ANDRZEJ BAŁANDYNOWICZ[1]

Academy of Justice, Poland

ORCID 0000-0003-1248-8069

JOACHIM THOMAS[2]

Catholic University of Eichstaett-Ingolstadt, Germany

ORCID 0000-0001-6071-6252

SOCIALIZATION, UPBRINGING, AND EDUCATION FOR PEACE

SOCJALIZACJA, EDUKACJA I WYCHOWANIE DO POKOJU

Streszczenie: Edukacja na rzecz pokoju wyłania się jako kluczowy element systemów edukacyjnych, mający na celu wyposażenie osób w niezbędną wiedzę, umiejętności i postawy, aby aktywnie angażowały się w pokojowe współistnienie i transformację konfliktów. W artykule przeanalizowano różne podejścia i strategie stosowane w edukacji na rzecz pokoju. Omówiono również wyzwania i możliwości związane z wdrażaniem edukacji na rzecz pokoju w różnych kontekstach, z uwzględnieniem czynników kulturowych, społeczno-politycznych i ekonomicznych.

Słowa kluczowe: Pokój, wychowanie do pokoju, edukacja, socjalizacja, filozofia prawa

Abstract: Education for peace is emerging as a key component of educational systems to equip individuals with the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitudes to actively engage in peaceful coexistence and conflict transformation. The article examines various approaches and strategies used in education toward peace. It also discusses the challenges and opportunities associated with implementing peace education in different contexts, considering various cultural, socio-political, and economic factors.

Keywords: Peace, peace education, education, socialization, philosophy of law

---

1 **Andrzej Bałandynowicz** is a professor at the Academy of Justice. His scientific interests focus on the study of social phenomena in criminology, penitentiary science, sociology of law, and philosophy of law. He is the author of the modern theory of imprisonment and the creator of the probation system. E-mail address: balandynowicz.an@gmail.com.

2 **Joachim Thomas** is a professor in the Department of Psychological Diagnosis and Intervention at the Catholic University of Eichstaett-Ingolstadt. His research interests focus on vocational rehabilitation, work and health, transition from school to work, migration and intercultural psychology.

Philosophy of Law Perspective

The philosophy of law deals with law in relation to higher values, known as ideas, among which peace occupies an important place alongside others such as justice, equity, tolerance, freedom, and security. Of all the content of law, theories of natural law occupy the leading position. Natural law defines the normative rules that should be in force, not what they are. Peace, therefore, appears precisely as a state of oughtness. If peace is the goal, then the way to achieve it must be defined. Thus, until Immanuel Kant in his work *Perpetual Peace* (1787) spelled out a new view of the problem, peace was interpreted in terms of utopia. It acquired real features only in the second half of the 20th century (Izdebski 2001). Philosophical and legal considerations of peace point to the role and importance of the law itself to implement and protect peace and the rules of war, until war is completely eliminated. It is possible on these grounds to put forward the thesis that law itself becomes an absolute condition for peace, and thus there can be no peace without law.

From the perspective of natural law philosophy, therefore, peace is a certain ideal, a higher value, but also a state that can occur between people as individuals, including those organized into larger social groups such as states. The study of peace and conflict is a branch of social science called irenology or polemology. Many philosophers of law have equated law with order and harmony, and therefore with states that are, in principle, peaceful. Peace has never been associated with war, struggle, conflict, dispute, massacre, violence, rape, slaughter, genocide, or extermination. Meanwhile, in the modern world—developed to the level of nuclear military technology—war is associated with the annihilation not only of humanity, but of the entire planet and life on it until this point. The history of the world is largely linked to the history of humanity, defined by the state of peace and war. For the Greeks, acceptance of war was natural, while peace was treated only as a temporary state. Heraclitus of Ephesus based a theory of ever-changing existence on the concept of war, saying it was the father and king "of all things" (as quoted in Palacz 1988, p. 26). Fire is the symbol of war, and at the same time it symbolizes the mutability of the entire universe; from the struggle of opposites a wonderful harmony is born. War is a natural attribute of logos: cosmic reason as a creative and simultaneously destructive force. Being has a beginning and an end in fire. Reality is only the transformation of fire, and this fire is by its nature eternal and dynamic. Heraclitus was convinced that war is characterized by existence, while everything in the world appears as its fruit: the fruit of contention and necessity (Palacz 1988, p. 27). Similarly, the coincidence of Love and Strife, Life and Death, Peace and War was proclaimed by Empedocles of Acragas: "Caritas (Love) hates overwhelming necessity" (Arystoteles, 1983, p. 116).

Unlike the Greeks, the Romans treated peace as the natural state of affairs. They allowed for the possibility of waging wars for the purpose of ideological expansion, but with the intention of bringing about peace as quickly as possible through the *Pax*

Romana. The Roman Empire was based on the doctrine of external and internal warfare in following theological rationality. According to this doctrine, the sacred character of starting and waging war is justified (Karolak 2001). For the Romans, therefore, war was permissible under certain conditions as a transitional state leading to peace, primarily in cases of defending state borders and preserving alliances (Izdebski 2001).

Of the ancient philosophical schools, the Epicurean moral concept deserves attention. It urges people to achieve inner harmony, even though in the external world war appears natural. The Epicureans realized that only a person with a peaceful disposition could achieve peace of mind. This attitude was associated with minimalism, according to which the greatest pleasure is the absence of unpleasantness (Szyszkowska 2009).

The Stoics preached the sensibility of living in accordance with rational nature and its laws as a condition for achieving virtue. An important and innovative element of their views was the principle of the brotherhood of all people. According to the Stoics, the world is the common homeland of all people. According to the Stoics, the common homeland of all people is the whole world. Thus we should treat others fraternally and live according to the laws of cosmic reason, or peace—that is, on the principles of mutual respect for dignity, freedom, and equality, the source of which is nature (Tokarczyk 1999).

Christian philosophy devoted a great deal of attention to the issues of peace and war. For early Christians, peace was a divine state, and so peacemakers "shall be called sons of God." The famous pacifistic words of Jesus, "all who take the sword shall perish by the sword," justify the prohibition of violence, even in self-defense. The ruthless struggle between good and evil, which will end in the victory of good, takes place not only in temporal life but also in spiritual life. A Christian should fight against evil, and first and foremost against his own weaknesses. However, the transition from the volitional-spiritual sphere to the external sphere stood in contradiction to the gospel parables about brotherly love (Dubiel 2001).

Medieval Christian thinkers formulated the concept of just war, related to the moral theory of what is termed "the choice of the lesser evil." Augustine in his work *De Civitate Dei* describes the war between the divine state and the earthly state as a historiosophical act of human predestination, beginning with the fate of the biblical brothers Cain and Abel and finalizing with the final clash in the apocalyptic battle of Armageddon (Augustyn 2002).

However, the greatest contributions to justifying and explaining just war theory were made by Raymond of Penyafort and Thomas Aquinas. The former formulated five conditions for a just war: it must have a proper cause, object, and subject, and must be waged with proper intentions by a legitimate authority. In light of such intervention, war appears to be a necessary means of restoring peace. It can be waged in defense of the homeland and the weak. Its only participants can be laypeople. The motive for the war must not be hatred, revenge, or greed, and it is

to be supported by authority—preferably the Church defending the faith (Izdebski 2001). Thomas Aquinas, whose philosophy became official Catholic doctrine, wrote about just war in his *Summa Theologiae*. According to Aquinas, war should always be waged with the consent of church authorities, in the interests of the church or the Christian state. He also introduced a new justification for waging wars on holy days; that is, if such a necessity arises, then a battle can be fought on a holy day (Bobrus 2001).

In the second half of the 20th century, French neo-Thomist Jacques Maritain, one of the founders of personalism, distinguished between a just war waged to remove social evils and an unjust war waged for other purposes. It was not until the conciliar movement and Pope John XXIII's 1963 encyclical "*Pacem in terres*" proclaiming peace on earth between all peoples based on truth, justice, love, and freedom condemned all war as a means of settling disputes.

Education for Peace

Coexistence is the basic paradigm contributing to the affirmation of life and respect for peace. It sees humanity as a particle of the universe, as Schweitzer writes: "The ethics of reverence for life…demands that every one of us in some way and with some object shall be a human being for human beings." The culture of peace should be regarded as an idea, an ethical principle, a norm, and an educational goal. It should be a category of action and commitment, of civic responsibility, renouncing all acts of aggression and violence in favor of negotiation and dialogue (Piejka 2017).

In promoting the idea of multiculturalism, one should work towards bridging differences and strengthening the common good. Multiculturalism needs to be understood as a dynamic and continuous process of cooperation. The formation of an educational commitment for the 21st century should take place with the consideration of cultural pedagogy. As Wojnar writes: "This issue grows into symbolic dimensions and deserves our close attention. For we have long overcome the superficial slogans of the politicized 'struggle for peace,' and are instead looking for educational ways to, as Cyprian Kamil Norwid wrote, 'make peace.' Therefore a culture of peace can be accepted as a basic ethos in the coming century" (Wojnar 2016, p. 110). One's effort to learn about different values promotes respect of other cultural achievements and cultivates a posture of openness that simultaneously promotes personal growth. In this process the individual acquires knowledge of values, principles, and cultural symbols in relation to his or her own culture, seeing how it relates to other cultures. In addition, one acquires individual competence and a sense of freedom and responsibility outside one's own culture. This fosters the ability to make correct choices in the face of cultural differences. The effects of this influence, on the one hand, focus on the elimination of stereotypes, prejudices, conservative thinking toward other, and the eradication of all fears and

archetypal consciousness. Understood in this way, the process of forming a culture of peace can counter the formation of separatist, megalomaniacal, xenophobic, nationalist cultures that are directed at the confrontation of military might or the liquidation of others. Equipping the individual with a new cultural identity leads to the initiation of self-realizing behavior and creative activity, allowing one to feel conscious and responsible for the fate of members of various communities and the entire human race.

Spreading a culture of peace involves treating this idea as universal and as a fundamental goal of education. It fosters the formation of attitudes of respect for others and oneself, respect for dignity and autonomy, and teaches tolerance and dialogue as a means of interpersonal communication. To this day humans choose evil, violence, and harm to their fellow human beings, as Ludwik Hirszfeld wrote about in describing the story of his life: "Monsters of hate, cruelty, and stupidity began to creep up from the depths and embrace human hearts with their slippery tentacles. Man, who prided himself with having attained the peak of civilization, was converted into a creature worse than a beast, a creature worse than a beast, a creature that reversed the history of the world and moved it back several thousands of years. The human mind surpassed itself only in creating new tools for crime. Modern man—the so-called implementer of the ethics of coexistence—proved to be lower than troglodytes. After the war, I met a black man who was returning to Africa. He said he was going home because he could no longer take European savagery. In Africa they killed to eat; in Europe they killed for pleasure" (Hirszfeld 2011, p. 48).

Modern man expands the sphere of social communication and thus enlarges the scope of influence of his own culture by revealing the rules of its functioning. Opening up to others and creating an expanded identity of one's own becomes a conscious act, while seeking the symmetry of colliding cultures (Hall 1984).

Positive human functioning in multiculturalism and allowing the realization of the right to peace, depends on value judgments. These reveal the actual state of understanding and experience of events in the surrounding reality as well as emotional involvement. We should strive for inferential value judgments, which allow us to create the development of the individual consciously and responsibly. In this way one can avoid neglecting the assimilation of universal norms and values in the process of socialization. The measure of an individual's development should be the pursuit of exploring one's own ethics and undertaking a "positive infection" of axiological elements towards the external environment. It was rightly argued by Roman Ingarden that a creative person is one whose "action consists in the fact that he fights for the realization of values, and fights not for the sake of the reward of heroism, but only as a man aware of the true value of the value he is trying to realize" (Ingarden 1987, pp. 96–97).

In today's conditions of a world subjected to the influence of liberal democracy and capital economy based on the monopoly of profit and postmodern cultural

trends, building a creative and active human being becomes the challenge of our times. An individual with an educated motivation for dialogue—responsible for his or her own choices and capable of the kind of action that characterizes world peace—can halt the course of expansion of commodity culture and democracy based on the fraudulent offer of freedom. Efforts should be made to ensure that modern man is situated in culture, because then he is able to understand himself and his own culture with the assistance of other cultures. By this path, the individual identifies with the community, and personal ties take precedence over material ties. Essential to fostering the values of a culture of peace is being guided by the principle of tolerance and dialogue, which makes it possible to reject indifference, elimination, and hostility. Then one can break down all stereotypes, myths, and barriers that limit communication, which will lead to creative encounters, reconciliation, and integration.

Tolerance is another way of bearing with; showing patience, forbearance, and respect; acknowledging; being reconciled to a different value judgment on a certain action. Adam Piekarski points out that "the basis of tolerance is respect for the person, respect for his dignity and individuality, freedom, and rights. It presupposes treating another person's views and beliefs equally with one's own" (Piekarski 1979, p. 20). On the other hand, Stefan Swieżawski emphasizes that tolerance is a basic value, a virtue, and it stems from humility and appreciation of one's neighbor (Swieżawski 1993). It is worth noting two dimensions of tolerance: humanistic and normativistic. The former is associated with general permissiveness, an attitude of leniency, benevolent acceptance, sympathetic understanding, and a liberal tendency to punish norm violations. The second dimension, however, indicates the presence of a very punitive and strict norm, and denotes a state of enduring, tolerating transgressions of this norm, an unpleasant situation, or behavior contrary to an accepted social rule. The attitude of putting up with—withstanding dissent—is a consequence of practical and psychological circumstances. It is often derived from a certain way of coexistence based on the mutual balancing of individuals and dissimilar groups.

Above all, tolerance should consider the formal-legal dimension related to individual freedom and civil liberty, which require action by the individual toward acquiescence, endurance, endurance, patience in the face of otherness and difference. This kind of open and democratic attitude teaches dignity and respect for universal values, including peace as a fundamental good and right of all humanity. This formal-legal dimension of tolerance is the ontological basis of this axionormative category. In today's socio-political reality the principle of community participation, the contribution of the partnership relationship, is significantly reduced, which inevitably leads to the expansion of unilateral expectations, liberalizing demands from partners, the ideology of political correctness, and significant cultural relativism. This mindset can be described as dogmatic, minimizing interaction, deviating from epistemological creativity,

being insensitive to alternative judgments, and manifesting the ability to create broader areas of societal communication. A counterweight to the dogmatic mindset may be Carl Rogers's (1992) theory of freedom, which legitimizes causal action at the level of negotiation and compromise. The substance of this concept boils down to showing that the role of the creative and active life of the individual, as an innate dimension, has creative potential only in a climate of understanding, recognition, and respect of empathetic actions. Expanding the area of inclusive freedom makes it possible to notice others. It activates cognitive processes of emotional or intellectual reactivity towards them, to undertake cooperation and exchange for common development. The value of tolerance takes full shape under the conditions of creating a culture of peace with the participation of material means and instruments, which are encounter, dialogue, and acceptance.

To begin with, it is always necessary to create situations that are conducive to breaking social isolationism and at the same time attempt to shape inclusive states based on voluntariness and internal freedom. Only on the grounds of experiencing inclusive freedom, not exclusionary freedom, can the dynamism of life be unleashed with the participation of self-awareness to overcome barriers, fears, prejudices, and disorders of emotional reactivity. In this situation, encounter and mutual acceptance always create an opportunity to establish personal, open, and fully democratic relations. This leads to the realization of the value of peace in the practice of sovereign entities, including sovereign states. It is worth considering here Martin Buber's concept of the imperative of dialogue, referring to the negative experience of contemporary a-cultural trends, which become palliatives of the world of values. These prefer the effectiveness of human actions at any cost involving lower and material needs, freed from states of self-discovery and inner volitional-spiritual sensitivity in relation to oneself and the external environment (Buber 1992). According to the assumptions of this theory, personal identity— which constitutes the scope, depth, and dynamic of human individualism—is acquired as a result of an encounter with another human being, or through the influence of the common good: "A reliable dialogue grows out of a certain assumption, which must be accepted—explicitly or tacitly—by both parties; neither you nor I can know the truth about ourselves if we remain at a distance from each other, enclosed within the walls of our fears, but we must look at each other, as it were, from the outside, I with your eyes and you with mine, we must compare our views in conversation, and only in this way are we able to find the answer to the question of how it really is with us" (Buber 1992, p. 32).

The imperative of dialogue in fostering a culture of peace is, from an ontological-gnoseological point of view, a complex category. Its establishment testifies to a type of humanity that adopts a formula that is exploratory, open, and directed toward what is the opposite of what currently is. This attitude can be described as constant self-actualization, which can only take place in the space of unlimited freedom. It is freedom that constitutes the axiological category that becomes the direct

dimension that allows a person to enrich himself and experience a culture of peace. The imperative of dialogue, in the layer of its substantive content, is a continuous, evolutionary, and dynamic process as it moves from internal dialogue toward motivational and supportive dialogue towards external dialogue. It is designed to bring the negotiating parties closer to the knowledge of the truth. Only guided by the meta-need for mental-intellectual transgression is it conducive to reaching the heights of learning about oneself and the world. The effect of applying the imperative of dialogue in the creation of a culture of peace is to recognize the need for love in relation to oneself and others, by recognizing it as leading in the hierarchy of sensations and feelings by a person. Only then does a person acquire respect and a sincere desire to understand the other, follow the principle of responsibility for himself and those around him, and adopt the rules of ethical precepts. The latter involve the need to enrich one's own identity with moral criteria that support becoming a responsible person, that is, coming out of the state of ethical dormancy. Józef Tischner, referring to Emmanuel Lévinas's thesis, stresses that "Man serves values—realizing them, values serve man—saving him. The encounter with the 'Other' can only happen in a dialogical reality. I can no longer be I-in-self and I-for-self, but I must become I-with-others and even I-for-others. I must open myself to the very otherness of the 'Other.' I must sink into this otherness […]" (Tischner 1995, p. 50).

It is also worth citing Ryszard Kapuściński on the role and importance of dialogue in humanization of man and its impact on changing the world. Internal, motivational-supportive and external dialogue should be, in his opinion, aimed at understanding—that is, learning the truth. This situation can only be achieved on the level of encounter, rapprochement, and acceptance of the individual. The established mutual relationality becomes a source of mutual cognition and expansion of the boundaries of inclusive freedom in the territory of the community and the whole world (Kapuściński 2007).

In the 21st century, a person who undertakes education based on "new patterns" (and "not worn out" or "outdated" patterns) refers to respect for a culture of peace, cementing and uniting into one community the inhabitants of our globe, and should unleash creative practices that change the image of the world with the participation of the creative individual. What is important is not the achievements of democracy in the field of systemic economic, banking, or military solutions, but the formation of a people capable of transcending the limits of their own ethnocentrism and sociocentrism in favor of a culture of peace as a state of freedom, equality, and tolerance (Czajka 2012, p. 13).

Therefore, modern man should understand that peace is the most important natural right of the individual; it grows on intercultural and transcultural soil, and it requires the understanding that the diversity and multiplicity of its elements can provide a permanent and sustainable foundation for internal peace and external peace, realizing a culture of peace on our globe (Szerląg 2011).

Education (upbringing) for peace

In modern civilization, we should favor a "society of upbringing" that is designed to lead to multilateral and permanent learning of the individual and the development of his or her talents (Okon 1998). On the other hand, currently there is a crisis in the educational system: the education of young people. This problem was noted a century ago by philosopher and humanist John Dewey (1959–1952), who created and implemented the system of democratization of education. He claimed that "all upbringing is a process of growing the individual into the social consciousness of the species," and in school there is a "peculiar extension of both society and the family" (Dewey 1972, p. 10). According to Dewey, the school is supposed to be the terrain of the social life of the pupils and an experience associated with their mindfulness. The process of upbringing centered in the school institution is to improve the knowledge, competence, and skills of the individual during this period, not to instrumentalize this time of education towards preparing the child for adult life. Dewey assigned special importance to personal growth and maturity, assigning this category a priority humanistic value. He believed that the reverse process—that is, not guaranteeing the reevaluation of the student's attitudes towards empathy and pro-sociality—ceases in fact to be life and becomes a mere dummy or substitute for human life (Dewey 1972).

The institutional democracy of the school in light of Dewey's concept is to treat it as a small society, where individuals learn about reality, the rules of interpersonal communication, cultural norms and standards, and learn through practical action. All these elements boil down to forming and actualizing a community of thought and action between individuals, allowing them to achieve individualism as well as unity with all of humanity, of which they are heirs (Dewey 1972).

Dewey's concept of education abolishes and cancels all dualisms such as "knowledge/action," "intellect/feelings," or "method of cognition/learned object." This model makes it possible to build a holistic human structure with a multidimensional sensory and volitional-spiritual condition. It also refers to the Aristotelian rule that a person should be characterized by coherence and homogeneity of thinking, speaking, and acting. Only an internally integrated rational-spiritual structure of the individual allows the formation of social ties based on healthy principles of human equality, being an expression of acceptance of the foundation of these actions, namely, inner peace. It opposes the instrumental treatment of human beings by others; it is not an end, but a means. Thus it rejects education and upbringing as reduced to mutual exploitation and social utilitarianism using physical force, social position or position (Murzyn 2001). Such a situation would violate the understanding of democracy and lead to a preference for material, rather than personal, relationships between people. Dewey gave the theory of education a pragmatic character, linking cognition to action. Focusing on effective and efficient action, he dismissed scientific cognition and relegated

to the background the classical values of goodness, truth, and beauty. He related education and training to the future, as he believed that the content of cognition is what has been established, discovered and is certain, while its reference— the horizon to follow—is the future.

Dewey's practicalized conception of education and democracy should be critically examined since, as Franciszek Bereźnicki rightly pointed out, "it is not the content of education, but the development and world of human values that are considered the most important goals of education" (Bereźnicki 2001, p. 5). Moreover, he warns that philosophy cannot be understood, as Dewey did, that it is "an articulation of various practical issues" and proclaims the view that philosophy is "a theory of education, understood as a conscious direction of practical action" (Dewey 1972, p. 456). As a representative of empiricism, Dewey failed to note that causal thinking, effective action, and correct social relations are only heterotelic and not autotelic values, and thus are incapable of creating human autonomy and subjectivity.

The most essential human need is to experience and feel the meaning of life, and this cannot be satisfied by acquiring practical abilities and experiences to solve practical problems. Education and upbringing are supposed to serve higher ideals and values, as they are the ones that promote the formation of an authentic sense of human existence. As cultural educator Bogdan Nawroczyński rightly states, "education is a fusion of two different orders of things— the valuable products of the human spirit and the inner spiritual life of the developing person" (Nawroczyński 1947, p. 161).

Dewey's fundamental error was that he tied the goals of education exclusively to the fundamental category, which is the life of the individual, and it was to this that he subordinated education. He either rejected or overlooked the external categories relevant to this process, other values besides human life that affect its essence and meaning. Biocentrism is largely related to human development and self-development, but this concept of paedocentrism oriented to the value of human life, must correspond with other autotelic values in its combined symbiosis.

Despite these criticisms, Dewey's system of democratic education gave rise to the transformation of anthropological and philosophical thought around establishing a new educational order for new generations. It should focus on the subjectivity of the person, individualization of education, self-governance, creative activity, teaching by doing, teaching life by living, implementation of self-development and self-education, and democratization of social life (Wołoszyn 2003).

Also at the international level, on the initiative of UNESCO, two reports were created on the issue of the image of educational systems. These constituted a "message to the peoples of the world," a kind of appeal for the repair of education, and in connection with it, the world and human civilization. These reports are united by the idea of dialogue of cultures, value systems, human rights, democratization of societies and educational systems. The first of these, Edgar Faure's report,

"Learning To Be," and the second by Jacques Delors, "Education: There Is a Treasure Hidden in It" (Półturzycki 2008, p. 116). The Faure Report adopts a starting thesis for 21st century education: a belief in democracy "conceived as the right of every person to realize his or her own full potential and to participate in creating his or her own future. And the key to democracy understood in this way is an education that will not only be universally accessible, but whose ideas and methods will be rethought" (Wołoszyn 2003, p. 169). The second report, on the other hand, bases education on four pillars: learning to know; learning to act; learning to live together, learning from coexistence with others; learning to be. Stefan Wołoszyn rightly notes that "still humanity [...] cannot get rid of all kinds of prejudices: racial, ethnic, national and xenophobic" (Wołoszyn 2003, p. 180). Thus the third pillar of education—pointing to the need for understanding between people of different nations, races, cultures, mutual respect, dialogue, and avoidance of violence and war—assumes special importance.

The fundamental task of education based on the referenced documents of the international legal order in this regard becomes a question of understanding the world and guiding self-development towards secondary integration into it. It becomes necessary to teach in such a way as to equip the individual with an autonomous capacity for self-affirmation and self-reflexivity so that he or she can steer his or her own life and imbue it with higher values, especially respect for the lives, health, and freedom of human beings (Denek 2001).

Delros's report predicts that the domain of 21st century humankind will be one of interpersonal and all-civilizational solidarity, which cannot be spoken of without knowledge of cultures, traditions, and understanding and respect for others. Education should serve the entire society to develop bonds of personal interaction and cooperation for the benefit of fellow citizens and the entire human race. Against the backdrop of general philosophical assumptions about education and the views of theoreticians and practitioners—as well as international civilization and cultural standards in this area—Poland is reforming reality in a formal and procedural way, ignoring the most important issues, namely, the axiological order in educational practice and educational processes. The reform initiated at the end of 1999 created a legal framework for the individualization of the educational process, the democratization of the intra-organizational system, teacher autonomy, and the cooperation of the three necessary links in the educational process—that is, teachers, students, and their parents. Reform, with the omission of axiology, is incapable of forming a human being in a democratic reality, as only high values can serve the self-development of the individual and the consolidation of community solidarity throughout society. Individualism, as Dewey pointed out, is the source of super-individualism, that is, collectivism. When individuals do not differ, for example, because of globalization or uniformity or conformist behavior, the result will be one-sided ideological views and the loss of the inherent right to freedom. Restrictions on internal freedom prevent people from self-realization and obtaining

self-satisfaction with life or a sense of meaning in existence. In education, it should be remembered that the goal of education is to form an autonomous person, independent, active, and creative to the extent of his or her individual capabilities, who searches out values for his or her own existence, creativity, and development. A system designed this way stimulates individuals to self-learning, raises their self-esteem to the right level, stimulates emotional involvement and problem-solving abilities, awakens responsibility for their own development, and reduces passivity, indifference, and aggression (Kłosowski 1999).

Summary

The Polish school was not and is not a democratic institution, as neither teachers nor parents participate in making important decisions regarding the organization of schoolwork. Only a self-governing school can create opportunities to prepare young people for life in a democracy—a school with a high level of education and with numerous, varied extracurricular activities. The educational process itself should generate constant conditions for the full integration of the activities of the teacher and the student, as well as between the students themselves in the search for values and creation of positive interpersonal communication, consisting in the equalization of emotional differences in interpersonal relations. The acquisition of skills in non-verbal communication serves to convey information about emotional-feeling life, and this is a tricky issue in the formation of human sensitivity and empathy. At the same time, it should be remembered that this sphere of inner life contributes to the formation of hierarchical needs, moral duty, evaluative relativism, and responsibility for oneself as well as the common good.

Here it is worth paraphrasing Fyodor Dostoevsky, who was convinced that the purpose of life is the mystery of human existence, not life itself. In realizing the purpose of life, one should focus on one's own free choices, with full preservation of personal, supra-individual, and transcultural identity. In this range of acquired qualities, a person should reject anti-values, palliatives of real ideas and high values. Among these real virtues, a prominent place should be given to life, health, dignity, freedom, inner peace, and the natural environment. It should include the idea of peace and education for peace and the formation of environmental awareness. To achieve this goal for the processes of education, there is a need to define new ideals of socialization based on the philosophy of man, the philosophy of culture, the philosophy of politics, and the psychology of individual development. They should provide conditions for the holistic nature of human beings, the multidimensionality of personal development, and secondary integration. They should release the potential for proactive cultural-creative activity, the realization of subjective values in the form of the right to internal peace and freedom, and the right to make voluntary commitments. This positive socialization of personal individualism should cause the autotelic need of individuals to assert

the validity of the values of community solidarity and the creation of an open, democratic rule of law. Assimilation of valuation with the participation of norms based on fairness, helpfulness, and efficiency will allow individuals to combine into a common segment the values of freedom, peace, and equality. The process of their fusion and unification will lead to the global acceptance of worldview pluralism, civilizational and cultural diversity, with the simultaneous sharing of dissimilarity, otherness, and diversity. A state of being indicating acceptance and understanding of others is the crown of democratic governance on a micro- and macro-social scale.

Bibliography

Arystoteles (1983). *Metafizyka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Augustyn św. (2002). *Państwo Boże*. Kęty: Wydawnictwo ANTYK.

Bereźnicki F. (2001). *Dydaktyka kształcenia ogólnego*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

Bobrus A. (2001). *Tendencje pacyfistyczne w katolickiej nauce społecznej*. W: Karolak S.J. (red.). *Pacyfizm. Prawo a dzieje państwa i ustroju*. Tom 2. Białystok: Temida 2.

Buber M. (1992). *Ja i Ty. Wybór pism filozoficznych*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX.

Czajka A. (2012). *Kultura świata w dialogu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego.

Denek K. (2001). *Krajoznawstwo i turystyka dzieci i młodzieży – okazją do współdziałania, samorządności i demokracji*. W: Dymara B. (red.). *Dziecko w świecie współdziałania*, cz. 2. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

Dewey J. (1972). *Demokracja i wychowanie. Wprowadzenie do filozofii wychowania*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.

Dubiel L., Malarczyk J. (2001). *Historia doktryn polityczno-prawnych*. Lublin: AWH Antoni Dudek.

Hall E.T. (1984). *Poza kulturą*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Hirszfeld L. (2011). *Historia jednego życia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Ingarden R. (1987). *Książeczka o człowieku*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.

Izdebski H. (2001). *Historia myśli politycznej i prawnej*. Warszawa: CH Beck.

Kapuściński R. (2007). *Ten inny*. Kraków: Czytelnik.

Karolak S.J. (2001). *Antyczne źródła idei pokoju*. W: Karolak S.J. (red.). *Pacyfizm. Prawo a dzieje państwa i ustroju*. T. 2. Białystok: Temida 2.

Kłosowski J. (1999). *Prawo uczenia do sukcesu*. W: Bińczycka J. (red.). *Prawa dziecka – deklaracje i rzeczywistość*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

Murzyn A. (2001). *Pragmatyzm J. Deweya a samorządności demokracja*. W: Dymara B. (red.). *Dziecko w świecie współdziałania*, cz. 2. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

Nawroczyński B. (1947). *Życie duchowe: Zarys filozofii kultury*. Kraków: Księgarnia Wydawnicza F. Pieczątkowski i SKA.

Okoń W. (1998). *Wprowadzenie do dydaktyki ogólnej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo „Żak".

Palacz R. (red.). (1988). *Klasycy filozofii*. Warszawa: Polskie Wydawnictwo Prawnicze Iuris.

Piejka A. (2017). *Kultura pokoju jako wyzwanie edukacyjne*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo naukowe ChAT.

Piekarski A. (1979). *Wolność sumienia i wyznania w Polsce*. Warszawa: Polska Agencja Interpress.

Półturzycki J. (2008). *Raport Edgara Faure'a „Uczyć się, aby być"*. W: Kruszewski Z. (red.). *Modernizacja edukacji, Projekty Międzynarodowe*. Płock: Wydawnictwo Novum.

Rogers C. (1992). *Tworzenie klimatu wolności*. W: Blusz K. (red.). *Edukacja i wyzwolenie*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza Impuls.

Schweitzer A. (1971). *Życie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PAX.

Swieżawski S. (1993). *O właściwe rozumienie tolerancji*. „Znak", nr 6, s. 4-5.

Szerląg A. (2011). *Konflikty i dialog w wybranych społeczeństwach wielokulturowych*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Atut.

Szyszkowska M (2009). *Dzieje filozofii*. Białystok: Temida 2.

Tischner J. (1995). *Gra wokół odpowiedzialności*. „Znak", nr 10, s. 47-55.

Tokarczyk B. (1999). *Historia filozofii prawa w retrospektywie prawa natury*. Białystok: Temida 2.

Wojnar I. (2016). *Humanistyczne przesłanki niepokoju*. Warszawa: Elipsa.

Wołoszyn S. (2003). *Oświata i wychowanie w XX wieku*. W: Kwieciński Z., Śliwerski B. (red.). *Pedagogika*, t. 1. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.