

## Learning and Development in Phenomenological Structuralism: Thinking Vygotsky via Chomsky

Paul C. Mocombe\*

The Mocombeian Foundation, Inc, West Virginia State University, United States

**\*Corresponding author**

*Paul C. Mocombe*

**Article History**

*Received: 16.12.2017*

*Accepted: 28.12.2017*

*Published: 30.01.2018*



**Abstract:** Building on structurationist theory of sociology, Vygotskyian sociocultural theory, Chomskyian cognitive linguistics, and postmodern and poststructural logic regarding the decentered subject and indeterminacy of meaning this work explores the origins and nature of human consciousness, cognition, social action, learning, and development within Paul C. Mocombe's phenomenological structural sociology, phenomenological structuralism. The article attempts to synthesize Vygotskyian sociocultural theory with Chomskyian cognitive linguistics in order to offer a more complete understanding of human consciousness, action, cognition, learning, and development amidst the postmodern and post-structural attempt to decenter the subject.

**Keywords:** Phenomenological Structuralism, Structurationism, Haitian/Vilokan Idealism, Social Class Language Game

### INTRODUCTION

In the attempt to resolve the structure/agency debate of the social sciences, Paul C. Mocombe [1] developed his phenomenological structural sociology, phenomenological structuralism, by building on the duality language of structuration's sociology while holding on to the idea of dualism through the reification of the social relations of production via the Althusserian logic of ideology and ideological apparatuses.

The psychological consequence of this philosophical and sociological project is the revelation by Mocombe that human cognition, action, learning, and development is both Vygotskyian and Chomskyian. That is, the human subject acts, learns, and develops based initially on its genetic and subatomic particle drives and impulses, which constitutes its preprogrammed form of sensibility and understanding in the Chomskyian sense. Second, the internalization and or deferment of the language and culture of a social structure amidst the preprogrammed form of sensibility and understanding of the brain and subatomic particles further lead to higher human cognition, action, learning, and development (in a specific direction, i.e., structural reproduction and differentiation) in the Vygotskyian sociocultural sense. In this article, I explore the issues of consciousness, cognition, action, learning, and development within Mocombe's phenomenological structural sociology.

### Background of the Problem

The structural-functional and structural Marxist turn in the mid to late 1960s and early 70s in explaining ethnic/racial identity or for that matter identity in general, privileged socially constructed relations within and via language and symbolic representation, as opposed to biology (i.e., race, genetics, structure of the mind, etc.), as the determining factor in identity or consciousness formation. This move, however, encountered a peculiar problem: to what extent should identity or consciousness formation be attributed to internal (individual subjective responses), as opposed to external and expressed processes (the social relations)? In other words, as Teresa Brennan [2] so eloquently phrases the problem, "[f]or if everything is socially constructed, how do novel ideas emerge? How does originality, or genius in the extreme case, come into being?" [3]. She continues, "this problem is equivalent to the old conundrum of [(structural)] functionalism. How do we know, do or write anything at odds with a received view? How do we explain those moments, or movements, which escape from the compound of socially constructed identifications?" [3].

Contemporarily in the social sciences, for the most part, two diametrically opposing responses attempt to resolve this problematic, i.e., Chomskyian cognitive processes or Vygotskyian and structurational processes. For Noam

Chomsky [4] the answer to this conundrum is internal individual subjective responses and structures. The human being finds itself in a homogeneous speech community (social structure) biologically preprogrammed with the ability to acquire language and formulate concepts, ideas, and knowledge. Language, and the capacity to speak and acquire it, which is unique to the human species, is genetically preprogrammed in the brain as a universal generative grammar. That is, the human mind possesses a language factor that is structured in the physical brain and generates the variety of languages, ideas, and concepts we encounter in our interaction with others. From this perspective, the observable differences in knowledge, concepts, and ideas we encounter among social actors in a particular homogeneous speech community is noted in the individual's genetic capacity or endowment to express the knowledge of their speech community. In other words, all humans biologically possess the same language generating structure or system like our organs and limbs; however, we are not all endowed with the same capacity to use it effectively or creatively. Just as some people are faster and stronger than others even though they possess the same legs and arms. It is also the case that some people, genetically, speak better and are more creative than others, giving rise to alternative concepts, ideas, and knowledge within a homogeneous speech community. Hence in the Chomsky viewpoint we know, do, or write anything at odds with a received view because of our biological/genetic endowments. As such, those moments, or movements, which escape from the compound of socially constructed identifications, are a result of individual biology and genetics. The problem with Chomsky's position, however, is that although it potentially accounts for the nature and origins of creativity and alternative discourses outside of the received view. It reads as though we have a plethora of creative people and alternative discourses in a homogeneous speech community, and they are not rare at all in the face of the fact that society, its actions and behaviors, are indeed very homogeneous.

For the Russian founder of sociocultural theory, Lev Vygotsky [5], the contrary is the case, i.e., human action, cognition, learning, and development are social constructions internalized by social actors via linguistic, i.e., speech, communication, which leads to higher cognitive developments. According to Vygotsky, human beings, internalize the external language, complex ideas, concepts, and knowledge of their speech community or culture, which in turn awakens a variety of internal developmental processes in the person, as they interact with parents, peers, teachers, etc. This internalization of a speech community's language, concepts, ideas, and knowledge via communicative discourse becomes the basic structure that constitutes a person's consciousness, thinking, and actions. Hence human action, cognition, learning, and development are a product of language, speech, education and their relation to societal or cultural interaction, which is tied to the social relations of production. In other words, Vygotsky's social interactionist theory posits that language, concepts, ideas, and knowledge learning and development are internalized via communicative discourse and societal interaction at an early age. As such, for Vygotsky, unlike Chomsky, it is very difficult to account for how we know, do or write anything at odds with a received view. For if the human subject, a child, simply internalizes the language, concepts, ideas, actions, and knowledge of a speech community, which in turn becomes their language, concepts, ideas, actions, and knowledge when they reach the zone of proximal development, how do we explain those moments, or movements, which escape from the compound of socially constructed identifications? The latter, within the logic of Vygotskyian theory, could only be possible via cross-cultural interaction due to the fact that Vygotsky overlooks the power dynamic by which cognition, action, learning, and development is constituted in the ideological structure of a society.

Similar to the sociocultural theory of Vygotsky as highlighted in the action/activity theory of Mike Cole, structurationist theorists in the social sciences, sociology and anthropology, also attempt to resolve this structure/agency problematic highlighted by Brennan [6]. They attempt to do so within a social constructivist paradigm that parallels Vygotsky's sociocultural theory. The structurationist or praxis school in the social sciences is commonly associated with Jürgen Habermas [7], Pierre Bourdieu [8], and Anthony Giddens [9] in sociology, and Marshall Sahlins [10], in anthropology [11]. Elaborated in a series of theoretical works and empirical studies, structurationists or praxis theorists account for agency and consciousness in social structure or system, "by clamping action and structure together in a notion of 'practice' or 'practises'" [11]. That is, structures are not only external to social actors, as in the classic structural functional view, but are also internal rules and resources produced and reproduced by actors "unconsciously" (intuitively) in their practices. That is to say, in structurationist or praxis theory, as Marx one-hundred years before suggested, the structure is "not a substantially separable order of reality", but "simply the 'ideal' form in which the totality of 'material' relations...are manifested to consciousness..." [12]. From this perspective, accordingly, structure or, sociological speaking, social structure, "may set (ideological) conditions to the historical process, but it is dissolved and reformulated in material practice (through mode of production and ideological apparatuses), so that history becomes the realization, in the form of society, of the actual (embodied rules) resources people put into play" [13]: consciousness, as a result, refers to "practical consciousness" or the dissolution and reformulation of a social structure's terms (norms, values, prescriptions, and proscriptions) in material practice as a duality.

Like Vygotsky, although this Neo-Marxist "clamping together" of structure, praxis, and consciousness descriptively accounts for "the individual moment of phenomenology" by explaining the unanimity, closure, and "intentionality" of a form of human action or sociation, the capitalist social (material) relations of production and its class

division, which constitutes the integrative actions of modern society, it fails, however, as pointed out in the epistemological postmodern/post-structural positions of Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Jacques Lacan to account for the origins and nature of fully visible alternative forms of practices (i.e., “the variability of the individual *moments* of phenomenology”) within the dominant order that are not class based, but are the product of the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse. Structurationists fail to see with its duality concept that society and its dominant institutionalized identity is not solely “one-dimensional” and differentiated by the dialectic of capitalist social relations of production, but is constituted, through power relations, as transition, relation, and difference. This difference, akin to Jacques Derrida's *différance*, is not biologically (racially) hardwired in the social actor, but is a result of self-reflective and non-impulsive social actors, upon internalizing the arbitrary structural terms or signifiers of their society via their consciousness, bodies, language, and linguistic communication, conceiving of and exercising other forms of being-in-the-world from that of the dominant symbolic order and its structural differentiation or relational logic [14, 9].

By “clamping” action, structure, and consciousness together, i.e., part/whole totality, like Vygotsky, however, structurationists do not account for, nor demonstrate, the nature and relation of this non-biologically and non-impulsive determined difference (*différance*) to that of the dominant practices of the social structure as highlighted in the theorizing of postmodern and post-structural scholars. Instead, like the activity position of Vygotskyian theorist Mike Cole, they re-introduce the problem in a new form: How do we know or *exercise* anything at odds with an embodied received view grounded in, and differentiated by, capitalist social relations of production?

My phenomenological structural ontology seeks to fix structurationism, Vygotskyian sociocultural theory, and Chomskyian cognitive linguistics to account for this agency problematic raised by postmodern and post-structural theorists by synthesizing the reincarnation ideas of Haitian epistemology, Haitian/Vilokan idealism, the materialism of physics, with the agential initiatives highlighted in the phenomenological discourses of Husserl, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and Sartre, the Neo-Marxist duality structuralism of structurationism, and Wittgenstein's notion of language game. In doing so, I essentially synthesize Vygotsky with Chomsky and postmodern and post-structural thought.

To this end of fixing structurationism to account for the nature, relation, and origins of alternative practical consciousnesses outside, and within, the structural reproduction and differentiation of capitalist relations of production, phenomenological structuralism builds on the material relationship highlighted in physics between the identity and indeterminate behavior of subatomic particles highlighted in quantum mechanics and the determinate behavior of atomic particles in their aggregation as highlighted in general relativity to understand the material constitution of consciousness at the subatomic/neuronal level in, and as, the brain and its manifestation as human practical consciousness at the atomic level as revealed by language, ideologies, ideological apparatuses, communicative discourse, and the actions of the body.

Generally speaking, consciousnesses in phenomenological structuralism are the embodiment of recycled subatomic neuronal energies of the multiverse objectified in the space-time of multiverses. Once objectified and embodied the neuronal energies encounter the space-time of physical worlds via a transcendental subject of consciousnesses and the sensibilities and form of the understanding of the body and brain in reified structures of signification, language, ideology, and ideological apparatuses, defined and determined by other beings that control the resources (economics) of the material world required for physical survival in space-time. The stances/analytics, ready-to-hand, unready-to-hand, and present-at-hand, of the transcendental ego vis-à-vis, 1) the sensibilities or drives of the body and brain, 2) drives or impulses of embodied residual memories of past recycled subatomic particles, 3) the actions produced via the body in relation to the indeterminacy/deferment of meaning of signifiers as they appear to individuated consciousnesses in ego-centered communicative discourse, 4) and the differentiating effects of the structures of signification, social class language game, of those who control the economic materials of a world is the origins of practical consciousnesses, learning, and development. Structurationism and Vygotskyian sociocultural theory highlights the latter process of human cognition, social action, learning, and development, while Chomskyian cognitive linguistics highlights the first, i.e., the cognition associated with the innate structure and sensibilities of the body and brain. My phenomenological structuralism suggests that 2 and 3, as highlighted in the reincarnation logic of Haitian epistemology, Haitian/Vilokan idealism, and quantum mechanics (recycled subatomic particles), and the decentered and deferred logic of postmodern and poststructural thought, are also the source of human cognition, action, learning, and development. All four types of cognitions and actions, the drives or sensibilities of the body, drives or impulses of embodied recycled past consciousnesses of subatomic particles, structural reproduction/differentiation, and deferential actions arising through the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse via the present-at-hand stance, exist in the material world with the physical, mental, emotional, ideological, etc. powers of those who control the material resource framework as the causative agent for individual behaviors. In other words, our stances in consciousness vis-à-vis the drives and sensibilities of the body and brain, structural reproduction and differentiation, drives/impulses of embodied past consciousnesses of recycled subatomic particles, and deferential actions arising from the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse determines the practical consciousness we want to recursively reorganize and reproduce in the material world. Those who control, through their bodies, language, mode of production, ideology,

ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse, the material resource framework, however, determine what actions they will allow to manifest within a social structure without the individual facing marginalization, alienation, repression, or death. Phenomenological structuralism highlights the origins of human consciousness, action, cognition, learning, development, and societal constitution within the aforementioned processes.

### **Theory**

Generally speaking, consciousnesses, human action, learning, and cognitive development for me are the embodiment of recycled subatomic neuronal energies of the multiverse objectified in the space-time of multiverses via and as our *nanm*, i.e., the soul or consciousness as articulated in Haitian transcendental idealism. Once objectified and embodied the neuronal energies encounter the space-time of physical worlds via a transcendental subject of consciousnesses and the sensibilities and form of the understanding of the body and brain in reified structures of signification, language, ideology, and ideological apparatuses, defined and determined by other beings that control the resources (economics—mode of production) of the material world required for physical survival in space-time. The Heideggerian stances/analytically, ready-to-hand, unready-to-hand, and present-at-hand, of the aggregated and embodied transcendental ego vis-à-vis, 1) the sensibilities or drives of the body and brain, 2) drives or impulses of embodied residual memories of past recycled subatomic particles, 3) the actions produced via the body in relation to the indeterminacy/deferment of meaning of signifiers as they appear to individuated consciousnesses in ego-centered communicative discourse, 4) and the differentiating effects of the structures of signification, social class language game, of those who control the economic materials of a world is the origins of practical consciousnesses, learning, and cognitive development. Structurationism and Vygotskian sociocultural theory highlights the latter process of human cognition, social action, learning, and development, i.e., structural reproduction and differentiation; while Chomskian cognitive linguistics highlights the first and third, i.e., the cognition associated with the innate structure and sensibilities of the body and brain; and the ability to defer meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse. My phenomenological structuralism suggests that two, as highlighted in the orchestrated objective reduction model of consciousness theorized by theoretical physicist Sir Roger Penrose and anesthesiologist Stuart Hameroff [15] is also the source of human cognition, action, learning, and development. In other words, consciousness is a fifth force of the universe, which is recycled and repeatedly embodied. Its embodiment carries with it traces of past lived-experiences, which appears as *a priori* forms of knowledge and understanding of the human individual, which are manifested as higher forms of learning and development within the human actor (i.e., savants). All four types of cognitions and actions, the drives or sensibilities of the body, drives or impulses of embodied recycled past consciousnesses of subatomic particles, structural reproduction/differentiation, and deferential actions arising through the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse via the present-at-hand stance, exist in the material world with the physical, mental, emotional, ideological, etc. powers of those who control the material resource framework as the causative agent for individual behaviors (practical consciousness) and the constitution of society. In other words, our stances in consciousness vis-à-vis the drives and sensibilities of the body and brain, structural reproduction and differentiation, drives/impulses of embodied past consciousnesses of recycled subatomic particles, and deferential actions arising from the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse determines the practical consciousness we want to recursively reorganize and reproduce in the material world. Those who control, through their bodies, language, mode of production, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse, the material resource framework, however, determine what actions they will allow to manifest within a social structure without the individual facing marginalization, alienation, repression, or death. In theory, their aim should be to move all human actors to the present-at-hand stance in order to understand the nature of their desires and a priori form of understanding in a problem solving homogeneous speech community constituted by determining what desires are appropriate to recursively organize and reproduce for the survival of the environment and all species in it.

### **DISCUSSION**

In other words, what I am suggesting here in my phenomenological structuralism, which seeks to highlight the phenomenology of being-in-the-structure-of-those-who-control-a-material-resource-framework and the origins of our practical consciousness vis-à-vis our aggregation as subatomic particles, is that embodiment is the objectification of the transcendental ego. This transcendental ego is a part of an universal *élan vital* that has ontological status in dimensions existing at the subatomic particle level and gets embodied via, and as, the body and connectum of Being's brains. Hence the transcendental ego is the universal *élan vital*, which is the neuronal energies of past, present, and future Beings-of-the-multiverse, embodied, and encounters a material world via and as the body and brain in mode of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse. Once embodied in and as human individual consciousnesses in a particular universe, world, and historical social formation, the transcendental ego becomes an embodied hermeneutic structure that never encounters the world and the things of the world in themselves via the aggregated built in ontogenetics of the body, brain, and the neuronal energies. Instead embodied hermeneutic individual consciousness is constituted via the recycled subatomic neuronal particle energies which are aggregated as a transcendental ego and the body in their encounter and interpretation of past recycled neuronal memories and things enframed in and by the language, bodies, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and practices of those who control the

economic conditions of a material resource framework and its social relations of production, which they use to interpellate the human actor. In consciousness, as phenomenology posits, it (individual subjective consciousness of embodied beings) can either choose to accept the structural knowledge, differentiation, and practices of, the drives of the body, the impulses of recycled past consciousnesses of subatomic neuronal particles, the actions of those who control, via their bodies, mode of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse, the economic conditions of the material resource framework and recursively reorganize and reproduce them in their practices, or reject them, through the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse, for an indeterminate amount of action-theoretic ways-of-being-in-the-world-with-others, which they may assume at the threat to their ontological security. It is Being's stance, ready-to-hand, unready-to-hand, and present-at-hand vis-à-vis 1) the ontogenetic drives of the aggregated body, 2) impulses of residual actions/memories of embodied recycled past consciousnesses/subatomic particles, 3) the phenomenological meditation/deferment that occurs on the latter actions, and ideologies of a social system along 4) with its differentiating logic, which produces the variability of actions and practices in cultures, social structures, or social systems that enframe the material world.

Hence being encounters the world via the drive of its aggregated brain and body, impulses of recycled past consciousnesses or subatomic particles, and structures of signification, which derive from class division and social relations of production as reified in the bodies (as agential initiative), language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse of those who control the resources of a material resource framework. Be that as it may, as an embodied hermeneutic structured being we never experience the facts of the world and their conditions of possibility as the "the things in themselves;" instead, we experience them not culturally and historically, which is a present-at-hand viewpoint, but structurally and relationally, via the bodies, language, ideology, and communicative discourse in institutions or ideological apparatuses, i.e., the social class language game, of those who control the economic conditions of the material resource framework we find ourselves thrown-in, via our bodies, language, and communicative discourse. In other words, we experience them structurally or relationally, and our stances, ready-to-hand, unready-to-hand, present-at-hand, vis-à-vis these ideological structures determine our practical consciousness or behaviors.

We initially know, experience, and utilize the things of the world in the preontological ready-to-hand mode, which is structural and relational. That is, our bodies encounter, know, experience, and utilize the things of the world in consciousness, intersubjectively, via their representation as objects of knowledge, truth, usage, and experience enframed and defined in the relational logic and practices or language game (Wittgenstein's term) of the institutions or ideological apparatuses of the other beings-of-the-material resource framework whose historicity comes before our own and gets reified in and as modes of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse. This is the predefined phenomenal structural, i.e., ontological, world we and our bodies are thrown and interpellated in in coming to be-in-the-world. How an embodied-hermeneutically-structured Being as such solipsistically view, experience, understand, and utilize the predefined objects of knowledge, truth, and experienced defined by others and their conditions of possibilities in consciousness in order to formulate their practical consciousness is albeit indeterminate. Heidegger is accurate, however, in suggesting that three stances or modes of encounter (Analytic of Dasein), "presence-at-hand," "readiness-to-hand," and "un-readiness-to-hand," characterizes our views of the things of consciousness represented intersubjectively via bodies, language, ideology, and communicative discourse, and subsequently determine our practical consciousness or social agency. In "ready-to-hand," which is the preontological mode of human existence thrown in the world, we accept and use the things in consciousness with no conscious experience of them, i.e., without thinking about them or giving them any meaning or signification outside of their intended usage. Heidegger's example is that of using a hammer in hammering. We use a hammer without thinking about it or giving it any other condition of possibility outside of its intended usage as defined by those whose historicity presupposes our own. In "present-at-hand," which, according to Heidegger, is the stance of science, we objectify the things of consciousness and attempt to determine and reify their meanings, usage, and conditions of possibilities. Hence the hammer is intended for hammering by those who created it as a thing solely meant as such. The "unready-to-hand" outlook is assumed when something goes wrong in our usage of a thing of consciousness as defined and determined by those who adopt a "present-at-hand" view. As in the case of the hammer, the unready-to-hand view is assumed when the hammer breaks and we have to objectify it, by then assuming a present-at-hand position, and think about it in order to either reconstitute it as a hammer, or give it another condition of possibility. Any other condition of possibility that we give the hammer outside of its initial condition of possibility which presupposed our historicity becomes relational, defined in relation to any of its other conditions of possibilities it may have been given by others we exist in the world with. Hence for Heidegger, the ontological status of being-in-the-world-with-others, via these three stances or modes of encountering the objects of consciousness hermeneutically reveal, through our view, experience, understanding, and usage of the predefined objects of knowledge, truth, and experience.

Within the conception of the constitution of society and the human being outlined above, the duality construct of structurationism parallels the internalization of Vygotskyian sociocultural theory and only accounts for the actions of human subjects who internalize the 4) structural reproduction and differentiation of their social structure as expressed in the modes of production, language, ideology, and communicative discourse via ideological apparatuses. Chomskyian



cognitive linguistics accounts for actions and activities arising from the drives and impulses of the sensibilities and forms of the understanding of the body and brain. Postmodern and poststructural theory, I am suggesting, accounts for social action arising from the impulses of subatomic particles and the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse. In the end, those in power positions of a speech community or social structure determines what actions are allowed to manifest within the structural differentiation and reproduction of their social relations of production without facing marginalization, alienation, repression, or death.

Hence in the end, subject constitution is a product of an individual's stance, i.e., analytics, vis-à-vis three structures of signification and the ability to defer meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse stemming from the social class language game (i.e., language, symbols, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse) of those who control the mode of production of a material resource framework. It is the ready-to-hand drives of the body and brain, ready-to-hand and present-at-hand manifestation of past recycled residual consciousnesses/subatomic particles, the present-at-hand phenomenological meditation and deferment of meaning that occurs in embodied consciousness via language, ideology, and communicative discourse as reflected in diverse individual practices, within the ready-to-hand, unready-to-hand, and present-at-hand differentiating logic or class divisions of the social relations of production, which produces the variability of actions and practices in cultures, social structures, or social systems. All four types of actions, the drives/impulses of the body and residual past consciousnesses of subatomic particles, structural reproduction/differentiation, and actions resulting from the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse, are always present and manifested in a social structure (which is the reified ideology via ideological apparatuses, their social class language game, of those who control a material resource framework) to some degree contingent upon the will and desires of the economic social class that controls the material resource framework through the actions of their bodies (practical consciousness), language, symbols, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and social relations of production. They choose, amidst the class division of the social relations of production, what other meaning constitutions and practices are allowed to manifest themselves without the Beings of that practice facing alienation, marginalization, domination, or death.

The individual being is initially constituted as recycled and embodied subatomic particles of the multiverse, which have their own predetermined form of understanding and cognition based on previous experiences as aggregated matter (this is akin to what the Greek philosopher Plato refers to when he posits knowledge as recollection of the Soul). Again, the individual's actions are not necessarily determined by the embodiment and drives of these recycled subatomic particles. It is an individual's stance, ready-to-hand, unready-to-hand, and present-at-hand, when the subatomic particles become aggregated matter or embodied, which determines whether or not they become aware, present-at-hand, of the subatomic particle drives and choose to recursively reorganize and reproduce the content of the drives as their practical consciousness.

This desire to reproduce the cognition and understanding of the drives of the recycled subatomic particles, however, may be limited by the structuring structure of the aggregated body and brain of the individual subject. That is to say, the second origins and basis of an individual's actions are the structuring drives and desires, for food, clothing, shelter, social interaction, and sex, of the aggregated body and brain, which the subatomic particles constitute and embody. In other words, the aggregated body and brain is preprogrammed with its own (biological) forms of sensibility, understanding, and cognition, structuring structure, by which it experiences being-in-the-world as aggregated embodied subatomic particles. These bodily forms of sensibility, understanding, and cognition, such as the drive and desire for food, clothing, shelter, social interaction, linguistic communication, and sex, are tied to the material embodiment and survival of the embodied individual actor, and may or may not supersede or conflict with the desire and drive of an individual to recursively (re) organize and reproduce the structuring structure of the recycled subatomic particles. If these two initial structuring structures are in conflict, the individual moves from the ready-to-hand to the unready-to-hand stance or analytics where they may begin to reflect upon and question their being-in-the-world prior to acting. Hence just as in the case of the structuring structure of the subatomic particles it is an individual being's analytics vis-à-vis the drives of its body and brain in relation to the impulses of the subatomic particles, which determines whether or not they become driven by the desire to solely fulfill the material needs of their body and brain at the expense of the drives/desires of the subatomic particles or the social class language game of the material resource framework they find their existence unfolding in.

The social class language game, and its differentiating effects, an individual find their existence unfolding in is the third structuring structure, which attempts to determine the actions of individual beings as they experience being-in-the-world as embodied subatomic particles. The aggregated individual finds themselves objectified and unfolding within a material resource framework controlled by the actions of other bodies, which presuppose their existence, via the actions of their bodies (practical consciousness), language, communicative discourse, ideology, and ideological apparatuses stemming from how they satisfy the desires of their bodies and subatomic particle drives (means and mode of production). What is aggregated as a social class language game by those in power positions via and within its language,

ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse attempts to interpellate and subjectify other beings to its interpretive frame of satisfying their bodily needs, fulfilling the impulses of their subatomic particles, and organizing a material resource framework at the expense of all others, and becomes a third form of structuring individual action based on the mode of production and how it differentiates individual actors.

That is to say, an individual's interpellation, subjectification, and differentiation within the social class language game that presupposes their being-in-the-world attempts to determine their actions or practical consciousness via the reified language, ideology, etc., of the social class language game, the meaning of which can be deferred via the communicative discourse of the individual actors. Hence, the deferment of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse of the language and ideology of a social class language game is the final means of determining an individual's action or practical consciousness outside of, and in relation to, its stance, i.e., analytics, vis-à-vis the drives of subatomic particles, drives and desires of the body and brain, and structural reproduction and differentiation.

Whereas the practical consciousness of the transcendental ego stemming from the impulses of embodied subatomic particles are indeterminant as with its neuronal processes involved with the constitution of meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse (Albeit physicists are in the process of exploring the nature, origins, and final states of subatomic particles, and neuroscientists are attempting to understand the role of neuronal activities in developing the transcendental ego and whether or not it continues to exist after death). The form of the understandings and sensibilities of the body and brain are determinant as with structural reproduction and differentiation of the mode of production, and therefore can be mapped out by neuroscientists, biologists, and sociologists to determine the nature, origins, and directions of societal constitution and an individual actor's practical consciousness unfolding.

The interaction of all four elements in relation to the stance of the transcendental ego of the individual actor is the basis for human action in the world. However, in the end, consequently, the majority of practical consciousness will be a product of an individual actor's embodiment and the structural reproduction and differentiation of a social class language game given 1) the determinant nature of embodiment, form of understanding and sensibility of the body and brain amidst, paradoxically, the indeterminacy of impulses of embodied subatomic particles and the neuronal processes involved in ego-centered communicative discourse; and 2) the consolidation of power of those who control the material resource framework wherein a society, the social class language game, is ensconced and the threat that power (consolidated and constituted via the actions of bodies, mode of production, language, ideology, ideological apparatuses, and communicative discourse) poses to the ontological security of an aggregated individual actor who chooses (or not) either ready-to-hand or present-at-hand to recursively reorganize and reproduce the ideals of the society as their practical consciousness. It should be mentioned that in response to this latter process, those in power positions who internalize the ideals of the social structure and recursively (re) organize and reproduce them as their practical consciousness are in the unready-to-hand when they encounter alternative forms of being-in-the-world within their social class language game. They dialectically attempt to reconcile the practical consciousness of their social class language game with the reified practical consciousness of those who have deferred their meanings for alternative forms of being-in-the-world within their social class language. They can accept, marginalize, or seek to eradicate the deferred or decentered subject or their practices.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

### **Learning and Development in Phenomenological Structuralism**

For a homogeneous speech community to truly be liberatory, its ideological apparatuses must inhibit the development of certain practical consciousnesses amongst human actors. That is, it is only through the inhibition, the problems they produce, of certain interpretive practices are the stances/analytics for higher learning possible. The present-at-hand stance/analytics (because of its self-reflective position), which is the stance of science and ideology, is the highest developmental stance that can be achieved by the human actor. As such, to produce it amongst all human actors, the key for ideological regulators is to determine the criteria for allowing a practical consciousness to manifest within a particular resource framework. In Vodou, which would give rise to Haitian transcendental idealism and realism, all interpretive practices are allowed to manifest within a normative ethic of reciprocal justice. It is the normative ethic, which then prevents the manifestation of certain practical consciousnesses in order for higher learning and development to take place via the present-at-hand stance. So it is a combination of educating the human actor to assume a present-at-hand stance vis-à-vis the three structures of consciousness constitution and the ability to defer meaning in ego-centered communicative discourse coupled with a normative ethic of reciprocal justice within a problem-solving environment which is conducive for higher learning and development to take place. So in schooling the human actor, a homogeneous speech community must be constituted within a Montessori school environment focused on problem solving in grammar, physics, and the material environment for reproducing the mode of production required for survival of all species.

REFERENCES

1. Mocombe, P. C. (2008). *The soul-less souls of Black folk: A sociological reconsideration of Black consciousness as Du Boisian double consciousness*. University Press of America.
2. Austin, J.L. (1997). *How to do Things with Words* (Second edition, J.O. Urmson and M. Sbisà, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
3. Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*. New York and London: Routledge.
4. Chomsky, N., & Halle, M. (1965). Some controversial questions in phonological theory. *Journal of linguistics*, 1(2), 97-138.
5. Luckmann, T. (ed.) (1978). *Phenomenology and Sociology: Selected Readings*. New York: Penguin Books.
6. Ortner, S. (1984). "Theory in Anthropology Since the Sixties." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26: 126-166.
7. Habermas, J. (1987). *The Theory of Communicative Action: Lifeworld and System: A Critique of Functionalist Reason* (Volume 2, Thomas McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
8. Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice* (Richard Nice, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
9. Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
10. Sahlins, M. (1976). *Culture and Practical Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
11. Crothers, C. (2003). "Technical Advances in General Sociological Theory: The Potential Contribution of Post-Structurationist Sociology." *Perspectives* 26 (3): 3-6.
12. Gilroy, P. (1987). *There Ain't no Blacks in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*. London: Routledge
13. Sahlins, M. (1995a). *How "Natives" Think: About Captain Cook, For Example*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
14. Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society* (Volume 1, Thomas McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
15. Hameroff, S., & Penrose, R. (2014). Consciousness in the universe: A review of the 'Orch OR' theory. *Physics of life reviews*, 11(1), 39-78.