoljeća

»Tu i tamo čuju se pritužbe na plitkost načina mišljenja našega vremena i na propadanje temeljne znanosti. No ja ne vidim, da one, kojima je temelj dobro položen, kao što je slučaj s matematikom, prirodnom znanosti itd., i najmanje zaslužuju to predbacivanje, nego da naprotiv potvrđuju stari glas temeljitosti, a u posljednje ga vrijeme čak i nadmašuju. Upravo taj isti duh pokazao bi se djelotvoran i u drugim vrstama spoznavanja, da su se prije svega tek pobrinuli za ispravljanje njihovih načela. Naprotiv su u nedostatku toga ravnodušnost i sumnja i najposlije stroga kritika dokazi temeljitoga načina mišljenja. Naše je doba pravo doba kritike kojoj se mora podvrći sve.«

U godini u kojoj se u svim značajnijim svjetskim akademskim kutcima obilježava 300. godišnjica rođenja i 220. godišnjica smrti Immanuela Kanta, ova njegova bilješka iz »Predgovora prvom izdanju« *Kritike čistog uma* iziskuje višestruki pozor. Da znanosti, napose one prirodoslovne, mogu također biti u krizi, i to onoj vlastitog smisla, u međuvremenu je, među ostalim, upozorio i Edmund Husserl, navodeći da su racionaliziranje svijeta *more geometrico* i matematizacija svekolike zbilje postupno doveli do preokreta u općem shvaćanju humaniteta. U zadaći zauzimanja kritičkog stava Husserl zapravo slijedi Kanta – kriza znanosti će se ujedno pokazati i kao posljedica krize filozofije naročito u pogledu prononsiranog umskog samoozbiljenja čovjeka. Borba za smisao onog ljudskog u današnjem vremenu razotkriva da se ova kriza ne samo produbila do neslućenosti, nego se njome posvema ispostavila i nametnula potreba novog promišljanja ovog 'kritičkog' same krize.

To što za Kanta, pak, predstavlja 'kritičko', nama današnjima u takvoj jednoj zadaći možda je ponajbolje približio Gilles Deleuze, tvrdeći da osnovni problem interesne racionalnosti, posebice one matematičke, leži u tome što izostavlja takva pitanja koja su za nju formativna. Drugim riječima, čisti um koji zahtijeva samozakonodavstvo skončat će uvijek iznova u iluzornosti bez

svoje praktičke potvrde koju osigurava upravo i jedino kritika kao transcendentalna metoda njegove imanentne uporabe. Za samu filozofiju ovaj transcendentalni idealizam u nastajanju zapravo je označio početak onoga što će Gottlieb Fichte parafrazirajući samoga Kanta nazvati *revolucijom u načinu mišljenja* (*Revolution der Denkart*). Fichte je, naime, upravo u značaju kantovske kritike pronašao odsudni misaoni iskorak, čije bi seizmičko djelovanje na samu filozofiju trebalo ovu napokon privesti najstrožoj znanstvenosti kao čvrstoj brani od svih razarajućih tendencija svjetskog realiteta, vraćajući istodobno ljudima vjeru u dobrobit zajedničke i opće umnosti.

Kolika je filozofska moć čovjeka koji nikada ni na trenutak nije napustio svoj rodni grad može se sagledati tek osvjetljenjem vlastite duhovne situacije vremena u mjeri primjene takve javne upotrebe uma koju u svojoj filozofiji nalaže. To je mjera u kojoj i s kojom dokazujemo svoju sposobnost razračuna s ukočenošću vlastitih predrasuda, neovisno o tome što ih je izazvalo. Njegova filozofija utoliko nam ne dolazi iz prošlosti tek kao opomena, već nam daleko više prilazi približavajući budućnost kao putokaz i ohrabrenje. Progovoriti oštro o svim ključnim problemima suvremenosti ne ostaje tako samo pitanje izvorne čestitosti, već se ono iz sadašnjeg povijesnog trenutka nažalost ispostavlja i kao vitalno pitanje ukupnog opstanka. Kantov kritički duh koji se nikada ne odvaja od deontološke ideje ljudskog dostojanstva omogućuje pregršt prilika za zajedničko promišljanje i kao takav nimalo ne jenjava. Njegovo geslo moglo bi se sažeti ovako: filozofija čini razumljivim ono što je istinito. To je zapravo onaj trenutak kada egzistencijalna odgovornost neumitno postaje dijelom procesa demitologizacije. S te pozicije Kant je naročito bio svjestan kakva se opasnost krije u davanju prednosti tzv. popularnoj moralnoj filozofiji, koja sa sobom, kako je znao reći, uvijek donosi »odvratnu zbrku skrpanih opažanja i polusofističkih principa«. U spisu *Utemeljenje metafizike čudoređa* utoliko će zapisati da se tom zbrkom u pravilu naslađuju šuplje glave, zadovoljne takvim zavodljivim svagdašnjim naklapanjem, pri čemu će filozofi, koji tu opsenu proziru pozivom da se takvo popularno naličje barem privremeno ostavi po strani, redovito nailaziti na premalo sluha.

Čini se, na tom tragu, da je jedan od većih problema današnje filozofije to što se studente nagoni školskom učenju filozofije, a ne filozofiranju, koju razliku je, kako podcrtava naš Vladimir Filipović, Kant vrlo dobro znao i sveudilj primjenjivao. Za Kanta, na kraju krajeva, nije potrebna nikakva propisana znanost pa ni filozofija za stjecanje znanja o tome što trebamo činiti da bi bili dionici u dobru, poštenju i kreposti. U prilog neophodnosti filozofije ide tek to da se ono umski čisto i strogo po mogućnosti pritom ne učini primjerenim našim željama i nagnućima. Ta životnost koja se ne da zaustaviti nikakvim takozvanim sudbinskim okolnostima ispostaviti će doduše svoje različite historijske račune, ali njeni neizvjesni tijekovi će tek tu i tamo dati za pravo takvoj zapućenosti koja udovoljava onome filozofski zapitanom *zašto?* i još više *čemu?*, odnosno kako će u uvodu u *Metafiziku čudoređa* sam Kant o tome zaključiti: »moć nekog bića da djeluje u skladu sa svojim predodžbama zove se *život*.«

FOREWORD

Boško Pešić

Kant's Three Centuries

"Now and again one hears complaints about the superficiality of our age's way of thinking, and about the decay of well-grounded science. Yet I do not see that those sciences whose grounds are well laid, such as mathematics, physics, etc., in the least deserve this charge; rather, they maintain their old reputation for well-groundedness, and in the case of natural science, even surpass it. This same spirit would also prove itself effective in other species of cognition if only care had first been taken to correct their principles. In the absence of this, indifference, doubt, and finally strict criticism are rather proofs of a well-grounded way of thinking. Our age is the genuine age of criticism, to which everything must submit."

In a year in which the 300th anniversary of the birth and the 220th anniversary of the death of Immanuel Kant are being celebrated in all notable academic corners of the world, this note of his from the "Preface" (to the first edition) of the *Critique of Pure Reason* demands multiple attention. Edmund Husserl, among others, warned in the meantime that the sciences, especially the natural sciences, could also be in crisis, in crisis of their own meaning, stating that the rationalization of the world *more geometrico* and the mathematization of all reality gradually led to a reversal in the general understanding of humanity. In the task of taking a critical position, Husserl actually follows Kant – the crisis of science will also prove to be a consequence of the crisis of philosophy, especially with regard to the pronounced intellectual self-realization of the human being. The struggle over the meaning of what is human in today's time exposes that this crisis has not only deepened to an unsuspected level, but it has completely revealed and imposed the need for a new reflection of the 'critical' in the crisis itself.

What this 'critical' represents for Kant is perhaps best brought to us in such a task by Gilles Deleuze, arguing that the basic problem of self-interested rationality, especially mathematical rationality, lies in the fact that it omits such

questions that are formative for it. In other words, pure reason that demands autonomy will end up again and again in illusoryness without its practical confirmation, which is ensured only by criticism as the transcendental method of its immanent use. For philosophy itself, this emerging transcendental idealism actually marked the beginning of what Gottlieb Fichte, paraphrasing Kant himself, would call *a revolution in the way of thinking* (*Revolution der Denkart*). Namely, Fichte found in the significance of Kantian criticism a decisive thought breakthrough, whose seismic effect on philosophy itself should finally bring it to the strictest scientificity as a solid defense against all the destructive tendencies of the world's reality, at the same time restoring people's faith in the benefit of common and general rationality.

The extent of the philosophical power of the man who never for a moment left his hometown can only be seen by illuminating the spiritual situation of the age in the measure of the application of such public use of reason as he enjoins in his philosophy. It is the measure in which and with which we prove our ability to reckon with the rigidity of our own prejudices, regardless of what caused them. Therefore, his philosophy does not come to us from the past just as a warning, but rather approaches us by approximating the future as a guide and encouragement. To speak sharply about all the key problems of our time is not only a question of original integrity, but in the current historical moment it unfortunately also turns out to be a vital question of overall survival. Kant's critical spirit, which never separates from the deontological idea of human dignity, provides plenty of opportunities for joint reflection and as such does not wane at all. His motto could be summed up like this: philosophy makes intelligible what is true. This is actually the moment when existential responsibility inevitably becomes part of the demythologizing process. From this position, Kant was particularly aware of the danger hidden in giving priority to the so-called popular moral philosophy, which, as he used to say, always brings with it a "disgusting hodgepodge of patchwork observations and half-rationalized principles." In his book *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, he will thus note that generally shallow pates revel in this hodgepodge, satisfied with such seductive everyday chitchat, while philosophers, who see

through this deception, “get little hearing when they call [moralists] away for a time from this alleged popularity.”

Following this, it seems that one of the major problems of today’s philosophy is that students are encouraged merely to learn philosophy, and not to philosophize, which difference, as our Vladimir Filipović underscores, Kant knew very well and widely applied. For Kant, after all, no prescribed science or philosophy is needed to gain knowledge about what we should do to be partakers of good, honesty and virtue. The only thing that goes in favor of the necessity of philosophy is that the rationally pure and strict should not be made appropriate to our desires and inclinations. That vitality, which cannot be stopped by any so-called fateful circumstances, will of course have its own different historical accounts, but its uncertain courses will only here and there acknowledge such a wandering that complies with the philosophically asked *why?* and even more *what for?*, that is, as Kant himself concludes in the introduction to the *Metaphysics of Morals*: “The capacity of a being to act in accordance with its representations is called *life*.”

PROGRAM SKUPA / CONFERENCE PROGRAMME

Četvrtak, 21. studenoga

Thursday, 21 November

9:00-9:30

Otvaranje skupa i pozdravne riječi / Opening Ceremony and Welcoming Speeches

9:30-10:00

Plenarno predavanje / Plenary Lecture

Predrag Finci, »Kantov doprinos estetici« / "Kant's Contribution to Aesthetics"

10:00-10:15

Stanka / Pause

10:15-10:30

Ivan Milenković, »Slobodna igra sposobnosti (*Vermögen*): zajedničko osjetilo u *Kritici moći suđenja*« / "Free Play of Faculties (*Vermögen*): Common Sense in the *Critique of Judgment*"

10:30-10:45

Bernard Harbaš, »O suživotu bez suštine« / "On Living Together Without Essence"

10:45-11:00

Marijan Krivak, »'Ono' uzvišeno... Od Kanta i Lyotarda do neljudskog i tehnosfere« / "The Sublime. From Kant and Lyotard to the Inhuman and the Technosphere"

11:00-11:30

Rasprava / Discussion

11:30-12:00

Stanka / Pause

12:00-12:15

Ivana Jozić – Ivana Šarić Šokčević, »Kantov *Aufklärung* za početnike – ili kako jezikoslovci čitaju Kanta. Lingvistički pristup eseju« / "Kant's *Aufklärung* for Beginners – or How Linguists Read Kant. A Linguistic Approach to the Essay"

12:15-12:30

Sanja Ivanović Grgurić, »Čitanjem do prosvjećenja: Kantov poziv na kritičko čitanje« / "Reading for Enlightenment: Kant's Call to Critical Reading"

12:30-12:45

Tihomir Engler – Petra Žagar Šoštarić, »Schillerova drama *Wilhelm Tell* u svjetlu Kantove i Rousseauove misli« / "Schiller's play *Wilhelm Tell* in Light of Kant's and Rousseau's Thought"

12:45-13:15

Rasprava / Discussion

13:15-15:00

Stanka za ručak / Lunch break

15:00-15:15

Boško Pešić, »Kantov stav o idealizmu« / "Kant's Position on Idealism"

15:15-15:30

Pavao Žitko, »Kritička metafizika i ontološko »upotpunjavanje« Kanta« / "Critical Metaphysics and the Ontological 'Completion' of Kant"

15:30-15:45

Daniel Horvat, »Točka nesporazuma uma sa samim sobom« / "The Point Where Reason Has Misunderstood Itself"

15:45-16:15

Rasprava / Discussion

16:15-16:30

Željko Senković, »Usprkos. Kantov imperativ u horizontu ideje radikalnog zla« / "In Spite Of. Kant's Imperative in the Horizon of the Idea of Radical Evil"

16:30-16:45

Martina Volarević, »Lacanov kritika Kanta« / "Lacan's Critique of Kant"

16:45-17:00

Damir Sekulić, »Dostojanstvo kao duh slobode« / "Dignity as the Spirit of Freedom"

17:00-17:15

Katarina Jukić, »Problem otpora i postulat javnog prava u Kantovoj pravno-političkoj teoriji« / "The Problem of Revolution and the Postulate of Public Right in Kant's Theory of Law and Politics"

17:15-17:45

Rasprava / Discussion

Petak, 22. studenoga
Friday, 22 November

Studentska sekcija / Student Section

Tema: Kant i obrazovanje / Topic: Kant and Education

9:00-9:15

Pozdravne riječi / Welcoming speeches

9:15-9:30

Ivana Šojat, »Kultura kao polazište, sredstvo i *terminus* u Kantovu poimanju obrazovanja« / "Culture as a Starting Point, Medium and *Terminus* in Kant's Understanding of Education"

9:30-9:45

Marijana Mijić, »Odnos Kantove etike prema odgoju i obrazovanju« / "The Relation of Kant's Ethics to Upbringing and Education"

9:45-10:00

Karla Pružinac, »Kantovo razlikovanje javnog i privatnog uma« / "Kant's Distinction Between Public and Private Reason"

10:00-10:30

Rasprava / Discussion

10:30-10:45

Luka Prijić, »Od *despotēsa* do *basileusa*: Kantovo poimanje fizičkoga odgoja« / "From *Despotes* to *Basileus*: Kant's Understanding of Physical Education"

10:45-11:00

Ida Polak, »Sloboda u Kantovu poimanju odgoja i obrazovanja« / "The Concept of Freedom in Kant's Understanding of Upbringing and Education"

11:00-11:15

Ante Klisović, »Kantovo poimanje odgoja dječje moralnosti« / “Kant's Understanding of Children's Moral Upbringing”

11:15-11:45

Rasprava / Discussion

11:45-12:00

Stanka / Pause

12:00-12:15

Luka Mustapić, »Kantov doprinos suvremenom građanskom odgoju« / “Kant's Contribution to Contemporary Civic Education”

12:15-12:30

Irena Kapović, »Usporedba filozofskih pogleda Immanuela Kanta i Karla Marxa na odgoj i društvo« / “Comparison of the Philosophical Views of Immanuel Kant and Karl Marx on Education and Society”

12:30-12:45

Martina Ivanović, »Problem empatije i suvremeni izazovi obrazovanja postavljeni Kantovim poimanjem odgoja (i obrazovanja)« / “The Issue of Empathy and Contemporary Problems in Education Founded in Kant's Concept of Education”

12:45-13:15

Rasprava / Discussion

13:30-14:30

Radionica »Kant kao odgajatelj« / Workshop “Kant as Educator”
(Moderatori / Moderators: David Mrđanov i Karla Pružinac)

SAŽECI/ ABSTRACTS

Schillerova drama Wilhelm Tell u svjetlu Kantove i Rousseauove misli

Stvaralaštva Friedricha Schillera (1759. – 1805.) i Johanna Wolfganga Goethea (1749. – 1832.) predstavljaju vrhunac književne produkcije na njemačkom govornom području krajem 18. i početkom 19. stoljeća. Razdoblje je to Weimarske klasike (1794. – 1805.), čiji je teorijski postav uglavnom formulirao Friedrich Schiller u vidu programa estetskog odgoja čovjeka. U izlaganju se razmatraju idejne poveznice Schillerove drame *Wilhelm Tell* s Rousseauovom predodžbom o »dobrom divljaku« i Kantovom filozofijom morala, kako bi se na toj osnovi istaknuo i suvremeni značaj Schillerove drame kao poziva na uvijek aktualno propitivanje smisla i funkcije ljudske društvenosti i druželjubivosti, a pogotovo u doba urušavanja čovjekova habitusa uslijed obezglavljenja suvremenom digitalnom komunikacijom.

Schiller's Play Wilhelm Tell in Light of Kant's and Rousseau's Thought

The works of Friedrich Schiller (1759–1805) and Johann Wolfgang Goethe (1749–1832) represent the pinnacle of literary production in the German-speaking world at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. It is the period of the Weimar classics (1794–1805), whose theoretical framework was mainly formulated by Friedrich Schiller in the form of a program for the aesthetic education of humans. The presentation examines the conceptual links of Schiller's play *Wilhelm Tell* with Rousseau's notion of the "good savage" and Kant's moral philosophy, in order to highlight the contemporary significance of Schiller's play as a call to the ever-current questioning of the meaning and function of human sociability and friendliness, and especially in the era of the collapse of human habitus due to beheading by modern digital communication.

PREDRAG FINCI

Kantov doprinos estetici

Kant je neosporno veliki filozof. Jedan od najznačajnijih filozofa. Iako je bio vrlo obrazovan, o umjetnosti je znao vrlo malo. A ipak je njegova *Kritika moći suđenja* postala temeljna knjiga cjelokupne estetike i filozofije umjetnosti. Njegovi sudovi ukusa i razmatranje prosuđivačkih moći subjekta usmjerili su svako buduće promišljanje o estetskim fenomenima. Jesu li Kantova stajališta o estetskim fenomenima još uvijek relevantna u naše doba? O tome će biti riječi u mojem izlaganju.

Kant's Contribution to Aesthetics

Kant is one of the most significant philosophers of all time. He possessed encyclopaedic knowledge, but not so in the sphere of the arts. And yet his *Critique of Judgement* is one of the crucial books of the entire aesthetics and the philosophy of the arts. His judgement of the taste and the reflection on the critical judgement of the subject led to all forthcoming reflections of the aesthetic phenomena. Are Kant's views on aesthetic phenomena still relevant in this day and age? This will be the subject of my presentation.

BERNARD HARBAŠ

O suživotu bez suštine

U radu se obrađuje značaj teorije Immanuela Kanta za suvremenu političku filozofiju, a posebno njezin utjecaj za postmoderno razumijevanje koncepcije zajednice. Postmoderni mislioci uglavnom dijele mišljenje da je tradicionalni koncept zajednice totalitaran, jer naglašava istovjetnost njenih članova. Postmoderni teoretičari poput Jean-Françoisa Lyotarda, Jean-Luca Nancyja i Jacquesa Derridaa ne odbacuju klasični pristup zajednici, nego ga smatraju nemogućim, a za takvo se viđenje koriste Kantovom estetskom i etičkom teorijom. Lyotard u Kantovoj estetskoj teoriji nalazi osnovu za razumijevanje raskola zajednice. Zajedništvo je nemoguće jer ne postoji unaprijed utvrđeno pravilo prema kojem se djeluje, nego je svako djelovanje pojedinačno i uvjetovano okolnostima. U Kantovu razmatranju kozmopolitizma i gostoprimstva Derrida vidi zajednicu otvorenosti i razlike te nužnost suživota. Nancy polazi od koncepta kategoričkog imperativa, prema kojem naše etičko djelovanje nema unaprijed utvrđeno pravilo, što on poistovjećuje sa singularnim pluralnim postojanjem i nemogućnošću zasnivanja zajednice na zajedničkoj suštini koja bi uvijek i za sve vrijedila.

On Living Together Without Essence

The paper deals with the significance of Immanuel Kant's theory for contemporary political philosophy, and especially its influence for the postmodern understanding of the concept of community. Postmodern thinkers generally share the opinion that the traditional concept of community is totalitarian, because it emphasizes the identity of its members. Postmodern theorists such as Jean-François Lyotard, Jean-Luc Nancy and Jacques Derrida do not reject the classical approach to community, but consider it impossible, and for such a view they use Kant's aesthetic and ethical theory. Lyotard finds in Kant's aesthetic theory a basis for

understanding the community split. Communion is impossible because there is no pre-established rule according to which one acts, but each action is individual and conditioned by circumstances. In Kant's consideration of cosmopolitanism and hospitality, Derrida sees a community of openness and difference and the necessity of living together. Nancy starts from the concept of the categorical imperative, according to which our ethical action does not have a predetermined rule, which he equates with singular plural existence and the impossibility of basing a community on a common essence that would be valid always and for everyone.

DANIEL HORVAT

Točka nesporazuma uma sa samim sobom

Neke tvrdnje iz Kantove *Kritike čistoga uma* koriste se paradigmatki, konceptualno. Primjerice: »(...) glavno pitanje ostaje uvijek to, što i koliko razum i um mogu spoznati slobodni od svakog iskustva...«; »Iskustvo nam doduše kazuje, što jest, ali nam ne kaže, da to nužno mora biti tako, a ne drukčije.«; »Pomoću osjetilnosti predmeti nam se daju, dok se pomoću uma pomišljaju.«; »Morao sam dakle ukinuti znanje, da bih dobio mjesta za vjerovanje...«. Kako nam se pomoću osjetilnosti predmeti daju? Što je Kant mislio pod time da je morao ukinuti znanje da bi dobio mjesta za vjerovanje? Za interpretaciju i razumijevanje tih tvrdnji potrebno je poznavati *Kritiku* u cjelini. Izlaganjem će se nastojati dati interpretacija još jedne tvrdnje iz Kantove *Kritike* koja po opsežnosti materije koja je potrebna za njezino razumijevanje, kao i po svome paradigmatskom značaju, stoji, i treba stajati, uz bok navedenim primjerima. To je tvrdnja iz »Predgovora prvome izdanju« *Kritike* kojom nas Kant upoznaje kako je otkrio točku nesporazuma uma sa samim sobom. Što je točka nesporazuma uma sa samim sobom, od čega se sastoji? To je tema ovoga izlaganja.

The Point Where Reason Has Misunderstood Itself

Some claims from Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* are used paradigmatically, conceptually. For example: "... the chief question always remains: 'What and how much can understanding and reason cognize free of all experience?' ..."; "It [Experience] tells us, to be sure, what is, but never that it must necessarily be thus and not otherwise."; "... sensibility and understanding, through the first of which objects are given to us, but through the second of which they are thought."; "Thus I had to deny knowledge in order to make room for faith...". How are objects given to us through sensibility? What did Kant mean by claiming that he had had to

deny knowledge to make room for faith? To interpret and understand these claims, it is necessary to know the *Critique* as a whole. The presentation will attempt to give an interpretation of another claim from Kant's *Critique*, which, due to the extensiveness of the matter needed for its understanding, as well as its paradigmatic significance, stands, and should stand, alongside the examples mentioned. This is the claim from "Preface" of the *Critique*, with which Kant introduces us to how he discovered the point where reason has misunderstood itself. What is the point where reason has misunderstood itself, what does it consist of? That is the topic of this presentation.

Čitanjem do prosvjećenja: Kantov poziv na kritičko čitanje

U radu se analiziraju Kantovi stavovi o čitanju, čitateljstvu i izdavaštvu na primjeru pisama piscu i nakladniku Friedrichu Nicolaiu »Über die Buchmacherei« (1798.) te na primjeru eseja »Was ist Aufklärung?« (1784.). Smještajući navedena djela u povijesni kontekst uspona knjige i izdavaštva u Kantovo doba, u kojem navike masovnog čitanja postaju značajan kulturni fenomen, cilj je rada odgovoriti na pitanja: Što je Kant mislio o vještini čitanja i suvremenom čitateljstvu te na koje izazove pritom upozorava? U radu se nadalje razmatra Kantov doprinos isticanju važnosti razvoja kritičkog čitanja kao esencijalnog alata za intelektualni razvoj pojedinca i njegovu neovisnost od autoriteta i dogmi.

Reading for Enlightenment: Kant's Call to Critical Reading

The paper analyzes Kant's views on reading, readership and publishing on the example of letters to the writer and publisher Friedrich Nicolai "Über die Buchmacherei" (1798) and on the example of the essay "Was ist Aufklärung?" (1784). Placing the aforementioned works in the historical context of the rise of books and publishing in Kant's era, in which the habits of mass reading become a significant cultural phenomenon, the aim of the paper is to answer the questions: What did Kant think about the skill of reading and modern readership, and what challenges does he warn against? The paper further considers Kant's contribution to emphasizing the importance of developing critical reading as an essential tool for the intellectual development of an individual and their independence from authority and dogma.

*Kantov Aufklärung za početnike – ili kako jezikoslovci čitaju Kanta.
Lingvistički pristup eseju*

Da se često može čuti kako je njemački jezik težak i skoro nesavladiv, predrasuda je koju će svi germanisti poreći. Ne postoji težak strani jezik, nego samo nemotivirani učenici. Slično je i s čitanjem djela napisanih na njemačkom jeziku. Lijepa je književnost lektira koja se može naći na svim razinama učenja njemačkog kao stranog jezika, a filozofska djela traže ipak vrlo visoku jezičnu razinu. Kantova su djela bez sumnje lektira za vrlo napredne i vrlo motivirane govornike njemačkog kao stranog jezika. U njegovu se izričaju ogleda sva ljepota složenosti njemačke gramatike: od izbora riječi i kompleksnosti rečenica do vještih metafora i brizantnih izraza. Ono što jezikoslovac i filozof čitaju u jednom te istom Kantovu djelu nije isto. Jezikoslovac vidi značenje, formu i strukturu, filozof traži sadržaj i interpretaciju. Kantov esej »Was ist Aufklärung?« poslužit će kao ogledni primjer za lingvistički pristup eseju koji će uz pomoć hrvatskog prijevoda Kantov izvorni jezični izričaj pokušati približiti i široj publici. Uz čisti lingvistički opis jezika ponudit će se i semantički pristup o stvaranju značenja uporabom jezičnih struktura te postaviti pitanje o univerzalnosti poruka koje odašilje tekst.

*Kant's Aufklärung for Beginners – or How Linguists Read Kant. A
Linguistic Approach to the Essay*

It is often said that the German language is difficult and nearly insurmountable, a prejudice that all Germanists will refute. There is no such thing as a difficult foreign language, only unmotivated students. The same goes for reading works written in German. Belletristic literature can be found at all levels of learning German as a foreign language, but philosophical works require a very high level of linguistic proficiency.

Kant's works are undoubtedly reading material for very advanced and highly motivated speakers of German as a foreign language. In his expression, one can see all the beauty of the complexity of German grammar: from word choice and sentence complexity to skillful metaphors and impactful expressions. What a linguist and a philosopher read in the same work of Kant is not the same. The linguist sees meaning, form and structure, while the philosopher seeks content and interpretation. Kant's essay "Was ist Aufklärung?" will serve as a case study for a linguistic approach to the essay, which, with the help of a Croatian translation, will attempt to bring Kant's original linguistic expression closer to a wider audience. Alongside a purely linguistic description of the language, a semantic approach to how meaning is created through the use of linguistic structures will be offered, raising the question of the universality of the messages conveyed by the text.

Problem otpora i postulat javnog prava u Kantovoj pravno-političkoj teoriji

Kant u svojoj pravno-političkoj teoriji ne shvaća otpor kao pravo (čak ni kao sredstvo borbe protiv tiranske vlasti), što se može činiti iznenađujućim kada se uzme u obzir njegova podrška Francuskoj revoluciji. Međutim, držim da Kant prokazuje suptilniji moment u kojemu je zapravo riječ o dužnosti prepoznavanja povratka u prirodno stanje i svojevrstne »reaktivacije« pravne dužnosti ulaska u građansko stanje. Takav argument zahtijeva osvrtnje na Kantov postulat javnog prava koji glasi »iz odnosa neizbježnog supostojanja sa svima drugima prijeći u pravno stanje, tj. u stanje sudbene vlasti«. Hans Friedrich Fulda ukazuje, među ostalim, na imperativnu formulaciju postulata kojom je postulat upućen izravno svakom pojedincu, kako u prirodnom tako i u građanskom stanju, kao i to da zahtjev postulata nije ispunjen onda kada smo stvorili državu, već se nastavlja i, primjerice, zahtjevom za stvaranje kozmopolitskog međunarodnog poretka. Kantov vladar nema pravnih dužnosti (koje moraju podrazumijevati i prisilu), no to ne znači da mu je u političkom smislu dozvoljeno samovoljno djelovanje – ograničen je, dakle, stalno prijetjećom opasnosti od prirodnog stanja. Ta opasnost ne dolazi od podanika pobunjenika – jer funkcionalna će se država s njima lako obračunati, već od nesposobnosti vladara koja konačno dokida institucije javne vlasti. U situaciji kada on raspusti državu, osobama ne preostaje ništa drugo nego ponovno ući u građansko stanje. Kant napuštanje prirodnog stanja i (ponovnog) ulaska u građansko stanje formulira kao pravnu dužnost koja podrazumijeva prisilu, što znači da oni koji ne žele stupiti u građansko stanje na to mogu biti prisiljeni.

The Problem of Revolution and the Postulate of Public Right in Kant's Theory of Law and Politics

For Kant, revolution is not a right, not even as a means of fighting tyranny. However, I believe that a subtler point can be found in Kant's dealing with the problem of revolution – the duty to recognize the return to the state of nature and the “reactivation” of the legal duty to enter the civil state. This argument requires looking back at the postulate of public Right, which reads “When you cannot avoid living side by side with all others, you ought to leave the state of nature and proceed with them into a rightful condition, that is, a condition of distributive justice.” Hans Friedrich Fulda highlights, among other things, the imperative formulation of the postulate by which it is addressed to everyone, whether they are in state of nature or in the civil state, as well as the fact that the task of the postulate is not complete when the state is created, but still entails the request to create the cosmopolitan order. Kant's ruler has no legal duties, which does not mean that they are politically allowed to act arbitrarily – they are limited by the constantly threatening danger of the state of nature. This danger does not come from revolutionaries because a functioning state will easily deal with them, but from the incompetence of the ruler who gradually dissolves the state. In such a case people must re-enter the civil state. That is a legal duty which implies coercion, i.e., those who do not want to enter the civil state can be forced to do so.

»Ono« uzvišeno. Od Kanta i Lyotarda do neljudskog i tehnosfere

Izlaganje tematizira koncept »uzvišenog« kao jedan od temeljnih Kantove estetike. U trećoj *Kritici* Kant se pokazuje najproročijim glede predviđanja mračne totalitarne povijesti neljudskog u 20. i 21. stoljeću, i to bez vlastite namjere. Najprije se izlaže povijest termina. Tematiziraju se Longin, Burke, Mendelssohn... Zatim se lapidarno predstavlja i sama Kantova koncepcija »uzvišenog«, kako nam je prezentna u njegovoj *Kritici* moći suđenja (1790.). »Uzvišeno« se pokazuje neizostavnim izazovom svim našim moćima imaginacije. Izaziva osjećaj udivljenosti, ali i straha. Strah je to, ipak, koji je sretno prebrođen i preživljen. Sam će Kant ovaj koncept »uzvišenog« izuzeti iz područja estetičkog – gdje se supostavlja uz klasični pojam »lijepog« – te ga staviti u domenu čovjekova moralnog statusa. Nadalje se izlažu dvije postmoderne teorije »uzvišenog«. Jean-François Lyotard koncept – prijeporno – uzima za najvažniji u postmodernoj estetici. Fredric Jameson govori, u kontekstu Kulturne logike kasnog kapitalizma, o tzv. »histerički uzvišenom«. Tu se već pokazuje aksiološka dvosmislenost samog termina. Zaključak izlaganja supostavlja koncept »uzvišenog« uz onaj neljudskog i tehnosfere. U eri umjetne inteligencije i umjetnog života radi se o društvenoj entropiji globalnog kapitalizma. Dakle, o tehnosferi. U radikalnoj opciji, koncept onog »uzvišenog« jednako je čudovišan konceptu neljudskog, od Kafke nagoviještenog *Unheimlich*. Na koncu, kakvo je mjesto Kanta u današnjoj povijesno-filozofijskoj revalorizaciji? Svakako ono koje ga postavlja u domenu entuzijazma potaknutom duhom revolucioniranja postojećih okolnosti. Fichteovski, odabirete onakvog Kanta kakav ste čovjek.

The Sublime. From Kant and Lyotard to the Inhuman and the Technosphere

The presentation deals with the concept of the “sublime” as one of the fundamentals of Kant’s aesthetics. In the third *Critique*, Kant, without even intending it, proves to be the most prophetic regarding the prediction of the dark totalitarian history of the inhuman in the 20th and 21st centuries. First, the history of the term is presented. Longinus, Burke, Mendelssohn are discussed... Then Kant’s concept of the “sublime” is presented in a concise manner, as given to us in his *Critique of Judgment* (1790). The “sublime” proves to be an indispensable challenge to all our powers of imagination. It inspires a feeling of wonder, but also fear. It is a fear, however, that is happily overcome and survived. Kant excludes this concept of the “sublime” from the field of aesthetics – where it is juxtaposed with the classic concept of the “beautiful” – and places it in the domain of human moral status. Then, two postmodern theories of the “sublime” are presented. Jean-François Lyotard considers the concept – controversially – to be the most important in postmodern aesthetics. In the context of the *Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Fredric Jameson discusses the so-called “hysterically sublime.” The axiological ambiguity of the term itself is already shown here. The conclusion of the presentation juxtaposes the concept of the “sublime” with that of the inhuman and the technosphere. The era of artificial intelligence and artificial life is all about social entropy of global capitalism. So, all about the technosphere. In the radical option, the concept of the “sublime” is as monstrous as the concept of the inhuman, the *Unheimlich* hinted at by Kafka. Finally, what is Kant’s place in today’s historical-philosophical revaluation? Surely the one that places him in the domain of enthusiasm fueled by the spirit of revolutionizing existing circumstances. In the manner of Fichte, what sort of Kant one chooses depends on what sort of human one is.

Slobodna igra sposobnosti (Vermögen): zajedničko osjetilo u Kritici moći suđenja

Kantova *Kritika moći suđenja* nastoji odgovoriti na pitanje je li sudu ukusa (estetskom sudu) moguće osigurati nužnost i univerzalnost, odnosno jesu li i kako mogući estetski sudovi *a priori*. Sud je ukusa uvijek poseban – »ova je ruža lijepa« – te je sada pitanje može li se on podvrgnuti nekakvim pravilima, ili zakonima koji bi ga izvukli iz puke subjektivnosti koja se ne dotiče nikoga drugog osim onoga tko taj sud izriče? Sud ukusa, međutim, ne počiva ni na kakvim (logičkim) pravilima koja bi mu prethodila i koja bi ga određivala na onaj način, recimo, na koji je spoznaja uvjetovana zakonima razuma, te sud ukusa, prema tome, ne počiva na pojmu. Istovremeno, taj sud mora zadovoljiti uvjete prema kojima nije potrebna tuđa suglasnost (jer bi sud morao biti *a priori*) da bi važio, ali, istovremeno, on mora pripadati »predodžbi istog objekta« (pred kojim osjećamo zadovoljstvo, primjerice ruža) u »svakom drugom subjektu« (jer sud mora biti nužan i univerzalan). Umjesto pojma pojavljuje se zajedničko osjetilo (*sensus communis*) kao temelj suda ukusa. Kad god u igru uvede zajedničko osjetilo, *sensus communis*, Kant računa na potencijal onog zajedničkog. Ono *communis* upućuje na *communitas*, na nekakvu općost, odnosno zajednicu u kojoj prosuđujemo (prosuđivanje izvan zajednice, naime, ne bi imalo smisla jer sud se ne bi imalo kome saopćiti). Sud ukusa, utoliko, mora biti saopćiv da bi uopće bio sudom ukusa, ali bez posredovanja pojma. Kako je to, uopće, moguće? Kako možemo bilo što saopćiti bilo kome ukoliko nemamo pojmovnu mrežu koja važi nezavisno od bilo kakvog iskustva? Zajedničko osjetilo se, utoliko, sada razumije kao svojevrсни *a priori*. Ali kakav je to *a priori* koji se temelji na onome što je po definiciji iskustvo? Utoliko je potrebna, Kantovim riječima, »estetička općenitost ... od posebne vrste, jer predikat ljepote ne povezuje s pojmom objekta razmatranim u cijeloj njegovoj logičkoj sferi, a proteže ga ipak preko cijele sfere onih, koji sude«, odnosno, prema znamenitom Kantovu određenju, bez pojma izaziva opće sviđanje. Ovo izlaganje nastoji pokazati zaplete koji se nužno pojavljuju

uvođenjem zajedničkog osjetila kao konteksta u sferi koja nastoji važiti bez konteksta (dakle nužno i univerzalno). Ili, drugim riječima, može (a možda i mora) li se Kritika moći suđenja, na tragu Hanne Arendt i Gillesa Deleuzea, čitati prije svega kao politički tekst, kao ono što će Jacques Rancière nazvati »podjela osjetilnog« (*partage du sensible*).

Free Play of Faculties (Vermögen): Common Sense in the Critique of Judgment

Kant's *Critique of Judgment* tries to answer the question whether it is possible to ensure necessity and universality for the judgment of taste (aesthetic judgment), that is, whether and how aesthetic judgments are possible *a priori*. The judgment of taste is always singular – "this rose is beautiful" – and the question is whether it can be subjected to some kind of rules, or laws that would free it from mere subjectivity that does not concern anyone else but the one who makes that judgment? The judgment of taste, however, does not rest on any (logical) rules that would precede it and determine it in the way, say, in which knowledge is conditioned by the laws of understanding, and the judgment of taste, therefore, does not rest on concepts. At the same time, that judgment must satisfy the conditions according to which the consent of others is not required (because the judgment would have to be *a priori*) in order to be valid, but, at the same time, it must belong to the "representation of the same object" (in front of which we feel pleasure; for example, a rose) in "every other subject" (because the judgment must be necessary and universal). Instead of concepts, the common sense (*sensus communis*) appears as the basis of the judgment of taste. Whenever he brings into play the common sense, *sensus communis*, Kant counts on the potential of what is common. The *communis* refers to *communitas*, to some kind of generality, that is, the community in which we judge (judging outside the community, namely, would not make sense because there would be no one to communicate the judgment to). So, the judgment of taste must be communicable but without the mediation of

concepts. How is that even possible? How can we communicate anything to anyone if we do not have a conceptual network that is valid independently of any experience? To that extent, the common sense is now understood as a kind of a priori. But what kind of a priori is it, being based on what is by definition experience? Therefore, in Kant's words, "the aesthetic universality attributed to a judgement must also be of a special kind, seeing that it does not join the predicate of beauty to the concept of the object taken in its entire logical sphere, and yet does extend this predicate over the whole sphere of judging subjects," that is, according to Kant's famous definition, without a concept, arouses a universal liking. This presentation seeks to show the entanglements that necessarily arise from the introduction of the common sense as context in a sphere that tends to be valid without context (thus necessarily and universally). In other words, if the *Critique of Judgment*, in the footsteps of Hannah Arendt and Gilles Deleuze, can (and perhaps must) be read first of all as a political text, as what Jacques Rancière will call "the partition of the sensible" (*partage du sensible*).

Kantov stav o idealizmu

U drugom izdanju svoje prve Kritike, u odlomku znakovita naziva »Pobijanje idealizma«, Kant tvrdi da se usuprot onom tzv. problematičnom (kakav, primjerice, zastupa Descartes) i onom tzv. dogmatskom (kakav, primjerice, zastupa Berkeley) idealizmu, filozofski ipak može zaključiti na izvjesnost povezanosti one svijesti koja je određena vremenom u kojemu se nalazi i one svijesti koja je svjesna svih svojih odnosa prema izvanjskim stvarima. Međutim takvo iskustvo, kada je riječ o stvari(ma) po sebi, nije tek unutarnje zrenje, nego pretpostavlja vrstu realnosti koja upućuje na svekoliku umnost kao vrhovno načelo svakog svjetskog poretka. Transcendentalna dedukcija kategorija pritom se ispostavlja kao ključno mjesto Kantove idealističke filozofije jer otkriva takav jedan shematizam po kojemu se može govoriti o spoznaji istine koja nije njen puk rezultat, nego je sama ta spoznaja (transcendentalna) istina. Težište se izlaganja utoliko radikalizira pitanjem koliko i iskustvo takvog, transcendentalnog idealizma kao mogućnost iskustva uopće na koncu ostaje neshvaćeno kao skandal današnje filozofije.

Kant's Position on Idealism

In the second edition of his first Critique, in a section significantly titled "Refutation of Idealism", Kant claims that against the so-called problematic (such as represented by Descartes, for example) and the so-called dogmatic (such as represented by Berkeley, for example) idealism, one can still philosophically conclude on the certainty of the connection between the consciousness determined by the time in which it is and the consciousness conscious of all its relations to external things. However, such an experience, when it comes to the thing(s) in itself/themselves, is not just an inner intuition, but assumes a kind of reality that points to all rationality as the

supreme principle of every world order. The transcendental deduction of the categories turns out to be a key point of Kant's idealistic philosophy because it reveals such a schematism by which one can speak of knowledge of truth which is not its mere result, but that knowledge itself is (transcendental) truth. The focus of the presentation is thus radicalized by the question of how much the experience of such transcendental idealism as a possibility of experience in general remains misunderstood as a scandal of today's philosophy.

DAMIR SEKULIĆ

Dostojanstvo kao duh slobode

Izlaganje je zaokupljeno Kantovim konceptom javne upotrebe uma kao svojevrsnom osnovom prosvjetiteljstva. Naglasak je pritom posebice na ulozi slobode; naime, Kant upravo i samo slobodu smatra nužnim prosvjetiteljskim preduvjetom, i to baš slobodu javne upotrebe uma – koja, za razliku od one privatne, mora biti slobodna bez ikakvih ograničenja. Dok privatna upotreba uma kod Kanta podrazumijeva neku vrst heteronomije, upotreba je uma javna samo kada je autonomna, odnosno kada čovjek najprije odgovara samome sebi kao dijelu razumskoga svijeta. Tada je postupanje čovjeka obilježeno otvorenošću, jer on nastupa u ime vlastite osobnosti. Takvo se preuzimanje odgovornosti za vlastito biće može svesti na uspostavu i očuvanje čovjekova *dostojanstva*. Dostojanstva pak nema bez duha slobode, u kojem smislu Kant putem javne upotrebe uma poziva na *mišljenje* – samostalno, otvoreno, propitujuće, nenasilno, koje se obračunava s predrasudama i proširuje spoznaju. Poziv je to, dakle, na *slobodu* mišljenja, a koja se aktualizira tek slobodom izražavanja.

Dignity as the Spirit of Freedom

The presentation deals with Kant's concept of the public use of reason as a basis of enlightenment. The emphasis is placed on the role of freedom; namely, Kant considers freedom itself to be the sole necessary prerequisite for enlightenment – the freedom of the public use of reason, to be exact – which, unlike the private one, has to be free without any restrictions. While the private use of reason in Kant implies a kind of heteronomy, the use of reason is public only when it is autonomous, i.e., when a human being is first responsible to themselves as part of the rational world. In this case, a human being's behavior is characterized by openness, because they act on behalf of their own person. Such taking responsibility for one's own being

comes down to establishing and preserving human *dignity*. But there is no dignity without the spirit of freedom, in which sense Kant, through the public use of reason, calls for *thinking* – independent, open, questioning, nonviolent, dealing with prejudices and expanding knowledge. It is, therefore, a call for *freedom* of thinking, which is actualized only through freedom of expression.

Usprkos. Kantov imperativ u horizontu ideje radikalnog zla

U ovom izlaganju naglasit ću drugačijost najznačajnijeg modernog filozofa, Immanuela Kanta, a što ću izraziti sintagmom: Misliti i biti Usprkos. Analiza kategoričkog imperativa pokazat će mnoge antiteze: materijalno-formalno, subjektivno-objektivno, hipotetičko-kategoričko i heteronomno-autonomno, što je vodilo principijelnoj razlici između empirijske ugodaneugoda motivacije i moralne umne motivacije. Moralno dobro ono je djelovanje kojemu je odredbeni razlog motiv dužnosti (čista umna forma moralnog počela), dok moralno zlo ima odredbeni razlog u motivu nagnuća. Zbog toga su dobro i zlo primarno određenja volje. Kako unutar same Kantove etike, gdje su antinomije ključne, tako je i odnos njegove etike spram ideje radikalnog zla (iz djela *Religija u granicama pukog uma*) posebno antinomična i intrigantna tema *a propos* odnosa dobra i zla, te slobode nasuprot determinacija prirodne uzročnosti. Naime, što je radikalno (neiskorjenjivo) zlo u nama, i kako je onda uopće moguć moral (u Kantovu smislu)? Kant je izniman i zbog niza drugih aspekata svoje filozofije: ne okreće se tradiciji, odnosno njegova je originalnost i ponovno zasnivanje filozofije neusporedivo, kritizira tradicionalnu metafiziku, suprotstavlja se autoritarizmu i institucionalnoj religiji, protivi se raznovrsnim *bellum iustum* teorijama i umjesto pragmatičnoga političkog optiranja bezuvjetno se zalaže za mir. Sve navedeno, u cjelini njegove filozofije, jest moćno filozofsko *Usprkos*.

In Spite Of. Kant's Imperative in the Horizon of the Idea of Radical Evil

In this presentation, I will emphasize the otherness of the most significant modern philosopher, Immanuel Kant, which I will express with the phrase: To think and be in spite of. The analysis of the categorical imperative will show a plethora of antitheses: material-formal, subjective-objective,

hypothetical-categorical and heteronomous-autonomous, which led to the principal difference between empirical pleasure-displeasure motivation and reasonable moral motivation. Morally good is an action for which the determinative rationale is the motive of duty (the pure form of reason of the moral principle), while moral evil has the determinative rationale in the motive of inclination. Which is why good and evil are primarily determinations of will. Kant's ethics, in which the antinomies are key, as well as the relationship of his ethics to the idea of radical evil (from the work *Religion within the Bounds of Bare Reason*) is a particularly antinomical and intriguing topic *apropos* the relationship between good and evil, and freedom versus the determination of natural causality. Namely, what is radical (ineradicable) evil in us, and further, how is morality even possible (in Kant's sense)? Kant is also exceptional considering several other aspects of his philosophy: he does not turn to tradition, i.e., his originality and refoundation of philosophy is incomparable, he criticizes traditional metaphysics, he opposes authoritarianism and institutional religion, he opposes various bellum iustum theories and instead of pragmatic political opting, he unconditionally stands for peace. All of the above, in the entirety of his philosophy, is a powerful and philosophical *in spite of*.

MARTINA VOLAREVIĆ

Lacanova kritika Kanta

Ovo će se izlaganje usmjeriti prema Lacanovu čitanju *Kritike praktičnog uma*. Razlaganju problematike Lacan pristupa u seminaru *Etika psihoanalize* (1959. – 1960.) te u tekstu *Kant sa Sadeom*. Početna je točka Lacanova mišljenja Freudov stav o patogenoj prirodi moralnosti. Pogubno je za ljudsku prirodu ukoliko moral ograničava svaki vid nagonске tjelesne ugone. Nezadovoljeni nagonски impulsі subjekt najčešće vode u neurozu. Restriktivna se narav morala izrazito jasno pokazuje u Kantovoj etici koja odbacuje moralnu dimenziju svakog ponašanja koje je utemeljeno na načelu osobne ugone. Za Kanta ugoda ne može biti temelj praktičnog zakona jer joj nedostaje nužnost; ona je uvijek samo proizvoljna reakcija subjekta na empirijski dan objekt. Sredstvo susprezanja osjećaja samoljublja, koji je ishod djelovanja na temelju načela osobne ugone, jest moralni osjećaj. Moralni je osjećaj bol poniženja koja nastaje kada moralni subjekt rukovodi svoje djelovanje principima utemeljenim na osjećaju ugone. Lacan dovodi u odnos osjećanje boli Kantova moralnoga osjećaja sa Sadeovom empirijom boli u kojoj se postiže užitak pružanjem ili primanjem mučenja ili poniženja.

Lacan's Critique of Kant

This presentation will focus on Lacan's reading of the *Critique of Practical Reason*. Lacan approaches the analysis of the problem in the seminar *Ethics of Psychoanalysis* (1959–1960) and in the text *Kant with Sade*. The starting point of Lacan's consideration is Freud's position on the pathogenic nature of morality. It is disastrous for human nature if morality limits every form of instinctual bodily pleasure. Unsatisfied instinctual impulses most often lead the subject to neurosis. The restrictive nature of morality is very clearly demonstrated in Kant's ethics, which rejects the moral dimension of any behavior that is based on the principle of personal pleasure. For Kant,

pleasure cannot be the basis of practical law because it lacks necessity; it is always only an arbitrary reaction of the subject to an empirically given object. The means of restraining the feeling of self-love, which is the result of actions based on the principle of personal pleasure, is moral feeling. Moral feeling is the pain of humiliation that arises when the moral subject directs their actions by principles based on a feeling of pleasure. Lacan relates the feeling of pain of Kant's moral feeling with Sade's experience of pain in which pleasure is achieved by inflicting or receiving torture or humiliation.

Kritička metafizika i ontološko »upotpunjavanje« Kanta

Prevođenje metafizičke spekulacije u gotovo isključivo epistemički, no ne i ontološki relevantnu terminologiju i filozofijsku analitiku posljedica je, iako ne i prvotna nakana, Kantova kritičkog pristupa problemu. Rehabilitacija metafizike unutar jednog takvog teorijskog okvira i pod jakim filozofijskim premisama dualističkog razdvajanja subjekta od objekta, pod kojim bi onda iskustvovanje tog objekta od strane subjekta najdalje vodilo tek do predodžbeno, ali ne i noumenički utemeljene spoznaje stvarnosti, nije, po kasnijim ontologistički definiranim interpretacijama Kanta, u potpunosti uspjela. »Upotpunjavanje« kritike metafizikom postaje tako načinom na koji određene postkantovske tradicije, a u ovom slučaju filozofijska doktrina talijanske škole kritičkog ontologizma, nastoje realizirati upravo tu prvotnu Kantovu nakanu. U ovom se izlaganju, stoga, predstavljaju i obrađuju spekulativne premise takvog filozofijskog napora koji, u namjeri da dođe do Kanta »čišćeg« od Kanta samog, uvelike nadilazi kritički uspostavljena ograničenja istini sukladne filozofijske rasprave i misli općenito.

Critical Metaphysics and the Ontological "Completion" of Kant

The translation of metaphysical speculation into an almost exclusively epistemic terminology and philosophical analysis – rather than an ontological one – is a consequence, though not the original intention, of Kant's critical approach to the issue. The rehabilitation of metaphysics within this theoretical framework and strong philosophical premises of dualistic separation between subject and object – where the subject's experience of the object leads only to representational, rather than noumenal, knowledge of reality – has not been entirely successful, according to later ontologically defined interpretations of Kant. The "completion" of critique through metaphysics becomes the approach by

which certain post-Kantian traditions – in this case, the Italian school’s doctrine of critical ontologism – aim to fulfill Kant’s original intention. This presentation thus introduces and examines the speculative foundations of a philosophical endeavor that, in its aim to realize a Kant “purer” than Kant himself, significantly surpasses the critically established boundaries of truth-aligned philosophical discourse and thought overall.

STUDENTSKA SEKCIJA / STUDENT SECTION

MARTINA IVANOVIĆ

Problem empatije i suvremeni izazovi obrazovanja postavljeni Kantovim poimanjem odgoja (i obrazovanja)

Immanuel Kant problem odgoja promišlja temeljem obuhvatnog postavljanja čovjeka na noge kao kritički usmjerenog, umnog, moralnog bića. Prema tome, etička dimenzija jedan je od ključnih elemenata razvoja 'zrelog' mišljenja. Takva *paideia* je u aktualnosti predložena kao obrazovanje za život, iako u praktičkoj primjeni već naslućuje rezultat prividnog i zakržljalog odgoja koje potenciranjem, ali svjesnim izbjegavanjem osnaživanja kritičkog mišljenja za cilj ostavlja krnje moralne jedinice. Kantovo razmatranje odgoja (*Erziehung*) strogo postavlja sliku kontinuiranog procesa koji upućuje na suvremenu tematiku neprestanog rada na vlastitom razvijanju kritičkog mišljenja koje se po svemu sudeći nije maknulo dalje od potencije. Promatrajući pravilnike i propisane metodike, pored navedene problematike kritičkog mišljenja, empatija gotovo da nije prisutna u osnovnoškolskom obrazovanju, ako ne uzimamo u obzir pojedinačne učiteljske primjere ili pojedine usmjerene akcije. Drugim riječima, eksplicitni razgovor o empatiji ili njezinoj ulozi u razvijanju čovjeka izostaje. Ovim izlaganjem planira se ukazati na Kantovo poimanje odgoja s posebnim naglaskom na suvremenu problematiku te izložiti odgovore koji proizlaze iz tako postavljenog pojma čovjekovog odgoja i obrazovanja.

The Issue of Empathy and Contemporary Problems in Education Founded in Kant's Concept of Education

Immanuel Kant prominently discusses the problem of education as a comprehensive notion of bringing up a person as a critically oriented, reasonable, moral being. Therefore, the ethical dimension becomes one of the crucial elements for the development of mature thinking. Such a *paideia* is contemporarily proposed as education for life, although in practical

application it is already anticipatory of the result of an illusory and stunted comprehensive education, which, by emphasizing, but consciously avoiding, the strengthening of critical thinking, leaves truncated morally-reasonable individuals. Kant's exclusive attribution of education (*Erziehung*) to man, regarding Kant's specific determination of man, strictly sets the image of a continuous process of education that points to the contemporary theme of constant work on one's own development of critical thinking, which seemingly has not moved beyond potency. In addition to the aforementioned issue of critical thinking, empathy is imperceptibly present in primary school education, if one observes the regulations and prescribed curriculums. Empathy is latently present in the arbitrary approach to students or additional activities of the institution such as specifically targeted actions. There is no explicit discussion about empathy or its role in human development. The goal of this presentation is to point out Kant's understanding of education with special emphasis on contemporary issues and to present the problems arising from such a concept of human upbringing and education.

IRENA KAPOVIĆ

Usporedba filozofskih pogleda Immanuela Kanta i Karla Marxa na odgoj i društvo

Filozofsko pitanje uloge odgoja, preoblikovano suvremenim duhom vremena, dobilo je sociološki značaj kao konstitutivni čimbenik društva. Razmatranje problema odgoja djelima Immanuela Kanta i Karla Marxa pokazuje da je njegova uloga proporcionalna njihovim općim filozofskim orijentacijama. Kant, koji naglašava značaj moralne autonomije i razuma, poistovjećuje ulogu odgoja s individualnim moralnim razvojem, dok Marx, orijentiran na pitanja klasne borbe i nejednakosti, predstavlja mogućnost kolektivnog djelovanja kao ključni problem odgoja. Kao predstavnici dva različita pristupa odgoju, Kant i Marx nedvojbeno pridonose suvremenoj raspravi povezanosti odgoja i društvenih odnosa. O tome će biti riječi u izlaganju.

Comparison of the Philosophical Views of Karl Marx and Immanuel Kant on Education and Society

The enduring question of the philosophical role of education, reshaped by the contemporary spirit of time, has assumed sociological significance as the constitutive factor of society. Consideration of the problem of education in the works of Immanuel Kant and Karl Marx shows that its role is proportional to their general philosophical orientations. Kant, who emphasizes the importance of moral autonomy and reason, equates the role of education with individual moral development, while Marx, oriented towards issues of class struggle and inequality, presents the possibility of collective action as the key issue in education. Representing two different approaches to education, Kant and Marx undeniably contribute to the modern debate on the educational impact on society. This will be discussed in the presentation.

Kantovo poimanje odgoja dječje moralnosti

Izlaganje ima za cilj istražiti i shvatiti Kantovu filozofiju odgoja, a pogotovo odgoja moralnosti. Kant u svojoj filozofiji ističe kako je čovjeku nužan odgoj, te ga dijeli na tjelesni i praktični ili moralni odgoj. Tjelesni odgoj obuhvaća samo rani dio odgoja u kojem se dijete othranjuje i disciplinira, dok se u praktičnom djelu odgoja čovjek formira kao biće koje ima moral. Moralnost mora isključivo dolaziti iz maksima i zakona dužnosti. Pojmovi poput maksima i zakona dužnosti složeni su za dječji um, te se oni jedino mogu usaditi u djecu ako imaju dobro izgrađen karakter. U tom smislu, religija i Bog pojmovi su koje Kant izbjegava u svojoj filozofiji odgoja zbog toga što oni pružaju nagradu za činjenje dobrih djela budući da, prema njemu, dobra djela trebaju biti sama po sebi dovoljna bez ikakve nagrade, i trebali bi ih činiti radi dobra sama. Ovo izlaganje dolazi do zaključka da je Kantova filozofija odgoja po tome relevantna i danas u suvremenoj pedagogiji.

Kant's Understanding of Children's Moral Upbringing

The goal is to research and understand Kant's philosophy of upbringing, especially moral upbringing. In his philosophy Kant emphasizes that humans need upbringing and divides it into physical and practical or moral upbringing. Physical upbringing only covers the early stages of being brought up focusing on nurturing and discipline, while on the other hand practical upbringing forms the morality of a human. Morality must exclusively come from motivation by duty and maxims. Concepts like these are hard for children to grasp and can only be instilled into children if they have a well-built character. Religion and God are ideas that Kant likes to avoid in his philosophy of upbringing because they add a reward for doing good deeds. According to Kant, good deeds must be enough by themselves without any rewards for doing them. We should do good deeds for the sake of goodness. This

presentation concludes that Kant's philosophy of upbringing is still relevant in contemporary pedagogy.

MARIJANA MIJIĆ

Odnos Kantove etike prema odgoju i obrazovanju

Djeca i mlade osobe primarni su subjekti formalnog odgoja i obrazovanja. Oni su također osjetljiva društvena skupina, zbog čega proces odgoja i obrazovanja treba koncipirati na za njih najbolji mogući način. Najnoviji su rezultati tih napora suvremene metode podučavanja, raznoliki materijali i digitalni alati za izvođenje nastave. Time se nastava obogatila za efektivnost, ali osiromašila za pitanje njezina istinskog cilja. Za ponovno otvaranje potonjeg pitanja, poticajno je Kantovo promišljanje o odgoju i obrazovanju kao predispozicijama za čovjekov napredak i izlazak iz sirovog stanja prirode. Proces je odgoja i obrazovanja za njega svrhovit, složen i bitno drugačiji od aktivnosti igre. Ono što se njime treba dosegnuti tiče se oblikovanja vlastitih stavova i karaktera. To se pak pokazuje u suglasju s Kantovim razmatranjima o dužnosti, autonomiji volje i ostvarenju čovječnosti.

The Relationship of Kant's Ethics to Upbringing and Education

Children and young people are the primary subjects of formal education. They are also a sensitive social group, which is why the process of upbringing and education should be conceived in the best possible way for them. The latest results of these efforts are modern teaching methods, diverse materials and digital tools for teaching. This made teaching richer for effectiveness, but poorer for the question of its true goal. To reopen the latter question, Kant's reflection on upbringing and education as predispositions for human progress and exit from the raw state of nature is stimulating. For him, the process of upbringing and education is purposeful, complex and fundamentally different from game activities. What should be achieved with it concerns shaping one's own attitudes and character. This, in turn, is shown to agree with Kant's considerations on duty, the autonomy of the will and the realization of humanity.

LUKA MUSTAPIĆ

Kantov doprinos suvremenom građanskom odgoju

Kantov doprinos suvremenom građanskom odgoju neosporan je te fundamentalno važan. Njegova filozofija naglašava autonomiju kao ključni aspekt ljudskog razvoja, gdje je u središtu moralni razvoj. Kant je vjerovao u važnost obrazovanja u kojem se potiče osjećaj društvene odgovornosti i unutrašnja disciplina te da je obrazovanje važno i za razvoj autonomnih ljudi koji djeluju prema vlastitim moralnim uvjerenjima. Kant također potiče razvoj kritičkog mišljenja kako bi pojedinci postali aktivni sudionici društva. Njegove ideje, oblikovane u kontekstu prosvjetiteljstva, relevantne su i danas, nudeći temelje modernom pristupu prema građanskom odgoju. Kant ističe kako odgoj ne smije biti tiranski, već da kroz moralni odgoj treba poticati autonomiju i samodisciplinu kod djece. Povezano s time, kroz moralni odgoj, učenici razvijaju svoj moralni kompas koji ih vodi prema moralnom i odgovornom djelovanju kao građana. Kantove ideje u suvremenom dobu nude vrijedne smjernice za odgoj koji teži formiranju moralnih i odgovornih građana sposobnih za samostalno i etično djelovanje.

Kant's Contribution to Contemporary Civic Education

Kant's contribution to contemporary civic education is indisputable and essential. His philosophy emphasizes autonomy as a key aspect of human development, where moral development is at the center. Kant believed in the importance of education in which a sense of social responsibility and internal discipline are encouraged, and he believes that education is also important for the development of autonomous people who act according to their own moral convictions. Kant also encourages the development of critical thinking, so that individuals become active participants in society. His ideas, shaped in the context of the Enlightenment, are still relevant today, offering the foundations

for a modern approach to civic education. Kant points out that education must not be tyrannical, but through moral education it is necessary to encourage autonomy and self-discipline in children. Related to this, through moral education, students develop their moral compass that leads them towards moral and responsible action as citizens. Kant's ideas in the modern age offer valuable guidelines for an upbringing that strives to form moral and responsible citizens capable of independent and ethical action.

Sloboda u Kantovu poimanju odgoja i obrazovanja

U izlaganju se prikazuje Kantova ideja slobode u okvirima odgoja i obrazovanja i pojedinih pedagoških pravaca. Kant ističe važnost slobode kao temeljne vrijednosti u odgojno-obrazovnom procesu, smatrajući da je odgoj sredstvo za postizanje samostalnosti i racionalnosti. U svom djelu *Kritika čistog uma* Kant naglašava da je sloboda neophodna za moralni razvoj budući da samo slobodan pojedinac može biti sposoban samostalno odlučivati te autonomno djelovati. Odgojno-obrazovni rad treba poticati i njegovati samostalnost učenika te nuditi situacije u kojima je moguće prakticirati istu. U tom kontekstu Kant upozorava na važnost učitelja u postizanju autonomije učenika te ističe da jedino odgojen čovjek može odgajati druge. Na učitelju tako leži velika odgovornost za postajanje učenika onime što jesu u svojoj još neostvarenoj slobodi te je na njemu da svojim autoritetom stoji kao primjer, time što i dalje ostavlja prostor za samoaktualizaciju. Jedno od glavnih pitanja jest i uravnoteženje odnosa disciplina-sloboda, što Kant tematizira u djelu *O pedagogiji*, a što predstavlja jedno od težišta ovoga izlaganja.

The Concept of Freedom in Kant's Understanding of Education

The presentation explores Kant's idea of freedom in the framework of upbringing and education and certain pedagogical directions. Kant emphasized the importance of freedom as a fundamental value in the educational process, considering education a means for achieving independence and rationality. In his book *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant stresses that freedom is essential for moral development, as only a free individual can make independent decisions and act autonomously. Educational practice should encourage and cultivate student independence, providing situations where this independence can be exercised. In this context, Kant highlights the importance of the teacher in fostering student autonomy, asserting that only

an educated person can educate others. Thus, the teacher holds a great responsibility in guiding students to become their true selves within their not-yet-realized freedom, standing as an example through authority while still allowing space for self-actualization. One of the central issues is balancing discipline and freedom—a topic Kant addresses in *On Pedagogy*, which serves as one of the foundational points of this presentation.

Od despotēsa do basileusa. Kantovo poimanje tjelesnoga odgoja

U izlaganju se pojašnjava važnost tjelesnog odgoja u Kantovoj ideji čovjekova razvitka. Uvodno se putem antičke tradicije i antičkoga književnog korpusa, prvobitno *Biblije* i Platonova djela *Politeia*, prikazuje leksička razlika dvaju starogrčkih pojmova *despotēs* i *basileus* te se dovode u vezu s Kantovim poimanjem čovjeka u nerazvijenoj fazi i razvijenoj fazi. Uspoređujući pojam *basileus* i *despotēs* u navedenim djelima u potpunosti se kristalizira njihovo značenje te omogućuje potpunije shvaćanje Kantove sintagme despotska volja koja je prisutna u ranoj dobi djece te ju obilježavaju nekontrolirano ponašanje, vika te u konačnici bijes. Potom se prikazuju osnovne sastavnice tjelesnog odgoja poput hranjenja, dojenja ljudskim, odnosno životinjskim mlijekom itd. Prikazuju se filozofski utjecaji koji su Kanta nagnali na donošenje sudova vezanih za fizički odgoj te se posebni fokus stavlja na filozofsku misao Pestalozzija i Rousseaua iznoseći u kojoj mjeri Kant odstupa od navedenih izvora ili im prijanja. Naposljetku, razmatraju se Kantovi izravni savjeti vezani uz prve mjesece djetetova života i njihova relevantnost u današnjem dobu uspoređujući ih sa suvremenim medicinskim pogledima.

From Despotēs to Basileus. Kant's understanding of physical education

This presentation discusses the importance of physical upbringing in Kant's idea of human development. Through ancient tradition and ancient literary corpus, primarily the *Bible* and Plato's work *Politeia*, the presentation shows lexical differences of two ancient Greek words, *despotēs* and *basileus*, and their meaning relates to Kant's understanding of the human undeveloped and developed stages. By comparing the terms, their meaning is fully crystallized and it enables a more complete understanding of Kant's syntagm 'despotic will,' which is present in children at early age and is characterized by uncontrolled behavior, shouting and, ultimately, anger. After that, the basic

components of physical upbringing are presented, such as feeding, breastfeeding with human or animal milk, etc. Then the philosophical influences that led Kant to make judgments related to physical upbringing are thematized, and special focus is placed on the philosophical thought of Pestalozzi and Rousseau, considering the extent to which Kant deviates from or acknowledges them. Lastly, Kant's direct advice related to the first months of a child's life is observed, and they are compared with modern medical views showing their relevance today.

Kantova razlika javnog i privatnog uma

Promišljajući duhovno stanje svoga vremena, Kant je razmatrao povezanost svevremenog i danas aktualnog problema obrazovanja s privatnim i javnim umom te slobodom. Može se reći da je sloboda javne uporabe uma, temeljem maksime rasudne snage, tj. sposobnosti refleksivne apriorne usporedbe vlastitog suda sa stajalištem svih drugih, njegov ključni doprinos prosvjetiteljskoj misli. S obzirom na to, izlazak iz (samoskrivljene) nepunoljetnosti iziskuje slobodu javnog uma, odnosno hrabrost za stvaranjem i izražavanjem vlastitoga mišljenja, popraćenu preuzimanjem brige za sebe. Dok privatna upotreba uma označava službovanje, izvršavanje tuđih naredbi i pravila struke poput podučavanja utvrđenome gradivu, javna upotreba uma podrazumijeva osobno slobodno obraćanje cijelom svijetu, iznošenje novih perspektiva u javnosti, poput pisanja znanstvenih radova radi doprinosa općem dobru. Na temelju toga, Kant smatra da tek njegovanje javnog uma omogućuje građanstvo utemeljeno na načelima slobode, jednakosti i samostalnosti. Povezano s time, zagovara on humanost u obrazovanju i odgoj za bolju budućnost, inzistirajući na vođenju djece u samostalnom razmišljanju i spoznavanju te razvoju kao slobodnih bića. Zaključno, može se reći da je Kantovo poimanje fenomena slobode javnoga uma anticipiralo stanje današnjice, obilježeno nesrazmjerom tehnologijskog i humanističkog razvoja, neravnotežom vrijednosti, osjećajem izgubljenosti te prijetećom katastrofom. Stoga bi razmatranje njegovih ideja moglo inspirirati duhovno osamostaljenje, istraživanje novih ideja i njihovo slobodno iznošenje javnosti, shvaćanje značaja obrazovanja budućih generacija te angažman oko njegova stremjenja k miru i slobodi.

Kant's Distinction Between Public and Private Reason

Reflecting on the spiritual state of his time, Kant considers the connection between a timeless problem of education and the private and public reason and freedom. It can be said that the freedom of the public use of reason, based on the maxim of rational power, i.e., the ability to reflexively *a priori* compare one's own judgment with the point of view of all others, is his key contribution to Enlightenment thought. That being said, emerging from (self-imposed) immaturity requires the freedom of public reason, that is, the courage to create and express one's own opinion, accompanied by taking care of oneself. While the private use of reason signifies a local performance of some civic service, following the orders of others and the rules of a profession such as teaching established material, the public use of reason implies a personal free address to the whole world, presenting new perspectives to the public, such as writing scientific papers to contribute to the common good. Based on this, Kant believes that only nurturing public reason enables citizenship based on the principles of freedom, equality and independence. Related to this, he advocates humanity in education and upbringing for a better future, insisting on guiding children in independent thinking and cognition and development as free beings. In conclusion, it can be said that Kant's understanding of the problem of the freedom of public reason anticipated the state of today, characterized by a disproportion between technological and humanistic development, an imbalance of values, a feeling of being lost, and a threatening catastrophe. Therefore, the consideration of his ideas could inspire spiritual independence, the exploration of new ideas and their free presentation to the public, the understanding of the importance of the education of future generations, and the commitment to its pursuit of peace and freedom.

IVANA ŠOJAT

Kultura kao polazište, sredstvo i terminus u Kantovu poimanju obrazovanja

Kant terminološki i sadržajno odgoj odjeljuje od kulture koju smješta u domenu obrazovanja, ali ne kao strogo odijeljene komponente u umnome nastojanju u odnosu na mlade, nego kao konsektivnosti koje slijede jedna drugu u svrhu sveobuhvatnosti. Odgoj je, naime, u njegovu učenju ono čime se dijete odvaja od divljaštva. Kulturu kao nadogradnju odgoju shvaća kao civilizacijsku stečevinu, sveukupnost znanja i umijeća stečenih do određenog trenutka u vremenu, sveukupnost koju valja usvojiti kao polazište budućeg napretka, širenja paradigme. U tom bismo smislu za Kanta mogli reći da ljudsko dijete smatra *tabulom rasom*, neotesanom protežnošću koja vazda iziskuje svojevršno formatiranje, za razliku od mladunčadi životinja kojoj je od trenutka rođenja data svojevrсна imanentnost ponašanja sukladnog opstanku, opstajanju na životu. Ljudsko biće za ljudskost treba formatiranje odgojem, a zatim i civiliziranost obrazovanjem temeljenim na usvajanju kulture.

Culture as a Starting Point, Medium and Terminus in Kant's Understanding of Education

Kant separates education terminologically and content-wise from culture, which he places in the domain of education, but not as a strict division of components in mental effort in relation to young people, but as consecutives that follow each other for the purpose of comprehensiveness. Namely, in his theory, education is what separates the child from savagery. He understands culture as an extension of education as a civilizational asset, the totality of knowledge and skills acquired up to a certain point in time, a totality that should be adopted as a starting point for future progress, the expansion of the paradigm. In this sense, we could say that Kant considers the human child to be a *tabula rasa*, an uncouth expanse that always requires a kind of formatting, in contrast to animal cubs, which from the moment of birth are given a kind of

immanence of behavior in accordance with survival, staying alive. For humanity, a human being needs formatting through education, and then civilization through education based on the adoption of culture.

RADIONICA »KANT KAO ODGAJATELJ«

Studentska radionica dio je programa Tjedna filozofije (2024.) na Filozofskom fakultetu u Osijeku osmišljena u znaku tristote obljetnice rođenja velikoga filozofa Immanuela Kanta. Živimo u vremenu u kojemu se njegovi spisi itekako čine potrebnim za ponovno čitanje. Kao studenti filozofije smatramo da ono čemu nas Kantova filozofija podučava ima značajnog udjela u današnjoj pedagogiji i obrazovnim znanostima. Kant kao odgajatelj prvenstveno se pojavljuje preko svoje razrade filozofskih načela autonomije, slobodnog djelovanja i individualne moralnosti. Takav bi odgoj u Kantovu shvaćanju trebao pomoći pojedincima u razvoju sposobnosti samostalnog razmišljanja i donošenja ispravnih moralnih odluka. Smatrao je da se svrha obrazovanja ne iscrpljuje samo prenošenjem znanja, već i oblikovanjem moralnog karaktera kao i sposobnosti kritičkog mišljenja. U ključu takvog razumijevanja disciplina se ispostavlja kao ključni element odgoja, ali njen smisao prema Kantu ne bi smio biti represivan, već bi se trebao postaviti kao sredstvo ostvarenja osobne slobode. Djeci je u tom smislu potrebno dati poduku kojom će naučiti ovladati svojim nagonima i ponašati se u skladu s moralnim zakonom. Učitelj pritom ima presudnu ulogu, naročito u pomoći pri razvijanju kritičkog mišljenja i moralnog prosuđivanja. Umjesto gotovih odgovora, Kant nalaže učenje samostalnog postavljanja pitanja. Budući da se moralnost ne može naučiti prisilom ili poticajem izvanjskog nagrađivanja, već samo razumijevajućim prihvaćanjem moralnih zakona, moralni odgoj nameće se kao središnji dio takve pedagogije koja je u stanju dati istinski doprinos stvaranju društva utemeljenog u praktičkoj racionalnosti.

Ciljevi su ove studentske radionice višestruki i mogu se rasporediti na sljedeći način:

1. Upoznavanje s Kantovom filozofijom: sudionici će steći osnovno razumijevanje Kantovih ključnih filozofskih ideja, uključujući kategorički imperativ, autonomiju i racionalnost.
2. Razumijevanje Kantovih pedagoških načela: sudionici će istražiti kako Kantova filozofija utječe na njegove ideje o obrazovanju i odgoju, s posebnim naglaskom na razvoj autonomije i moralnog prosuđivanja kod učenika.

3. Primjena Kantovih ideja u suvremenom obrazovanju: sudionici će raspravljati o načinima na koje se Kantove pedagoške ideje mogu primijeniti u današnjim obrazovnim sustavima i praksama.

4. Poticanje na kritičko mišljenje: radionica će poticati sudionike na kritičko promišljanje o ulozi učitelja i važnosti moralnog odgoja, koristeći Kantove ideje kao polazište.

5. Praktične aktivnosti i diskusije: sudionici će sudjelovati u praktičnim aktivnostima i grupnim diskusijama kako bi bolje razumjeli i primijenili Kantova pedagoška načela u stvarnim situacijama.

6. Evaluacija i refleksija: na kraju radionice, sudionici će imati priliku evaluirati naučeno i reflektirati o tome kako mogu integrirati Kantove ideje u svoj rad ili osobni razvoj.

Sudionici: osječki i vukovarski gimnazijski učenici i učenice te studentice i studenti Odsjeka za filozofiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Osijeku.

Moderatori: David Mrđanov i Karla Pružinac

WORKSHOP “KANT AS AN EDUCATOR”

The student workshop is part of the Philosophy Week program at the Faculty Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek, designed to mark the three-hundredth anniversary of the birth of the great philosopher Immanuel Kant. We live in a time where his writings seem very much in need of re-reading. As students of philosophy, we believe that what Kant's philosophy teaches us has a significant role in today's pedagogy and educational sciences. Kant as an educator appears primarily through his elaboration of the philosophical principles of autonomy, free action and individual morality. In Kant's understanding, such education should help individuals develop the ability to think independently and make moral decisions. He believed that the purpose of education is not exhausted only by imparting knowledge, but also by shaping moral character as well as the ability to think critically. In such an understanding, discipline turns out to be a key element of education, but its meaning according to Kant, should not be repressive, but should be positioned as a means of achieving personal freedom. In this sense, it is necessary to teach children how to control their impulses and behave in accordance with the moral law. The teacher has a crucial role, especially in helping to develop critical thinking and moral judgment. Instead of ready-made answers, Kant orders learning to ask questions independently. Since morality cannot be learned by coercion or the incentive of external rewards, but only by an understanding acceptance of moral laws, moral education is imposed as a central part of such a pedagogy that is able to make a true contribution to the creation of a society based on practical rationality.

The goals of this student workshop are multiple and can be divided as follows:

1. Introduction to Kant's philosophy: participants will gain a basic understanding of Kant's key philosophical ideas, including the categorical imperative, autonomy, and rationality.
2. Understanding Kant's pedagogical principles: participants will explore how Kant's philosophy influences his ideas about education and upbringing, with

a special emphasis on the development of autonomy and moral judgment in students.

3. Application of Kant's ideas in contemporary education: participants will discuss ways in which Kant's pedagogical ideas can be applied in today's educational systems and practices.

4. Encouraging critical thinking: the workshop will encourage participants to think critically about the role of teachers and the importance of moral education, using Kant's ideas as a starting point.

5. Practical activities and discussions: participants will take part in practical activities and group discussions in order to better understand and apply Kant's pedagogical principles in real situations.

6. Evaluation and reflection: at the end of the workshop, participants will have the opportunity to evaluate what they have learned and reflect on how they can integrate Kant's ideas into their work or personal development.

Participants: high school students from Osijek and Vukovar, as well as students from the Department of Philosophy at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Osijek.

Moderators: David Mrđanov and Karla Pružinac

**ADRESAR IZLAGAČA/
ADDRESSES OF THE SPEAKERS**

Tihomir Engler
Filozofski fakultet
L. Jägera 9
HR-31000 Osijek
tengler@ffos.hr

Bernard Harbaš
Filozofski fakultet
Zmaja od Bosne 52
BiH-72000 Zenica
bernard.harbas@unze.ba

Martina Ivanović
Filozofski fakultet
I. Lučića 3
HR-10000 Zagreb
martty6b@gmail.com

Ivana Jozić
Filozofski fakultet
L. Jägera 9
HR-31000 Osijek
ivanajozic212@gmail.com

Irena Kapović
Dubrovačka 29
HR-32270 Županja
irene.kapo1612@gmail.com

Marijan Krivak
Filozofski fakultet
L. Jägera 9
HR-31000 Osijek
mkrivak@ffos.hr

Predrag Finci
30 Newlands Place
UK-EN5 2SX Barnet
predrag.finci@gmail.com

Daniel Horvat
Crni put 30
HR-31200 Višnjevac
daniel.horvat68@gmail.com

Sanja Ivanović Grgurić
Filozofski fakultet
L. Jägera 9
HR-31000 Osijek
sanjagrguric11@gmail.com

Katarina Jukić
Fakultet političkih znanosti
I. Lepušića 6
HR-10000 Zagreb
katarinajukic247@gmail.com

Ante Klisović
Lapovačka 6
HR-32100 Vinkovci
ante.klisovic110@gmail.com

Marijana Mijić
Zvečevska 3
HR-31000 Osijek
marijanamijic99@gmail.com

Ivan Milenković

Treći program Radio Beograda
Hilandarska 2,
RS-11000 Beograd
ives_bg@yahoo.fr

Boško Pešić

Filozofski fakultet
L. Jägera 9,
HR-31000 Osijek
bpesic@ffos.hr

Luka Prijić

Baranjska 58,
HR-31000 Osijek
lprijic@ffos.hr

Damir Sekulić

Filozofski fakultet
L. Jägera 9 ,
HR-31000 Osijek
dsekulic@ffos.hr

Ivana Šarić Šokčević

Filozofski fakultet
L. Jägera 9,
HR-31000 Osijek
isaricsokcevic@ffos.hr

Martina Volarević

Filozofski fakultet
L. Jägera 9,
HR-31000 Osijek
mzezelj@ffos.hr

Luka Mustapić

Matije Gupca 5,
HR-31554 Taborjanci
lmustapic23@gmail.com

Ida Polak

Prosina 12b,
HR-32000 Vukovar
ida.polak032@gmail.com

Karla Pružinac

Dravska obala 18,
HR-31000 Osijek
karla.pruzinac@gmail.com

Željko Senković

Filozofski fakultet
L. Jägera 9,
HR-31000 Osijek
zsenkovic@ffos.hr

Ivana Šojat

N. Š. Zrinskog 10,
HR-31000 Osijek
ivanasojat13@gmail.com

Pavao Žitko

Filozofski fakultet
L. Jägera 9,
HR-31000 Osijek
pzitko@ffos.hr

