

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY-ND 4.0 International) license • <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0>



SZYMON DĄBROWSKI¹

Pomeranian University in Słupsk, Polska

ORCID 0000-0002-7268-5665

Received: 24.04.2023; revised: 26.07.2023; accepted: 27.07.2023

ETHICS OF SOLIDARITY FR. JÓZEF TISCHNER IN THE EDUCATION OF THE 21ST CENTURY

ETYKA SOLIDARNOŚCI KS. JÓZEFA TISCHNERA W EDUKACJI XXI WIEKU

Streszczenie: Artykuł poświęcony jest badaniom z zakresu fenomenologii społecznej ks. Józefa Tischnera (1931-2000), w których to jednym z najistotniejszych zagadnień jest *Etyka solidarności*, rozumiana tu jako *Etyka sumień*. Podstawowym założeniem tekstu było uznanie projektu *Etyki solidarności* jako źródłowo zaangażowanego społecznie, a także pedagogicznie. Co za tym idzie, celem najistotniejszym jest tu ujawnienie wewnętrznego potencjału powyższej propozycji dla analiz z zakresu pedagogiki ogólnej i społecznej. W roku 2021 minęła 90-ta rocznica urodzin Autora oraz 40-ta rocznica pierwszego wydania *Etyki solidarności* (1981), co stało się to dobrą okazją do rekonstrukcji podstawowych tez omawianego projektu, ale również próbą wskazania potencjału edukacyjnego, przy szczególnym uwzględnieniu problematyki społecznej w dobie wyzwań postawionych przed społeczeństwem demokratycznym w XXI wieku w Polsce i Europie.

Słowa kluczowe: ks. Józef Tischner, filozofia wychowania, pedagogika, pedagogika społeczna, etyka solidarności

Abstract: The article is devoted to research in the field of social phenomenology of Fr. Józef Tischner (1931–2000), in which one of the most important issues is the Ethics of Solidarity, understood as the Ethics of Conscience. The basic premise of the text was to recognize the project of the Ethics of Solidarity as socially and pedagogically engaged in its source. Consequently, the most important goal here is to reveal the internal potential of the above proposal for analysis in the field of general and social pedagogy. In 2021 it was the 90th anniversary of the author's birth and the 40th anniversary of the first edition of the Ethics of Solidarity (1981), and thus a good opportunity to reconstruct the basic theses of the project, but also an attempt to indicate

¹ **Szymon Dąbrowski**, director of Pracownia Badań nad Kulturą i Religią Uniwersytetu Pomorskiego w Słupsku; adjunct at Instytut Pedagogiki Akademii Pomorskiej w Słupsku; vice president of Pomorskie Towarzystwo Filozoficzno-Teologiczne; subject editor of the scholarly journal "Karto-Teka Gdańska". E-mail address: szymon.dabrowski@apsl.edu.pl.

the educational potential, with particular emphasis on social issues in the time of challenges faced by a democratic society in 21st century in Poland and Europe.

Keywords: Józef Tischner, philosophy of education, pedagogy, social pedagogy, ethics of solidarity

Introduction

In Poland in 2022 there was mass, grassroots, social, and very active help organized for people fleeing the war from the territory of Ukraine. According to journalists and commentators on social life, this situation, in terms of its scale and people's engagement, resembled the events of the Solidarity movement of the 1980s in Poland (Wyborcza 2022). There are many analogies to those events. First, the leading role in this aid process, just as it was four decades ago, was taken by individuals (specific people and families) who then gathered and formed groups. Second, systemic and logistical activities were initiated primarily by non-governmental organizations (the third sector), as was the case in the 1980s with the first independent trade unions (NGOs 2022). Third, as in the past, state (government) actions were reactive to what was happening in Polish society (GOV 2022). The Solidarity movement of the 1980s awakened a deeply dormant social energy that waited for the moment when it could explode and socially manifest itself. Accordingly, today the war in Ukraine, and thus the enormous scale of suffering of the civilian population, aroused in Polish society a desire to help and the need to provide support. In 2020, we celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the August events (1980–2020) in which the Solidarity movement began a gradual (not always intentional) process of demanding the return of Poland to the community of democratic states. One key intellectual and spiritual leader of those events was Rev. Józef Tischner. His original diagnosis as well as the concept of the *Ethics of Solidarity* (published in 1981) have become the foremost intellectual pillars of that movement. At this point, it is worth presenting the Solidarity Movement and the idea of the Ethics of Solidarity to point out elements that, to this day, seem to be topical and creative both in the social space and within Polish educational theory and practice.

A lot has been written about the Solidarity movement in Polish scientific literature (NSZZ “Solidarność” 1980–1989). Its phenomenon has been analyzed socially, economically, and politically. Still, it seems there is room for further analysis in the sphere of education. The Solidarity movement is a broad and ambiguous concept most often identified with NSZZ “Solidarność,” i.e., the Independent and Self-Governing Trade Union. It was a national trade union established in 1980 to defend and observe workers' rights in the Polish People's Republic (PRL). It was a milieu associating people in opposition to Poland's then (so-called communist) power. “Solidarity” as a mass social movement was created based on numerous

strike committees, including the Inter-Enterprise Strike Committee in Gdańsk, which became a founding entity for NSZZ “Solidarity.” On November 10, 1980, it was officially registered with the Provincial Court in Warsaw. Lech Wałęsa was the most recognized and identified person with this movement both on Polish and international grounds. Throughout the time of the Polish People’s Republic (1945–1989), and especially in the 1980s, the institution of the Catholic Church and its representatives was an essential base for the organizational and logistic activities of the entire opposition movement. One such person was Rev Józef Tischner, who actively participated in the national congresses of the NSZZ “Solidarity.” During these meetings, J. Tischner preached sermons and homilies at the Holy Mass for participants and observers of congresses. This is how the text and individual chapters of Józef Tischner’s “Ethics of Solidarity” were born. The text in monographic (book) form was published only in 1981, initially containing only 15 chapters. It took up and analyzed primarily social issues including work, justice, upbringing, politics, etc. Throughout the eighties, the “Solidarity milieu” perceived the text as a manifesto and, simultaneously, the basic guidelines for the entire movement.

1. The Ethics of Solidarity

A phenomenological proposal showing the process of constituting values in the social dimension in Rev. Józef Tischner’s work was the concept of the Ethics of Solidarity. This project is complicated to classify unequivocally. On the one hand, it was created on a living organism, in the sense that it described but also diagnosed the events of the Solidarity movement in real time, in its direct and dynamic action. On the other hand, the texts that make up the Ethics of Solidarity were included in the official documents of the Solidarity movement congresses and directly impacted the participants of those events. The strategy of philosophical research here referred to the principle of phenomenological analysis, where each problem chapter was created on the basis and from the perspective of specific historical events: “The text was born on the march. I remember writing the chapter called *The Adversary*. It was during the strike in Bielsko-Biała [...] Moreover, this was the case with every other chapter: first a specific event, then my philosophical commentary” (Tischner 2005, 6; translation mine). It is not the primary goal of the analysis to reach an unequivocal decision on to what extent the Ethics of Solidarity is a project solely describing—and to what extent constructing and co-creating—real social changes in the 1980s. What is most interesting here is the presentation of the essential elements of the discussed concept, which still seem to be current in the sphere of description and diagnosis of socio-educational changes (Dąbrowski 2018b, 389–404).

Tischner defines the Solidarity Movement as a grassroots social movement whose primary goal was to restore justice and equality in the work structure and the distribution of goods flowing from it. The main issue of the dispute and criticism

was the waste of goods in the work process, i.e., its apparent ineffectiveness. This phenomenon led to an inappropriate and unfair distribution of work effects, which made it impossible to meet most of society's primary material, social, and cultural needs. In this sense, Solidarity was a movement for a peaceful revolution, aiming to release the creative, moral, and spiritual potential both in the structure of work and in the broadly understood interpersonal relations. The category of solidarity was not identified here with a specific ethical theory or a concept belonging to a given tradition or philosophical trend. According to Tischner, Solidarity is an idea that requires mapping, action, and the direct relation of a human being to what is happening around him. It is the sphere of interpersonal interactions in which the other person is the subject of direct experience. The proposed analysis does not indicate such or other commands, prohibitions, or even instructions to act in favor of this idea. Instead, it is a phenomenological description of what is happening in relation to the sphere of values and, more broadly, axiological choices. However, the horizon of these analyzes points to the source of negative existential experience in the form of suffering, harm, and injustice, to which solidarity is somehow the answer. At this point, it becomes more apparent that the Ethics of Solidarity is defined as an ethic of conscience that is constituted independently or autonomously in relation to given ethical theories, systems, or concepts. It is an inner voice that asks for help, suffers, and experiences pain. Therefore, according to Tischner, demonstrating solidarity always means thinking, feeling, and acting based on conscience. "Conscience is a man's natural 'ethical sense,' which is to a great extent independent of various ethical systems" (Tischner 2005, 17).² In this respect, one cannot be in solidarity with people without conscience because there is no identification (encounter) on the level of axiological experience. People without conscience will not hear the call of the needy. Thus these are people closed to communication, dialogue, and meeting of values that have the potential to create a community. Social communication based on dialogue is understood here as a meeting not so much around an identical sphere of values but rather a meeting around a common unifying experience in the form of pain, harm, or suffering (Tischner 2005, 18–19).

A society based on a community of conscience is not constituted based on uniform ethics, philosophy, and even less religion. There is no identical and homogeneous structure and hierarchy of values (even the most universal) thanks to which the bond appears. The concept of the Ethics of Solidarity as the solidarity of consciences is, on the one hand, phenomenological ethics—i.e., a project built and rooted in the realities of a specific time and place. On the other hand, it is dialogical ethics in which particular social exchange and communication take place, building a community. One essential dialogical element on which the ethics of solidarity is founded is the courage to see and publicly manifest disagreement with one's

2 See <https://pchph.ignatianum.edu.pl/uploads/content/Tischner-EN.pdf>.

own suffering and that of others. It is only on this basis that social dialogue is created, the effect of which is the emerging bond, the foundation for the emerging community. A primary example of the manifestation of suffering in the social space is the disagreement with exploitation and opposition to work that degrades and destroys instead of developing and building. The space mentioned above is only an example and does not exhaust all spheres in which Tischner analyzes the scope and manner of manifesting the idea of solidarity. Undoubtedly, the energy in the form of resistance, opposition, and disagreement towards what individually and then socially appeared unfair became fundamental to the Solidarity movement. The movement, with about 10 million members in Poland in the 1980s, did not emerge thanks to a coherent axiological sphere or finding a value that would have the potential to unify and merge a heterogeneous social structure. According to Tischner, it was not specific values or an ethical system that became a community-creative element, but rather inner courage and a manifestation of disagreement with suffering and harm in individual and collective experience (Tischner 2005, 35–39). Only this internal fact, objectified in the social structure, could trigger the process leading to the emergence of the Solidarity community. It was a movement, not so much across boundaries but rather objectifying the shared experience of pain, harm, and suffering. The dialogue was an essential element at this point as a tool enabling the appearance of a shared experience (realization) of being in an unfair social structure. The internal dialogue of Solidarity was an objectified social cry that called for the restoration of justice in the sphere of the division of labor, redistribution of goods, and, more broadly, a return to full accessibility of private property. Initially, this communication was directed inward; only revealing the universal horizon and the universality of this phenomenon made participants aware of its objective scale. The universality and intensity of the protest evoked hope for change, which initially belonged only to the sphere of ideas and declarations. Fueled by the increasing activity and mobility of the Solidarity movement, hope not only came alive, but also became realizable according to inner conviction. The ethics of solidarity deconstructed a large part of the elements of the social structure, pointing to solutions that, at that time, were treated as impossible or lacking in alternatives. It is mainly about internal relations in economic, political, scientific, artistic, and family life, as well as upbringing and educational life. These last spheres of social life seem extremely interesting due to the postulates and conclusions contained therein, which do not seem to lose their relevance to this day (Potulicka, Rutkowiak 2010). Still present are the phenomena of inequality and exclusion of specific social groups, as well as harm and suffering experienced by specific people in the public education system. We see indications of this in contemporary Polish democracy in the third decade of the 21st century—with the related crisis of neoliberal education—as well as in “centrally planned education” (Gawin-Wilk, Szecówka-Nowak 2020, 25–40).

In the educational and upbringing sphere, according to Tischner, the Ethics of Solidarity reveals a profound truth in the process of maturation, growth, and empowerment of a human being. It is an entirely defined concept of the ethics of education, in which the concept of hope becomes the essential axiological category, and the principle of fidelity and trust becomes the standard of action. “It must be said that only those who have hope can teach and nurture. It must be added that they teach by shaping the hopes of pupils. Education is work upon the spirit—work according to hope” (Tischner 2005, 88, translation mine). All other values, such as love, friendship, responsibility, faith, and so forth, appear based on hope, identified here with awakening and the awareness of experiencing what surrounds us. Therefore, hope is a consciousness and agreement about the world that exists while simultaneously awakening energy to actively change the present, while faithfulness and fidelity refer to the attitude of a special companion. It is about carrying and nurturing one’s hope by the teacher, which is the foundation of upbringing but does not become its essence. This means that faithfulness allows for the existence of a relationship with another. Still, only trust constitutes consent to the individual path of development of the pupil’s hope. In Socratic language, a teacher and educator have a role like that of a midwife who assists with giving birth to a child. Later the teacher assists (accompanies) in the process of adolescence. A teacher does not create a child—that is, knowledge— and cannot give birth for someone—that is, understand, internalize, and mature for someone. The only thing he can do is be with the other person and support his or her individual efforts with no success guaranteed (Tischner 1996, 41–45). Due to the importance and limitations of the birth event (i.e., the maturation and constitution of the self-identity), the relationship between pupil and educator must be based on trust. It is the result of fidelity or practiced trust. If this element is missing, then educational activities are only superficial and indicate sham processes (Tischner 1966, 1334–1345).

According to Tischner, one of the greatest dangers or mistakes associated with a teacher’s is the belief that a complete influence on the student is possible. This refers to classical socialization, in which the teacher presents his own hope so that it becomes the student’s hope. Often this results from a belief that the mission of education is the activity of the one who has knowledge attempting to transfer his own resources and abilities to the student. Such a structure indicates not so much showiness or sham quality, but rather constitutes the superficiality of the message, which is justified by effectiveness (verified by tests and rankings). Externally, everything works smoothly and effectively from the system’s perspective.

But in a deeper structure, for example, of beliefs and thinking, we deal with two non-communicating worlds. The biggest problem of this approach is the reduction of the sphere of the student’s freedom and independence. It makes his or her primary goal to reflect on the strategies and thinking of his teacher. The second difficulty, a simple consequence of the first (negative socialization), is that it renders impossible the principle of fidelity. In a space where there is no place for a person’s

freedom, fidelity does not appear. The superficial content results in an educational relationship in which teacher and student might be said to pass by one another. When the individual and subjective perspective of the teacher and student come into existence, the role of the former begins to exist in *dramatic order*. It is a situation in which the educator becomes aware of the reciprocity in the relationship with the student, where both the student's success and failure become his victory or loss. Moreover, the educator begins to understand that his personal hope, honesty, and inner truth become the content of the message, but also a form of justification for how and what he is talking about. In other words, in the ethics of education based on the idea of Solidarity, teachers (family, social, cultural, etc.) are primarily responsible for their own hope, which has educational potential. It is only on this basis that thinking about tools, methods, and techniques that can help in the development and growing up of the pupil appears.

However, it will not be teaching equipment aimed at recreating or imitating even the best actions and choices of the educator. Fidelity, the main principle of action, is primarily to protect the inner self (of the teacher and the student) against the direct reproduction of external patterns. But above all, it is to direct one towards the awakening, awareness, and internalization of the autonomous sphere of values. In practice, it means that an educator who openly faces basic moral choices somehow fights with himself, wanting to preserve and protect what is already integrated and axiologically internalized. Therefore, the most profound educational message here is not the hope connected with the belief that every fight will end with a win, but rather the emerging awareness that the courage and inner willingness to take up this fight testifies to the process of continuous maturation and achieving one's independence (Tischner 2005, 91–92).

The ethics of solidarity on educational grounds deconstructs the role of fundamental values, which can be understood primarily as axiologically universalizing, disregarding their direct existential experience. This danger is complicated to diagnose and eliminate, since all axiological goals are seemingly achieved at the systemic and normative levels. The difficulty discussed here lies in seeing the fundamental values within their universal scope, that is, most often declarative and, above all, verbal. In other words, it is an understanding of cardinal values in their global, universal aspect, ignoring their direct and personal experience in a specific place and time. "One is encouraging the fight for worldwide peace but is not capable of teaching how to sustain peace within the family. One is commanding compassion for the misery of Africans but not teaching to see the lot of an overworked mother. Instead of sharpening man's natural sense of reality, this education blunts it" (Tischner 2005, 92–93).³

The difficulty indicated here reveals at least two axionormative severe problems of the education system. On the one hand, a question arises here whether the sphere

3 See http://www.tischner.org.pl/Content/Images/tischner_3_ethics.pdf.

of values declared as universal does not require the inclusion of direct social experiences into the space. On the other hand, there is also a question of the necessity to see the basic normative assumptions of the education system in the inter- and intra-social spheres (through criteria and goals, both external and internal to the social structure). Thanks to phenomenological analysis, Tischner's Ethics of Solidarity presents itself as a project correlating the sphere of justifying what is objective-subjective in an individual's experience. It also emphasizes the importance of the criteria for verifying what is internal-external in the social sphere. Regarding social criteria, the ethics of education based on the idea of Solidarity, understood as the solidarity of consciences, presupposes the necessary presence of universalizing justifications (e.g., conscience as a moral sense) and particularistic justifications (e.g., conscience as recognition of individual values). For education, it is a postulate indicating not only the need to combine both perspectives (cognitive holism) but also their mutual correlation based on the common sphere of social life (ontological holism). An example of such an approach is understanding education as a process of individual development, which becomes an essential element (leaven) of socio-cultural development (Tischner 1968, 903–913). Going further to what is objective and subjective individually, especially the idea of solidarity built on hope and fidelity, unites both spaces of understanding into a single whole. It shows not only the necessary presence of both spheres of justification but also their dependence on each other. In other words, it is the appreciation of the role of bottom-up (subjectivizing) actions which may become a driving force of changes in the social (objectifying) scope. In the ethics of solidarity, their strength depends directly on the degree of sensitivity to pain, injustice, and suffering, which becomes the main reason for dissent and resistance. The subjective experience of injustice towards a person becomes an imperative for individual and then community action. For the sphere of education, it is a postulate of disagreement, especially with that which subjectively presents itself as causing suffering and calls for reaction and prevention. Education based on the ethics of solidarity is, therefore, a project aimed at mindfulness and sensitivity, which disrupt that which contributes to injustice and human suffering in individual and then social experience. It is a postulate of education not only socially involved, but above all aimed at building strategies of transformative activities that criticize existing models of social reality and design possible solutions and changes (Klus-Stańska 2018, 187–259; Sajdak 2013).

2. Education according to the idea of solidarity

The presented concept of the Ethics of Solidarity was captured by Józef Tischner thanks to the use of the method of social phenomenology, in which the primary criterion for verification and description of phenomena is the analysis of processes and correlations between the individual and the social (Dąbrowski 2018a, 33–38). First, the tool of phenomenology was used to reveal the path that a given idea

(value) must travel, from personal experience to the moment of its appearance in the social sphere. In connection with the above, the Ethics of Solidarity (Ethics of Conscience) was interpreted as the sphere of the common experience of pain and suffering of a man living in the reality of the Polish People's Republic, which through the form of open manifestation in the public sphere, became phenomena constituting social change. The Ethics of Conscience is in this respect the ethics of reciprocity, where the painful experience of another person also becomes the subject of my experience. At the moment when the suffering of another person is noticed and felt by me, real individual and then social communication can take place. Its effect is the appearance of a common hope for change and a decision to fight against experienced and objectified injustice. The emerging hope entails the belief that it is necessary to be faithful to those who experience suffering. This, in turn, is one of the fundamental elements in the process of self-maturation (Tischner 2005, 35–39). The change caused in me by noticing another person's pain reveals the realm of my freedom through presence. I can stay with others and be faithful to what I have experienced or marginalize and negate this experience. In the first case, another person's pain becomes my pain, which makes me more sensitive and attentive to myself and the outside world, as well as receptive to what is not fully understood by, internalized by, and identical to me. Through the experience of the pain inflicted upon another person, a space appears within me that enables me to listen to and acknowledge the pain I experience and inflict (Tischner 2005, 104–111). In the second case, when I marginalize what appears unfair and causes suffering outside of me, I also do so indirectly with myself. Not only do I blunt my own moral sense and attentiveness to what I experience, but I also deny the fact that I myself can be the cause of someone's suffering. In both situations, of coming closer to or going away from another person's suffering, the issue of fusing that which is internal-external, subjective, and objective, as well as individual and social, into one whole, comes to the fore (Tischner 2005, 57–62).

For education, the ethics of solidarity is a new interpretation of the correlation between two often independently perceived spaces of human experience: the individual and the social; the subjective and the objective; and the internal and the external. A new interpretation of the relationships of the above spheres of human experience in terms of education and learning indicates the importance and significance of understanding the past and future categories. On the one hand, it is a critical reinterpretation while recognizing the achievements and significance of ideas, concepts, and methods of actions undertaken in the past and rooted in tradition (Dąbrowski 2017, 87–114). On the other hand, it is the postulate of seeing the contemporary school as an institution that not so much has to keep up with the dynamics of contemporary cultural and social changes but, above all, should design a space for individual activism and bottom-up social activities aimed at the future (Dąbrowski 2018b, 389–404). For educational practice, it is a proposal

to apply specific strategies and models of activity within three interdependent spheres: individual, local, and social (including global) life.

The implementation of the concept of solidarity and the resulting models of didactic work within the contemporary school are proposals similar to ideas already recognized in Polish pedagogical literature (Śliwerski, Rozmus 2018). It is primarily about the meaning and role assigned to the phenomenon of bottom-up activation, i.e., critical awareness of an individual participating in the socialization process. In the literature on the subject, this didactic model is grasped in terms of the analysis of constructivist and transformative didactics, which emphasize the importance of a conscious, critical, and acting subject (Klus-Stańska 2018, 187–259; Żylińska 2013; Malewski 2010). These (internally various) models are focused on developing the ability to self-assess and analyze individual, local, and global phenomena, as well as to activate resistance and creative activities. These refer to the justifications that reinforce the sensitivity and disagreement (reaction) to what appears unfair (morally wrong) in subjective experience and construct a subjective attitude necessary for the existence of an open, civic, and critical society. At this point, critical thinking becomes a tool of the individual's reaching autonomy (Dąbrowski 2020, 263–287). The understanding of autonomy, however, is rooted in the theory of moral development. At every stage of life, humans only gradually deepen the scope and understanding their own freedom. Therefore, education that triggers the attitude of conscious disagreement and resistance in the student, with simultaneous activity and willingness to act, provides him or her with competencies and abilities in subsequent, increasingly complex life choices. In other words, in constructivist and transformative didactics models, the student is to train him- or herself in self-diagnosing matters, both personal and socially ambivalent.

The above epistemological-axiological training is to be directed at the broadest possible analysis and recognition of a given situation, problem, or issue to independently generate possible solutions, activities, or actions on this basis. The role of critical thinking is paramount here because of its regulatory value, the potential to protect the individual against manipulation in the sphere of personal relationships. Critical thinking can also protect against the influence of populist strategies and totalizing concepts. In this approach, it is understood as a tool of existential and social prevention. Contemporary humankind is a conscious entity for whom it seems insufficient to be involved only in the present. One of the primary tasks of 21st-century education based on the Ethics of Solidarity may be to awaken awareness of how today's actions in the individual and social sphere affect what belongs to the future (Kamińska-Małek, Oleśniewicz 2020; Denek, Zimny 1999).

The aim and the effect of education practiced in the spirit of the Ethics of Solidarity is, therefore, to return to the source questions: what was it, what is it, what should it be? The answer that can be constructed based on the above proposal emphasizes the role and significance of human bonds and relationships (subjective sphere). Further, it indicates the importance of educational content that comes from

everyday (personal) life, while in education, this was marginalized or completely absent (objective sphere).

First, this touches on the process of learning and upbringing, the success of which depends on the quality of the relationship between the participants. It is the promotion and validation of personal, relational, and dialogue education. In the most profound sense this approach fulfills its tasks where the bond between the participants in the educational and developmental process is created. Such a bond guarantees presence, closeness, and trust, especially when difficult, ambivalent, or educationally borderline events (resistance, disagreement, disobedience, etc.) appear. In other words, it is building an educational environment in which people as subjects of the developmental process have space and acceptance as they face challenging tasks, taking into account the needs of oneself and others, as well as limitations and possibilities coming from the external world. Notably, the depth of the relations of the participants in this process does not depend on academic success (grades, tests, competitions, contests, etc.).

Second, in the objective sphere, education based on the foundation of reliable science is promoted in which the inseparable connection between what belongs to theory and practice is clearly emphasized. Emphases must also be drawn between what is intellectual, experimental, and emotional, and between what is objective and subjective (external and internal). Education based on solidarity means including diverse and heterogeneous content, dominated by the message of interdisciplinary (multifaceted) issues, and a form of holistic thinking, connecting, and integrating the fragmented world of scientific discourses. In didactic strategies, the model of solidarity education loudly calls for the need for more active and conscious inclusion in the processes of education and learning, moral, axiological, and psychological content. In the contemporary literature on the subject, a model similar to the discussed proposal is the concept of holistic education (Śliwerski 2020, 7–20). On the one hand, this model proposes a vision of a merged educational reality, which, although consisting of many disciplines of knowledge, finds spots combining distant or cognitively independent content. Thus, it breaks down the current school stereotype, indicating the necessity and non-alternativeness of following educational profiles (humanities, natural sciences, mathematics, etc.). On the other hand, the holistic model also postulates combining the sphere of ontology, epistemology, and axiology in the processes of education, development, and learning. This means that not only is interdisciplinary work promoted, but also the need to consider and combine the subject and object spheres simultaneously is pointed out. In other words, holistic education assumes the correlation (fusion) of the potentials and limitations of the participants in the learning and upbringing process with educational content that simultaneously suits them and fully develops them. In systemic terms, this requires not only a complete and in-depth diagnosis of learning entities but also the fusion in the educational content of what belongs to the order of science and everyday life (Śliwerski 2020, 15–20).

Contemporary researchers, lecturers, and teachers from different disciplines, using different methodologies, and adopting different paradigms of thinking about the construction of knowledge, are still faced with the same questions: what kind of world do we describe, in which we live, and what kind of world do we build and design? What values underlie our actions? The Ethics of Solidarity interpreted in the horizon of the processes of upbringing and learning means the constant demand for the human being in his existential whole, in his successes and failures, in suffering and happiness, under continuous ambivalence. This is the perception of development as intellectual (cognitive), emotional (psychological), and existential (life) processes, as spheres constituting the overall development process. Moreover, such an assumption makes it necessary to consider in the objective and subjective sphere what was before us, what surrounds us today, and what we will leave behind. The Ethics of Conscience in education indicates what is primary in this process. It is the perception of the dimension of personal relationships which have the potential to change what belongs to the personal, local, and social spheres:

Against this background, the Ethics of Solidarity becomes the ethics of awakening [...]. You have to break through the world of illusions to get to the basics. Faithfulness is the basis here. Once one has accepted the hope entrusted to them, let them carry it throughout their life (Tischner 2005, 93) [translation mine].

Conclusions

2021 marked the 90th anniversary of Rev. Prof. Józef Tischner's birth, as well as the 40th anniversary of the first edition of *Etyka solidarności* (*The Ethics of Solidarity*). It was a unique opportunity to look again, critically, at the author's works about events from four decades ago and analyze how up-to-date and creative his observations and conclusions are. In the text, I tried to indicate both the place and the way of constructing the Ethics of Solidarity and the resulting pedagogical concept. Here, however, the argument was subordinated to the overarching goal, which was to reveal the source or founding element (the sphere of values) of the Ethics of Conscience. This was an attempt to face the socio-educational challenges of the 21st century. In connection with the article's primary objective, I first presented the historical context of the Solidarity movement and Tischner's role. Then I gradually revealed the social determinants of the Ethics of Solidarity to indicate the possible application of this issue in the context of learning and upbringing processes. I used the phenomenological analysis Tischner proposed, which led to the question about the source and foundation of all pedagogical activity. It turned out that the Ethics of Solidarity fits into current projects of dialogical,

personal, and humanistic education, strongly valuing the role and importance of authentic, deep interpersonal relations in the developmental processes.

The originality of this proposal from more than four decades ago is expressed primarily in recognition of reciprocity and exchange in the structure of this relationship. Both the axiological and anthropological dimensions are based on two basic categories: hope and faithfulness. Teacher-educator (understanding this role very broadly and supra-institutionally), wishing to fulfill the task entrusted to him or her, is obliged to self-diagnose his or her hope, understood here as energy enabling primarily reflective, creative, and resistant activities. Hope as an internal imperative enabling action—diagnosis, assessment, and willingness to change—is presented in this form to the student. This moment, combined with the phenomenon of trust, is completed through the principle of trust or fidelity. This guarantees the development and support of the pupil's hope, but also stresses the necessity of the teacher's hope. Having his own hope, the educator shows it to the student, who, perceiving it as a challenge for himself, provides feedback, which becomes an integral element of the hope phenomenon described here. The same is true of the principle of faithfulness, where to be faithful to another person means to be faithful to yourself first. In education, this is nothing more than a presence unconditioned by results or school successes, but rather based on the axiological assumption that a certain kind of presence conditions human development. It is the vision of relationships, dialogue, and ties between participants as elements without which comprehensive personal and creative development is not carried out. The Ethics of Solidarity are two fundamental values: hope and faithfulness, upon which a bond is formed that preserves and somehow guarantees the existence of the most valuable (successive values) in the family, school, and local community, as well as in the social sphere.

The above text is a continuation and development of the theses in work entitled *Fenomenologiczne badania społeczne inspiracją dla polskiej pedagogiki religii* [Phenomenological Social Research as an Inspiration for the Polish Pedagogy of Religion] (Dąbrowski 2018a). The suggestions found therein about the phenomenological foundation of Tischner's philosophy and pedagogy became the starting point for the entire analysis. On the one hand, phenomenology is perceived as a tendency of contemporary philosophy, which was simultaneously Józef Tischner's inspiration and subject of critical analysis (Tischner 2002, 13–26). On the other hand, it has become a concrete method of cognition and philosophical description, creating an oppositional interpretative model in relation to traditional trends in Christian philosophy in Poland (Jawor 2019, Dąbrowski 2016, 74–93). Understanding the author's significance and effects of adopting this method is crucial here because it allows perceiving the broader context of the presented conclusions and philosophical decisions, including the philosophy of education, for contemporary pedagogical issues. The only outlined picture of the complex cognitive-methodological structure of the Ethics of Conscience indicates openness

in the sphere of ontological and anthropological assumptions. This means that the observations and theses resulting from the Solidarity movement from the 1980s still have their interpretative potential but also demand critical studies in the educational reality of the third decade of the 21st century (Dąbrowski 2018a).

Bibliography

- Bonowicz W. (2020). *Tischner. Biografia*. Kraków: Znak.
- Dąbrowski A. (2020). *Myślenie krytyczne: kilka uwag historycznych i teoretycznych*, "Argument: Biannual Philosophical Journal" vol. 2 no. 10, pp. 263–287.
- Dąbrowski S. (2018a). *Fenomenologiczne badania społeczne inspiracją dla polskiej pedagogiki religii*, Karto-Teka Gdańska, vol. 1 no. 2, pp. 33–47.
- Dąbrowski S. (2016). *Pedagogika religii Józefa Tischnera. W poszukiwaniu nowego modelu edukacji religijnej*. Słupsk.
- Dąbrowski S. (2018b). „Spór o istnienie szkoły”—krytyczna edukacja ró(w)żnościowa, W: Piekarski G., Sałapata M.A. (ed.). *Horyzonty i perspektywy edukacji równościowej*. Gdańsk: Katedra, pp. 389–404.
- Dąbrowski S. (2017). *Spór o polską pedagogikę religii—między tradycją a współczesnością*. W: Dąbrowski S, Obrycka M. (ed.). *Edukacja—wartości—kontrowersje*. Gdańsk, pp. 87–114.
- Denek K., Zimny T., (1999) [ed.] *Edukacja jutra: Tatrzańskie Seminarium Naukowe*, Częstochowa.
- Gawin-Wilk M., Szecówka-Nowak M. (2020). *Strategie radzenia sobie polskiej młodzieży ze szkół ponadpodstawowych z wykluczeniem społecznym*, „Psychologia Wychowania,” vol. 59 no. 17, pp. 25–40.
- Jawor M. (2019). *W stronę egzystencjalnego oblicza filozofii. Spór Józefa Tischnera z tomizmem*. Olsztyn.
- Kamińska-Małek A., Oleśniewicz P. (2020) [ed.]. *Edukacja jutra: zróżnicowane obszary rozwoju edukacji instytucjonalnej*. Warszawa.
- Kancelaria Prezesa Rady Ministrów, <https://pomagamukrainie.gov.pl/> (accessed August 1, 2022).
- Klus-Stańska D. (2018). *Paradygmaty dydaktyki. Myśleć teorią o praktyce*. Warszawa.
- Malewski M. (2010). *Od nauczania do uczenia się. O paradygmatycznej zmianie w pedagogice*. Wrocław.
- NGO.pl, <https://publicystyka.ngo.pl/badzmy-solidarni-z-ukraina> (accessed August 1, 2022).
- NSZZ „Solidarność” 1980–1989. Ruch społeczny, T.1–10, Instytut Pamięci Narodowej. Warszawa 2010.
- Potulicka E., Rutkowiak J. (2010). *Neoliberalne uwikłania edukacji*. Kraków.
- Tischner J. (1996). *Droga Sokratesa i perć Sabaty*, „Znak” 11, pp. 41–45.
- Tischner J. (2005). *Etyka solidarności oraz homo sovieticus*. Kraków: Znak.
- Tischner J. (2001a). *Filozofia dramatu*. Kraków: Znak.
- Tischner J. (2017). *Inny. Eseje o spotkaniu*. Kraków: Znak.

- Tischner J. (2002). *Myślenie według wartości*. Znak, Kraków 2002.
- Tischner J. (2001b). *Spór o istnienie człowieka*. Znak, Kraków: Znak.
- Tischner J. (2001c). *Świat ludzkiej nadziei*. Znak, Kraków 2001.
- Tischner J. (1991). *Zarys filozofii człowieka dla duszpasterzy i artystów*. Kraków 1991.
- Tischner J. (1968). *Z problematyki nauczania*. „Znak”, vol. 169 no. 170, pp. 903–913.
- Tischner J. (1966). *Z problematyki wychowania chrześcijańskiego*, „Znak” 149, pp. 1334–1345.
- Sajdak A. (2013). *Paradygmaty kształcenia studentów i wspierania rozwoju nauczycieli akademickich. Teoretyczne podstawy dydaktyki akademickiej*. Kraków.
- Śliwerski B., Rozmus A. (2018) [ed.]. *Alternatywy w edukacji*. Kraków-Rzeszów.
- Śliwerski Bogusław (2020). *Pedagogika holistyczna*, „Problemy Wczesnej Edukacji” vol. 49 no. 2, 7–20.
- Żylińska M. (2013). *Dydaktyka konstruktywistyczna*. Toruń.
- Wyborcza (2022), <https://wyborcza.biz/biznes/7,177151,28149579,chcesz-pomoc-ukrainie-przez-internet-lista-miejsc-gdzie-to.html?disableRedirects=true> (accessed August 1, 2022).