

Maria Mendel*, Agnieszka Naumiuk, Bohdan Skrzypczak****

* University of Gdańsk, ** University of Warsaw

In the interest of society Social pedagogy in the times of nationalism

ABSTRACT: Many of the current representations of social pedagogy find common ground in the expressed concern for „what is social”, „what is public”; for society. This concern takes the form of cultivating democratic thought in the conditions of an ongoing crisis of values, strengthening the principles of democracy. These conditions are conducive to the development of various types of conservatism, including the intensification of socially controversial forms in which contemporary nationalism manifests itself. We have composed a statement about these issues in three perspectives: socially responsible pedagogy (Agnieszka Naumiuk); public pedagogy (Bohdan Skrzypczak) and the pedagogy of the common place (Maria Mendel). We suggested these perspectives with the intention of using them as one of the many ways, currently emerging in the field of social pedagogy, of perceiving and changing the world in which we live, which cannot be described today without numerous references to the popular forms of nationalism.

KEYWORDS: Nationalism, public pedagogy, place pedagogy, social responsibility of pedagogy.

Introduction: Why concern for society; why now? (Maria Mendel)

Wiesław Theiss, inscribing his words in the jubilee of the 100th anniversary of Poland's regaining independence, reminded, accurately and meaningfully in the context of the current reality, of the fierce criticism of nationalistic concepts „from the National League” of Helena Radlińska (2018, p. 150). He quoted an opinion on – strongly emphasized also today – the position of nationalists on school and education, which, according to Radlińska,

„limits the horizons and inhibits the aspirations for change”, and their attitude and promotion of the controversial „pedagogy of memory”, which reduces national education to „constant looking at graves”, is „robbery of nationality” (Theiss 2018, p.150). She wrote: „(in) the name of the Polish school and the rebirth of the nation, the young generation is moving towards the graves and, having lit the lamps there, considering the past, not as free heirs of this past, but as slave debtors. The issue of education does not agree to be a slave of one slogan, one idea that excludes others, even the Polish idea, from the loftiest moments of the past brought up under the responsibility of life, for which it is to prepare employees” (Radlińska 1908, quoted from: Theiss 2018, p. 150).

Radlińska wrote about these issues on an ongoing basis, with the energy of a journalist who reacted vividly to the drifts of social development and changes in the nation of which she felt a part. Although she saw herself more as a researcher, acting „in compliance with the scientific method”, she believed that „the conditions of those times required the use of journalistic means: highlighting what is at the moment the most up-to-date, speaks to the will” (Radlińska 1964, quoted from: Theiss 2018, p.156). Impressed by this attitude and with the sense of numerous analogies that bring contemporary times closer to those that have become an urgent challenge for Radlińska, in this statement we try to address current issues that do not allow us, social pedagogues, to remain calm.

Today, the more nation, the less of a society. It is not difficult to find arguments for such a position. It can be said that this truth is now „floating in the air” and we all probably feel in some way that there are more and more nation around us, who is strangely understood and less of nation which we used to call a society, which means a large structure of social ties and relationships based on reciprocity. Margaret Thatcher’s famous statement that „there is no such thing as a society”¹ more than thirty years ago become a slogan of this trend growing at that time. This trend, ideologically, has been developing as both neo-conservative and neo-liberal. Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher – conservatives, according to the party affiliation, but

¹ Excerpt from an interview in *Women’s Own*, 1987, quoted from: Margaret Thatcher: a life in quotes, <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2013/apr/08/margaret-thatcher-quotes> (10.08.2018). This statement, more broadly: “They are casting their problems at society. And, you know, there’s no such a thing as society (highlighted by MM). There are individual men and women and there are families. And no government can do anything except through people, and people must look after themselves first. It is our duty to look after ourselves and then, also, to look after our neighbours”.

identified as neo-conservatives – can be a confirmation here (Klein 2004). „Neo”, added to the name of traditionally understood conservatism, expresses the power of the influence of globalizing capital, growing under their rule. As a result of the strength of these influences, little doubts arose that these leaders should be described as neoliberals². The marriage of conservative and liberal ideology in the „neo” version is also visible in another statement by Margaret Thatcher, who claims that *There Is No Alternative* – TINA. TINA slogan evokes the „TINA syndrome”. When it is referred to, it is clear that this is a course towards public sector privatization that covers global politics and the economy³, supported on the one hand by conservative values and on the other by the neoliberal ruthlessness of the free market principle.

However, this ideological „mix” has acquired a feature over the years that allows it to be described today as a drift within a new conservatism. It is about the emphasis on the military aspect of socio-economic and political reality. As in the case of Donald Trump, Vladimir Putin and others, its distinguishing features were the increasingly popular use of military strategies and tools as well as the development of political discourse in a climate of war-type confrontation, from Carl Schmitt, the creator of partisan theory (Schmitt 1963). This can be illustrated – again – by a quotation of Margaret Thatcher. During the – *de facto* never-spoken (partisan) – war on Falkland Islands, regardless of its dramatic course and sacrifice, she announced the end of the British military action in the following way: „Just rejoice at that news and congratulate our forces and marines. Let’s rejoice” (Thatcher 1982).

In the light of these conditions, the nation ceased to be something that used to be thought of as „self-creation”. The ideological machine, mixing the so-called traditional values and being an apotheosis of market freedom, formed a new paradigm of the nation. According to the assumption that a nation can be constructed like a corporate brand, the so-called „national branding” was created. It is developing, constructing nations „for the needs of those who have power, need and money to do it” (Szymik 2018, p. 92). National branding experts acting on their behalf invent nations according to simple instructions:

² This is what Naomi Klein, among others, did. See: *ibid.*

³ “There is No Alternative” (TINA) in Margaret Thatcher’s speech, giving roots to a neo-liberal paradigm, become a part of the world’s dictionary, giving a sign to the “TINA syndrome”, i.e. the rhetoric dominant in the social debate, inevitably leading to progressive commodification and privatization of the public sector as well as economic and social solutions that ruthlessly favor the party representing capital. See e.g: Żakowski 2005, p. 8

„Start with a flag, anthem, national days, stadiums, airlines, language and several myths” (Szymik 2018, p. 92).

The less society and the more of such a nation, the more dangerous nationalism is. As a political, economic and social attitude, contemporary nationalism is a tribute – appropriately – to the modern nation. This one, as it seems to indicate – has grown up on populism⁴, and the currently dominant version of market-oriented neoconservatism, which operates with strongly accented militarism, is a kind of a „corporate Brand”. A nation constructed on order, functional and subordinated to global interests played out in the political-military, economic and social spheres, serves these interests mainly through the attitude of its apologists, which it provokes and fuels. Nationalism, thus, also appears to be an „ordered” attitude, fully functional towards global business. All of this, with a very strong emphasis on military solutions mentioned above, brings to mind the threat of „final solutions”; it simply smells of war.

In these conditions, the importance and the need for concern for society, manifested in the cultivation of „what is social”, „what is among us” is growing in the area of mutual relations developed in everyday life. In this context, we continue to write about social pedagogy in versions that seem to us up to date; needed in these times.

Challenges of socially responsible pedagogy

(Agnieszka Naumiuk)

In social pedagogy, from the very beginning of its existence, social exclusion aroused opposition. Consent to the deliberate creation of conditions of social differentiation on the one hand and selective support systems for selected groups on the other hand has not been and is not acceptable if educators are to be guided by ideals, basic and fundamental for education, of creating conditions of social justice and equality. In the light of analyses of educational theories and practices, particular attention should be paid

⁴ Populism was described by Zygmunt Bauman as more and more attractive, because it spoke with the anger of the excluded ones (see: *Retrotopia*, Cambridge-Malden: Polity Press 2017). However, as Jan Tokarski wrote in an interesting polemic with him, Bauman does not notice that the populism owes its growing popularity to the defeat of the left, which in the 1990s and at the beginnings of the new century was looking for a “third way” and gagging on the flexibility of the borders of the postmodern world. The left equated the freedom to move these boundaries with liberty, thus opening the door to the expansion of the capitalist mentality. Zob.: Tokarski 2018, p. 64–67.

to the importance of educational environments, in relation to shaping the fullest possible human development. It is difficult to accept the situation of social oppression expressed through discrimination, exclusion from the resources of certain rights, humiliation, persecution or punishment of certain individuals and groups for their different ways of thinking, speaking, acting, inconsistent with the binding style imposed by force (Bielska 2013; Pilch, Sosnowski 2013).

Diversity inscribed in the social world, determines the richness of approaches and contexts of education for everyone. At the same time, a discussion arises on how to inscribe the concept of tradition in the context of a diverse community into the attitude of opening up to the world (Kurczewska 2016, p. 35). How to incorporate it into the whole socially diverse experiences, cultural varieties as well as economic and ethnic conflicts (Nikitorowicz, Muszyńska, Sobecki 2009), while taking into account the need for identity, belonging, acceptance, sense of security? As the chaos resulting from the rapid pace of change appears, the feeling of uncertain tomorrow grows and cultural misunderstandings and existential fears resulting from increasingly frequent mass migrations increase. The feeling of stability disappears and the power that promises peace gains strength. It soothes the pain of insecurity, gives a sense of security and inspires confidence in the effectiveness of a force that reduces social risks (see Beck 2004). Nationalism builds the reality of such social protection based on indoctrination and image of ethnic communities of blood, inherited from the ancestors, at the time of birth (Malczewski, Kaliński, Eckhardt 2012). The starting point is a peculiarly understood stabilization resulting from the historically strengthened right of belonging (and identity) of a national group in which privileges and protection do not result from any adaptation efforts. At the same time, in a spirit of nationalism, people should want to maintain their status of group determination – and persist in it with all present and future consequences, in particular the obligation to cooperate in the protection of others, as defined by their common national origin. According to Amitai Etzioni, this is not the source and primary importance of creating the rationale of nationalism and the role of governments (Ethioni 2014). However, the willingness to submit to power that demagogically consolidates the image of power, in exchange for a good life and loyalty rewards, seems to be greater in times of growth of nationalist and totalitarian mechanisms of social control, not for the first time experienced in Poland (Grott 2014). It is therefore legitimate to ask how it is possible that educators do not develop forms of resistance against manipulation and risking the next generation, which will have to grow up in the danger of oppression?

Neoliberal ideas undermined national strategies, which have been created for decades, of building safe happiness, offering instead internationalist visions of a man liberated from the limitations of national social discipline; in the free choice of a differently understood „substitute” community, one which would suit them more and which they could change if it did not meet their expectations. Neoliberal happiness is bought with the anxiety of freedom „from” instead of „to” (see Fromm 2007). However, by opening up inclusive thinking and attitudes of tolerance for different varieties and lifestyles after years of previous systemic socialist forms of social control, these ideas led to thinking mainly about rights, omitting the issue of relationships and co-responsibility. Neoliberalism has also failed in the context of unrest and life failures, education or economics. Considering life as an individual project with a personal risk of failure has transformed possible cooperation in the conditions of democratic freedom into a struggle for one’s own success – an existence liberated from the bond with others. Communist ideas of community (Grygieńć 2016) were confronted with post-socialist resentment to everything that is collective, which was used by capitalism that appears to be a sense of lack of individual limitations. Perhaps these tendencies made our pedagogical vigilance sleep – by focusing on the search for a recipe for neoliberal leaning, we accepted the promises of a return to „normality”, without noticing the destructive force behind the facade of the logic of returning to national ties and strengthening one’s own community, opens the way for another leaning, much more dangerous in its effects – the formation of totalitarian minds, as George Orwell, among others, showed in his famous novel „1984”.

In these two increasingly polarizing perspectives, the concept of the world may seem to us, pedagogues, exaggerated and unsustainable: both the reality of a free economy and subjecting man to market mechanisms, as well as strict social control and national protectionism. They are a contradiction to fair, empathic and open actions trying to integrate upbringing and education into the framework of directive management or to reduce its functioning to economic efficiency.

For a social pedagogue, the criterion of help and support is based on looking carefully at the world around and finding situations in which the potential and capabilities of groups and individuals are shaken and do not have the possibility of full bloom. It is also important to see the existing or possible to develop resources of the environment, which can be activated in prevention, intervention or social rehabilitation. Concern for the fate of a person has always turned into a specific idea of social work: the creation of care institutions, alternative approaches to forms of universal education,

training of social service workers or support for grassroots movements. In all these activities, the idea of a society that supports, educates and strengthens the development efforts of individuals and groups played a key role. Without a wise, aware of its role and resilient society, there can be no social education. Meanwhile, the last few decades have perpetuated the state of educational disintegration of the system of values, the effects of which we feel today: the struggle between absolute freedom in an educational society indifferent to the coexistence of conflicting norms, and educational absolutism resulting in neurotic attachment to the control of details of civil life and the need to regulate, and consequently over-regulate educational systems. Jane Addams, an American activist who succeeded in bringing about a fundamental change in attitudes towards immigrants and the poor in the United States by creating and running the Hull House Settlement in Chicago in 1889 for more than 40 years, has become a part of the tradition of fighting widespread acceptance of determination resulting from national affinity. By participating in the development of the movement of such settlements in the USA, Addams not only put into practice the noble ideas of social progressiveness, solidarity and community responsibility, but also brought out the long-term understanding that social integration is not a simple mechanical process, because it expresses community aspirations and hopes for the conditions of co-existence and that it cannot be reached in a better way than through education. Criticism of her actions by other community activists, reluctance of local authorities, financial difficulties and the need for continuous public activity, required work, courage and determination as well as, as she herself stated, long-term learning about community work. Addams worked in extremely different conditions, but there are some similarities to the current situation in Poland and in Europe – the perception of immigrants as a group of poor, uneducated people who are the cause of social pathologies, was, and unfortunately still is, common. Even today we are thinking about the way of working in the environment in situations of mass migration, we are fighting for the implementation of wise integration projects, hence also today there is a need for pedagogy to re-establish discussion on social responsibility of pedagogy (Naumiuk 2016).

One may wonder why such long-term initiatives as Settlements are no longer in place and whether it is possible to achieve social and educational success on a large scale, when community activists and initiatives of social organizations encounter so many difficulties on a daily basis? One can also talk about the end of the era of strong men and women, about a number of obstacles to the continuation of beautiful social works resulting from the times of mass consumption, loss of social ties, indifference to common

matters. Sometimes, however, we simply do not know how to investigate and describe a social phenomenon, how to support and sometimes critically, but not discouragingly reveal the weaknesses, threats or even pathologies existing in it. Certainly, there is a need for profound reflection and properly articulated care resulting from the study and inspection of a number of dangers to human education and development, not only in relation to the existing activities, but also in the fact of their absence. Understanding the meaning and essence of contemporary participation changes the quality of social change, while concern for the society and for the people living in it sets new goals for pedagogy (not only social) in relation to understanding partnership and civic participation.

Education is faced with new challenges of raising social awareness in the situation of participation based on imitation, with a low level of reflection, focused on copying Western models, without properly in-depth reflection on the sense and essence of one's own actions, and in the situation where there is no internal motivation to engage. It seems that especially in the face of difficulties in implementing free civic activities and understanding education as a long-term process, the role of social pedagogy is important in discussions on the importance of participation in strengthening democracy.

Unfortunately, the current systems of school education have particularly great difficulties in implementation of this concept. This should not be, as is currently the case, an 'out-of-school', 'alternative', 'innovative' measure only. However, in the present day, which focuses primarily on the realization of human rights, talking about co-responsibility on a daily basis goes to the background, and participation and social activity become rather a kind of hobby – so it must be interesting and attractive to find the willing to participate. Another point of view on the function of education to democracy has already been pointed out by John Dewey in his classic work „Democracy and Education”, showing its function of creating conditions for democracy and the need for its active response to the diverse needs of many groups belonging to the community, undertaking, through the widest possible shaping of individual experiences, the task of open exchange of knowledge and skills between people, reviving the creativity of individuals and thus providing them with greater opportunities for development (Dewey 1972, p. 113–122). In his opinion, isolation, selection (we could add: and the treatment of democratic participation as a form of spending free time only – ed. AN), causes an imbalance of intellectual stimulation, rigidity and organizational formalism, and in fact inhibits the development of individuals and groups, as well as the distortion of democratic structures (Dewey 1972, p. 118–119).

Therefore, pedagogy oriented on education towards responsible participation needs, by defining goals, among others, in the area of attitude towards society and social participation as a practice of everyday life, to reformulate the current acceptance of the existing styles of pro-social agitation, but also politicized criticism of specific forms of participation, towards understanding needs, possibilities, directing one's freedom to create the society in which one wants to live. Modernity demands reflection on the modern theory and practice of „pedagogy of social action” and dealing with myths, stereotypes and propaganda that hinder the understanding of ourselves as (pro)social beings. The very fact that education is oriented on participation in social change is symptomatic and indicates the lack of possibility to deprive it of its axionormative features. Current increase of social knowledge causes that the process of such reflection can no longer be closed in the discipline itself, but it democratizes itself and demands that the future of participation „in” and „for” education should be discussed with us, pedagogues, also by educators who are aware and enlightened social activists.

On the need to shape the public community

(Bohdan Skrzypczak)

In the debate on the place and importance of pedagogy in public life, its political dimension is relatively rarely emphasized. Meanwhile, as opposed to socialization (adaptation to the world as it is), it creates a space for the education of people, which is always a preparation for the society, which does not (yet) exist. The creation of constructs of the future world is, to a large extent, the domain of politics – it is in the political debate that visions of the new world are proposed. Whether we like it or not, in the area of society's development, political and pedagogical perspectives clash. Meeting of politics and pedagogy and relations between them are most often difficult for the latter. The concept of sub-paradigm of social pedagogy proposed in the book *Re-konstruowanie instytucji społecznościowych. Perspektywa pedagogiki społecznej* (Skrzypczak 2016) was created on this foundation. This point of view, defined as *public pedagogy*, places educational conditions for systemic/institutional and public/political shaping of society in the field of reflection. Maintaining the basic paradigm of social pedagogy – development understood as the processing of the environment by human forces – indicates the need to ‘arm it’ with a critical analysis of the educational effects: (a) the instrumental impact of public policies, (b) multidimensional informal education, (c) political impact of contemporary culture.

Public pedagogy refers in this aspect to the Anglo-Saxon concept of *public pedagogy*, which by combining the educational dimension with politics shows its consequences for the quality of the public sphere (Biesta 2014, p. 16). The tension observed today in the public sphere between the metaphorically speaking supporters of „society” and „nation” is a good opportunity to signal the point of view of public pedagogy both as a certain critical perspective (on the example of the application of two theories: M. Foucault’s governmentalization and Ch. Taylor’s social imaginary), as well as a way of pedagogical intervention.

Neoliberal microphysics of society managing

One of the greatest challenges of contemporary social pedagogy is the risk of being entangled in the mechanisms of neoliberal governance. The power present in this paradigm exposes – close to the pedagogues – the aspect of subjectivity understood as the freedom of the individual which is to be a self-steerable actor engaged in personal and collective development (see Granosik 2018). Such an approach means weakening the direct system of social control in favor of influencing what each of us chooses independently (Hindess 1999, p. 110). However, as some educators point out, one can see in it a kind of illusion of subjective autonomy, which is accompanied by an obligation of self-fulfillment reduced to a cafeteria of pre-established choices for individuals (Męczkowska 2006, p. 140–141). Michael Foucault’s governmentality (Foucault 1998) is a theory that allows a deeper recognition of this opaque reality of a „self-managed society” (Foucault 1998). It draws attention to the process of redefining the essence of power, which can be understood as the way in which governments seek to produce citizens who best implement their policies. He discovers the techniques and strategies through which society allows itself to be guided (Jones 2007, p. 174). In the case of neoliberal governmentality, the knowledge produced and organized practices (mental, rational and technical) are aimed at constructing self-regulating entities.

Applying this cognitive perspective, it can be concluded with some surprise that techniques and ways of influencing contemporary power are similar to the assumptions of social pedagogy. For example, in the concept of human capital promoted in public policy, we can find a category of human forces, while the strategy of active social policy resembles the processing of the environment by the forces of that environment. All this happens in the name of the ideal, which is subjectivity and, above all, self-development. Public programs/policies „become pedagogical” and can be understood as instruments through which societies regulate themselves and try to direct the human behavior towards acceptable directions” (Kraft, Furlong 2007, p. 26). However,

when we go deeper into the logic of public policies, we will discover that this way of managing the society has hidden negative mechanisms. It forces the recipients to non-alternative adaptation to the dominant rules of life. Projects funded by the European Social Fund, placing the need for empowerment at the forefront, at the same time significantly redefine it, depriving it of its emancipatory character. Agency, action, commitment, ethical responsibility, autonomy is transformed into: resourcefulness, effectiveness, rivalry, independence or information (Męczkowska 2007, p. 354). Disadvantaged groups are expected to share the values of the middle class, which are often contrary to their lifestyles: maternity, eating habits, leisure activities, family organization, communication (Granosik 2018, p. 60). Social pedagogy, unconscious of the threat, is sometimes entangled in public programmes carried out under the motto of empowerment. In this way, it is deprived of its educational mission – the emancipatory power – which makes it impossible to undertake social resistance, which would intersect the intricate threads of the microphysics of power over society (Arbiszewski 2001, p. 21). The result of governmentality processes is a sense of self-exclusion of various groups and communities that do not feel comfortable with the model of citizen and employee proposed to them. Many of them find acceptance and identity in the national community, in which they can finally be themselves, and even receive the right and encouragement to exclude others (e.g. the middle class) from the nation.

National social imaginary

The nation as an imaginary community (Anderson 1997), i.e. the one whose members, although they do not meet directly and do not know each other, create an image of a community in their minds, has become an important and expansive idea of contemporary public debate in Poland. It is with amazement that we are observing today how public affairs are being transformed into national issues, and even these, contrary to intentions, are dangerously close to nationalism. Reading the social sources and educational consequences of such transformation of meanings may be a problem not only for social pedagogues, but also for other participants in the public sphere. An inspiring theoretical framework for the analysis of the conditions for constructing a national community is provided by the concept of a social imaginarium proposed by Charles Taylor (Taylor 2010) and popularized in Poland a few years ago by Andrzej Leder (Leder 2014). Both researchers use the imaginary to understand the formation and impact of lasting images built on the memory of historical events, which then function in the consciousness

and ignorance of the society. Thanks to the fact that the stories that make up the imaginary are represented in words, stories, the whole symbolic legacy absorbed by each of us – in family, school, mass culture – they can at the same time constitute the backbone of the subjectivity of the entire community, referred to in psychoanalysis as the symbolic field. Charles Taylor defines this symbolic universe as a similar understanding of matters, enabling common practices and the emergence of a sense of legitimacy shared by broad social groups. It is worth emphasizing that these ideas may be false, i.e. they may hide some significant facts that do not fit the imposed meanings, thus becoming an ideological awareness. In this way, the imaginary transformation process focuses on reinterpretation of a previously widely shared set of beliefs.

This way of „educational” influence known in Poland as historical politics changes the entire system of social thinking. Reverses, transforms or creates a new historical social imaginary⁵. The authorities rewrite the past in such a way as to adapt history to the needs of the present. They create a narrative and then introduce it into the social bloodstream in order to make it binding. An interesting example of the power of a top-down imaginary can be the evolution of the importance of the activity of historical reconstruction groups. Today it is a real social movement in which tens of thousands of people are actively involved, and the recipients of the events being reconstructed are millions of Poles every year. The reconstructed past – images and accompanying social emotions – captured the social imagination and became one of the most important practices in the national symbolic field.

The beginnings of the movement, currently known as the reconstruction movement, date back to the 1970s in Poland, when the first knights’ event was organized at the castle in Golub – Dobrzyń. The Polish historical reconstruction movement was born in its complete form in the early 1990s as one of the manifestations of a renewed interest in local identity. The flagship programme of that time, „Małe Ojczyzny – tradycja dla przyszłości”, formed according to the pedagogical concept of environmental education, encouraged and gave space for historical research. The activated social energy, in a distant perspective, created a cultural identity, and in the near perspective, gave the opportunity to direct exciting historical spectacles, creating the opportunity to express local patriotism. The rapidly developing reconstruction groups were educationally attractive environments in which it was possible to acquire social

⁵ *To jest rewolucja. PiS zmienia imaginariusz historyczny. Interview with prof. Rafał Wnuk, „Gazeta Wyborcza”, <http://lublin.wyborcza.pl/lublin/7,48724,23842188,kto-nie-z-nami-ten-nie-jest-polakiem-tak-pis-buduje-wspolnote.html>.*

competences related to leadership and teamwork combined with an axiological dimension (knightly code, justice, courage, dignity). Importantly, reconstructive education through historical practice included not only men but entire families, becoming a multi-generational formative experience. A diverse and non-ideological movement has become a significant social and political potential. That is why at some point the social movement become annexed by the state's historical policy. A top-down narrative of heroic patriotism was imposed on the grassroots activity of the reconstructors. Historical reconstructions started to be contrasted with the so-called pedagogy of shame (critical historical analysis). In this way, over the course of several years, a varied movement of history enthusiasts became a carrier of nationally constructed national memory, a symbolic manifestation of which was the participation of the reconstructors in the nationalist message of the Independence March. Interestingly, traffic participants are probably aware of this „reversal effect” only to small extent (see Boudon 2008) which consist in the fact that original ideas of historical research have been incorporated into a new discourse that changes the meaning of social practices. The imaginary has the power to establish and even impose its own moral framework. In this way, as one of the creators of the public pedagogy H. Giroux notes, – „it plays a key role in the creation of narratives, metaphors and images that have a powerful pedagogical power to establish the way people think about themselves and their relationships with others” (Giroux 1998, p. 62).

**Project „Solidarność codziennie jest możliwa” [Solidarity is possible every day]
– pedagogical construction of the public community**

Critical studies conducted within public pedagogy emphasize the need for the pedagogue to act as a public intellectual (social activist), so that they can disseminate new ideas concerning the organization of social life by engaging themselves in testing them in social reality. This was the starting point for the development of a pedagogical intervention – the social campaign „Solidarność codziennie jest możliwa!” – prepared by the educators of the CAL⁶ Association. It was an attempt of social resistance in the situation of the threats described above. It assumed a grassroots and educational creation of a new social imaginary known as „solidarity every day”. Charles Taylor in his work entitled *Sources of the Self* (Taylor 2001) provided a reflective basis for such a practical manifestation of public pedagogy, noting that public space and activity is above all a meaningful moral community.

⁶ www.cal.org.pl.

Solidarity was treated as a counterpoint to the growing divisions. On the one hand, we have a bitter reflection indicating that the neoliberal transformation of two decades ago denied the hopes associated with the ethos of the 1980 Solidarity Revolution, and its heroes, the workers, turned out to be the losers of the changes. On the other hand, the way in which solidarity was incorporated into the direct political fight against the liberal-democratic vision of society. Therefore, we are dealing with a situation in which an important historical symbol for Poles divides rather than unites. Nevertheless, CAL educators decided that it is still possible to be inspired by the spirit of solidarity, but it needs to receive a new social context, and the inspiration for this is the name – *solidarity every day*⁷.

In this new sense, solidarity can be a measure of community quality, a determinant of social integration, an important response to problems such as aversion to others, including immigrants, envy, the difficult situation of many excluded groups, and the breakage of society. „When people think about self and non-self they quickly refer to stereotypes. They feel close to those who are similar to them, in terms of age, material, professional and social situation. Weaker people do not speak out and do not fight for their rights, they are invisible. In this way whole groups of forgotten people – other, stranger – are created. Because they do not belong to the main – „normal” trend in the community, they are often unnoticed, needless, separated by a wall of indifference or reluctance”⁸. People unite into tribes of common perceptions, not wanting to talk to other, stranger. They do not look for threads of understanding, but rather close themselves to bubbles or social tribes of people similar to them.

The quoted fragment of this bottom-up diagnosis shows that one of the most important challenges of social pedagogy today is the answer to the question whether and how we can cross invisible borders and barriers in our communities. How to take care of the weak and to do away with divisions, create spaces and opportunities in which everyone can feel important and appreciated – create common spaces. Meetings of educators and animators of CAL recognizing this situation showed not only the need to give a new meaning to the „community of solidarity” (every day), but also the willingness to build a new social contract through social narration and micro-measures for mutual trust, culture of cooperation and sensitivity to others. The result

⁷ The name and outline of the idea of solidarity every day was worked out daily by the educators of CAL and the European Solidarity Centre in Gdańsk.

⁸ The quote comes from the campaign materials.

of this reflection turned out to be a plan of pedagogical intervention – a civic campaign taking place on a local and national scale. The initiative was implemented by conducting 20 events/debates throughout Poland, in which over a thousand animators and social leaders took part, i.e. people who are active in their communities, are the driving force behind various initiatives – a social carrier of ideas. Each debate was prepared voluntarily by CAL educators (sometimes supported by friendly institutional partners) and assumed a social analysis based on specific examples, divisions among inhabitants occurring at the local level. Issues raised include tension-filled dyad: migrant/local people, open/closed spaces, passive/active citizenship, local authority/citizens, elite/people, networks/likes, neighbor – enemy/friend, public/private, heritage – our/foreign or influential/excluded. Discussion and active supportive forms (workshops, drama) made it possible to share examples, which were the starting point for finding the postulated daily micro-practices, which were called „gestures of solidarity”⁹. During the meetings, concrete examples of people who could be called animator(s) of solidarity on a daily basis were searched for. As a result of these searches, there were nominations for the Helena Radlińska award for animators of solidarity every day.

The campaign included three key intervention mechanisms aimed at reversing prevailing trends. The first was to strengthen or restore the axiological perspective and social sensitivity by reflecting on the presence of solidarity on a daily basis in the local projects and activities of the various institutions forced to function according to the instrumental logic of public policies. The second aimed at creating a participatory discourse of solidarity every day as a kind of grassroots social imaginary. The third assumed the interest of a group of animators and local leaders to be a promoter of solidarity practices on a daily basis. Implementation of these goals was to create attitudes thanks to which people of different cultures would be motivated to broaden the space of cooperation by groups that were previously excluded. This strategy was described by Peter Sloterdijk as the production of the immune system, understood as a symbolic support „to acquire good habits in everyday exercises for mutual survival” (Sloterdijk 2009 quoting Kołtan 2012, p. 138).

The campaign was strongly educational, promoting active, demonstrative and experimental attitudes. Active, because they were to create new solutions, which are trying to regain the real possibilities and areas of acting for the various forms of collective cooperation. Demonstrative because they showed

⁹ In reference to and against the microphysics of power that manifests itself in the smallest social practices and in human corporeality.

that „alternativeless” patterns from the market or nationally defined values could be abandoned. Experimental, because they served the purpose of discovering new ways of community entrepreneurship. Adoption of such outlined public pedagogy perspective was aimed at testing the educational process of producing and promoting high quality public togetherness – which means a space/place where we can and want to be in solidarity with others.

Perspective of the common place pedagogy

(Maria Mendel)

This statement focuses on the sense of community and the practice of social pedagogy as the pedagogy of the common place. I suggest thinking about this in connection with the validity of the need to defend the society presented in the Introduction¹⁰. Why?

In the book on the pedagogy of the common space, I tried to present arguments in favor of the thesis that advocates the sense of pedagogical work for shaping of new ideological orientations, social attitudes and instructions to behavior, subjectivity and policies of representation, enabling the change of those elements of contemporary reality, which contribute to destruction of what is increasingly scarce in it, and at the same time the most valuable, because practiced: democratic equality and social justice in activities. This activity takes place in a specific space, the physical-symbolic and educational dimensions of which, i.e. places which are important because of teaching, seem particularly interesting if one thinks about this change. In the book I focused on the city and school as places where the ruin of commonality¹¹ manifests itself and which development in a direction other than the present one I perceive as a real opportunity and pedagogical challenge.

When we talk about the ruin of commonality, we mean processes and phenomena that destroy the foundations of democracy and, more broadly, the *universe* of the common world, in other words, shared being, expressed in ontology of mutual sensitivity. The devastations experienced today do not allow alternatives (like the TINA syndrome mentioned above...) and they monopolize the public sphere. They destroy both urban *co-vivendi* and school, which – through the idea of universality and equality of education that shape it – would have a chance to carry out the key integration and democratization

¹⁰ The Reader will find further development of the fragments presented below in: Mendel 2017.

¹¹ Further explained concept of Pierre Rosanvallon, see idem: 2016.

functions that are crucial for society. Concurrently developing in relation to the city and school, these processes and phenomena *explicitly* express the ongoing disassembly of community ties – society, local communities – and democracy.

In this statement, for which the starting point is the validity of the postulate of defending the society, I want to emphasize that among its meanings, which – permeating them all – highlights the irreducibility and spatial dimension of interpersonal contact (without it there are no social ties and society, which is invariably being formed „somewhere”). Therefore, I focus on the social productivity of relations resulting from people’s lives not only „in the world”, but also „for the world” (according to the distinction between the types of existence made by Gert Biesta (Biesta 2017). This is the meaning of society, in which we should see the Foucault discourse (we live in relations of power), but also the depth of the sense of the common good. Particularly practicing it, which, following Pierre Rosanvallon, I call „commonality” (Rosanvallon 2013). According to him, commonality is a *sine qua non* for strengthening ties in society. It should include three basic, interoperable dimensions: participation, mutual understanding and circulation. The first takes place in „common as celebration and manifestation”, but also in „common feedback”, created in the flow of media information and the free transfer of ideas. The second dimension – „common as mutual understanding” – depends to a large extent on the work of those who study and describe the social world (intellectuals, journalists, etc.) and on activists, bloggers, artists and others who „express the life of society through sound and image” (Rosanvallon 2016, p. 32). Mutual understanding, based on meetings with them and the materials they provide, can „overcome prejudices and undermine over-simplified slogans, simplistic beliefs” (Rosanvallon 2016, p. 32). While the third dimension, *common as a circulation*, is defined in terms of a common space. „Common as a circulation [...] usually manifests itself in unwritten forms of courtesy, which, however, produce a kind of fragmented knowledge. Brief contacts complement the feeling of living next to others, which helps to develop an equal ethos. These contacts can take place in public transport, public buildings and even on the street. People share the constantly changing scenery, shaped by the quality of the urban environment. However, this type of communication is hampered by various barriers: the existence of isolated estates and enclaves, exclusion and unfounded privatization of urban space. **Commonality as a circulation is a fragile public good**” (highlighted by MM) (Rosanvallon 2016, p. 32).

We must take care of and strive for commonality, especially when the nationalism is doing well, which denies it in its fixation on divisions.

An important role here is played by the fragile, disappearing because of the lack of care, common good. Such a common good characterizes, among other, thing that is a democratic attitude for Savidan, and I described it as „orientation on commonality”¹². In this orientation, democratic values, such as equality and justice and precisely the common good, define the axiological space for action.

A space, invariably pedagogical, is the arena of shaping this fragile good, because it is extremely elusive and delicate, requiring constant care and cultivation. A space is also the physical dimension of expectation of achievement, when the partners dialoguing are bound by the pursuit of justice, resulting in the achievement of equal status by them. It is precisely this aspiration that gives one side of the conflict (which is an irremovable condition of democracy) a chance to better understand the other side and thus constructively build a Rosanvallon’s „society of equal people”. Gert Biesta (Biesta 2017) perfectly formed the pedagogical foundations of such an understanding of dialog. When I think of the pedagogy of the common space, I am constantly returning to his approach. Leszek Koczanowicz’s concept of non-consensual democracy, derived from American pragmatism, which permeates this pedagogy, as well as the theory of deliberative democracy and the assumption of non-reducible antagonism, which results in the praise of conflict, as the basis for civil relations, also constitutes an important ground for me in thinking about dialog (Koczanowicz 2015).

In general, the meaning of commonality can be reduced to the form of state of a democratic society, i.e. the one in which a new experience of the other, as a „being equal to us”, manifesting „both in the way of thinking, feeling and acting”; in the „democratic attitude”, has developed (Savidan 2012, p. 24–25). The question about the future of the democratic world is an issue of the conditions under which this state can be achieved. This is the basis on which the pedagogical interest in commonality grows in the physically defined, material „somewhere” – equality or social justice have their spaces, their character is deeply spatial (see Soja 2010).

The space which can be said to practice commonality is an expression of the externalization of dialog, which is a key form of democratic coexistence.

¹² Zob.: Mendel 2017. I understand orientation as Marek Ziółkowski does, for whom it is close to the meaning of attitude, but expresses less closed registers of the meanings of its constituent elements, such as knowledge about reality (in orientation understood broadly, also as unconscious, colloquial knowledge), values (in orientation understood as not always specified, e.g. visions of ideal states), etc. See: Ziółkowski 1990.

Looking for a common space, one should look for different forms of dialog, which creates such a place; ask about how and where it happens. Bearing in mind the urban space, it is possible, in response, to analyze the ways in which the inhabitants-neighbors arrange themselves with each other, in mutual relations, or how they build their *modus co-vivendi*. The set of such *modus*, grounded in the results of empirical research, is – among other things – a book about cases from Gdańsk analyzed by researchers representing different disciplines and thus remaining sensitive, in different ways, to what – in an effort to discover the practiced figures of a consensual and dignified social coexistence – focused their attention in the historical and current space of Gdańsk (Mendel 2015). It is important to note that the common space is created in a practiced, democratic dialog, which does not take place only in the conventional sphere, which is the verbal sphere (although, of course, it has its own representations in it). Within the framework of the research in Gdańsk, for example, Dorota Rancew-Sikora, an anthropologist of everyday life and sociologist, described, on the basis of a narrative and analysis of advertisements and plans for the layout of rooms, how, just after World War II, erecting partition walls in formerly German flats and houses inhabited by newly arrived tenants turned out to be a dialog to which both roommates, political-military and administrative management of the city were parties (Rancew-Sikora 2015, p. 229–275). These parties were not equal, but in the ongoing talks and formal as well as completely informal activities, in the exchange of documents and more or less final decisions on the premises, efforts for democratic consideration of voices and striving for equality were visible. What happened between people was often as terrible as conflicts can be, but the radical will to change and pragmatism of action often prevailed, because the wall not always was built where it had been ordered to be constructed, but where it had been decided according to negotiations. Dominik Krzysiński, studying the „disappearing shipyard and its defenders” from a pedagogical and sociological perspective, took a walk with the participants of the conflict – the fight for shipyard – along a subjective route of (non)existing places which are no longer there, as the shipyard no longer exists (Krzysiński 2015, p. 71–98). As a result, he was able to describe the fascinating dialoguing that once took place and which, as the study showed, is still being conducted, now focused on care for what is left. One could still recall fragments of the study of *modus co-vivendi* in Gdańsk, but common spaces, which I briefly presented following Rancew-Sikora and Krzysiński, will probably suffice for this moment. The conclusions – perhaps – poorly encourage people willing to practice pedagogy of the common space, because neither the tiny room won in a formerly

German apartment attracts as an expression of the fruitfulness of the form of co-existence recommended here, nor – even more – the subject of the dialog, which is the shipyard that almost doesn't exist. However, „almost” – as in well-known advertising – makes a huge difference, perhaps by designating some area of agency beyond which there is no longer a common space, but in which it still has a chance to develop. Cultivated, it can develop into a highly engaging form, consolidating its status as a place of compassionate, practiced commonality.

Final thoughts

Our exchange on concern for the fate of society, presented from three different perspectives: social responsibility, public role and shaping the space of life, adopted as a form of speech proposed by the organizers of the 6th Congress of Social Pedagogues, but also taken up in our joint article, has become a symbol of a specific, much needed way of our, social pedagogues, conversation, who share many things and who do not want to lose, despite individual views and different fields of research, the community character of the discipline and wish to continue its tradition of critical attitude in the interest of building better educational environments. Nationalist inclinations not only evokes bad memories and anxieties about the future, but also mobilize to intensify efforts to fight for human development in a situation where their voice is sometimes neglected in the variously understood game of interests of the authorities.

Literature

- Anderson B (1997), *Wspólnoty wyobrażone. Rozważanie o źródłach i rozprzestrzenianiu się nacjonalizmu*, Znak, Kraków.
- Arbiszewski K. (2001), *Problem Foucaulta. Podmiot, władza i zalecenia właściwego postępowania*, [in:] *Filozofia i polityka w XX wieku*, M. Szulakiewicz (ed.), Aureus, Warszawa.
- Beck U. (2004), *Spółczesństwo ryzyka. W drodze do innej nowoczesności*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe „Scholar”, Warszawa.
- Bielska E. (2013), *Koncepcja oporu we współczesnych naukach społecznych. Główne problemy, pojęcia, rozstrzygnięcia*, Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, Katowice.
- Biesta G.J.J. (2017), *The Rediscovery of Teaching*, Routledge, New York–Abingdon.
- Boudon R. (2008), *Efekt odwócenia. niezamierzone skutki działań społecznych*, Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa.
- Dewey J. (1972), *Demokracja i wychowanie: wprowadzenie do filozofii wychowania*, Ossolineum, Wrocław (wyd. pierwsze 1916).
- Foucault M. (1998), *Podmiot i władza*, trans. J. Zychowicz, „Lewą Nogą”, nr 10.
- Fromm E. (2007), *Ucieczka od wolności*, Wydawnictwo „Czytelnik”, Warszawa.

- Giroux H. (1998), *Schooling and the struggle for public life. Critical pedagogy in the modern wege*, Minneapolis.
- Granosik M. (2018), *Critical Social Pedagogy in Historical Context: the Polish Example*, [in:] *Social Pedagogy and Social Education: Bridging Traditions and Innovations*, D. Keller, K. O'Neil, H. Nicolaisen, D. Schugurensky, K. Villaseñor (eds.), Social Pedagogy Association Phoenix, Arizona.
- Grott B. (2014), *Dylematy polskiego nacjonalizmu. Powrót do tradycji czy przebudowa narodo-wego ducha*, Wydawnictwo von borowiecky: Klub Zachowawczo-Monarchistyczny, Ra-dzymin.
- Hindess B (1999), *Filozofie władzy*, trans. D. Leszczyński, L. Rasiński, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa–Wrocław.
- Jones M. (2007), *An Introduction to Political Geography Space, Place, and Politics*. Routledge, New York.
- Klein N. (2004), *No Logo*, trans. H. Pustuła, Świat Literacki, Izabelin.
- Koczanowicz L. (2015), *Polityka dialogu. Demokracja niekonsensualna i wspólnota krytyczna*, PWN, Warszawa.
- Kołtan J (2012), *Solidaryzm, antypolityka i zanik zaufania. Rozwój i upadek solidarnościowego etosu*, „Zoon Politikon”, nr 3.
- Kraft M.E., Furlog S.R. (2007), *Public Policy. Politics, Analysis and Alternatives*, CQ Press, Washington.
- Krzywiński D. (2015), *Znikająca stocznia i jej obrońcy. Wędrówka subiektywną trasą miejsc (nie) istniejących*, [in:] *Miasto jak wspólny pokój. Gdańskie modi co-vivendi*, Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe, M. Mendel (ed.), Instytut Kultury Miejskiej, Gdańsk.
- Mendel M. (red.) (2015), *Miasto jak wspólny pokój. Gdańskie modi co-vivendi*, Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe, Instytut Kultury Miejskiej, Gdańsk.
- Mendel M. (2017), *Pedagogika miejsca wspólnego. Miasto i szkoła*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe KATEDRA, Gdańsk.
- Męczkowska A. (2006), *Podmiot i pedagogika. Od oświeceniowej utopii ku pokrytycznej dekonstrukcji*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji TWP, Wrocław.
- Męczkowska A. (2007), *Edukacja a problem kształtowania relacji społecznych. Pomiędzy wyzwaniem podmiotowości a interwencją w związek człowieka i świata*, [in:] *Edukacja, moralność, sfera publiczna*, Materiały VI Ogólnopolskiego Zjazdu Pedagogicznego, J. Rutkowiak, D. Kubinowski, M. Nowak (eds.), Oficyna Wydawnicza Verba, Lublin.
- Naumiuk A. (2016), *Jane Addams i jej koncepcja pracy w środowisku społecznym*, „Pedagogika Społeczna”, nr 3(61).
- Nikitorowicz J., Muszyńska J., Sobecki M. (eds.) (2009), *Wspólnoty z perspektywy edukacji międzykulturowej*, Trans Humana Wydawnictwo Uniwersyteckie, Białystok.
- Orwell G. (2014), *Rok 1984*, Wydawnictwo Muza, Warszawa.
- Pilch T., Sosnowski T. (red.) (2013), *Zagrożenia człowieka i idei sprawiedliwości społecznej*, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”, Warszawa.
- Rancew-Sikora D. (2015), *Wspólny przedpokój? Modi co-vivendi w mieszkaniach*, [in:] *Miasto jak wspólny pokój. Gdańskie modi co-vivendi*, M. Mendel (ed.), Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe, Instytut Kultury Miejskiej, Gdańsk.
- Rosanvallon P. (2016), *Wspólność*, trans. Borys Jastrzębski, „Res Publica Nova”, nr 2.
- Rosanvallon P. (2013), *The Society of Equals*, tłum. A. Goldhammer, Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press.
- Savidan P. (2012), *Wielokulturowość*, trans. Ewa Kozłowska, Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa.

- Schmitt C. (1963), *The Theory of the Partisan: A Commentary/Remark on the Concept of the Political*, Duncker & Humblot, Berlin.
- Skrzypczak B (2016), *Współczynnik społecznościowy. Edukacyjne (re)konstruowanie instytucji społecznościowych – w perspektywie pedagogiki społecznej*, Wydawnictwo Edukacyjne „Akapi”, Toruń.
- Sloterdijk P. (2009), *Du musst dein Leben ändern. Über Anthropotechnik*, Suhrkamp, Frankfurt am Main.
- Soja E.W. (2010), *Seeking Spatial Justice*, Globalization and Community Series, University of Minnesota Press.
- Szymik J. (2018), *Kto wstydzi się orła?*, „Kontakt”, nr 37.
- Taylor Ch. (2001), *Źródła podmiotowości. Narodziny tożsamości nowoczesnej*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa.
- Taylor Ch. (2010), *Nowoczesne imaginaria społeczne*, Znak, Kraków.
- Theiss W. (2018), *Demokratyczna szkoła polska. Niepodległościowy projekt Heleny Radlińskiej z lat 1906–1918*, [in:] *Pomorskie drogi do Niepodległej*, J. Borzyszkowski, C. Obracht-Prondzyński (red.), Gdańskie Towarzystwo Naukowe, Gdańsk.

Źródła internetowe

- Almedom A.M. (2015), *Understanding human resilience in the context of interconnected health and social systems: Whose understanding matters most?* Ecology and Society 20(4):40. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-08195-200440> (access: 12.11.2018).
- Etzioni A. (2014), *Communitarianism revisited*, Journal of Political Ideologies, 2014 Vol. 19, No. 3, 241–260, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2014.951142>, <https://www.uv.es/sasece/docum2015/Etzioni%20Communitarianism%20Revisited.pdf> (access: 15.11.2018).
- Grygień J. (2016), *Wspólnota responsywna, czyli jaka? Komunitaryzm wobec problemu partycypacji politycznej*, Prakseologia nr 158, t. 2/2016 <http://cejsh.icm.edu.pl/cejsh/element/bwmeta1.element.cejsh-b0eea4c2-5909-417b-93ca-a3a322458ca3> (access: 15.11.2018).
- Kurczewska J. (2016), *Wspólnoty pamięci lokalnej i narodowej. Kilka uwag o ich zbiorowym wytwarzaniu à la polonaise*. Teksty drugie, 2016, nr 6, s. 30–51; http://rcin.org.pl/Content/63013/WA248_82847_P-I-2524_kurczewska-wspolnoty_o.pdf (access: 12.11.2018).
- Leder A. (2014), *Prześlona rewolucja. Ćwiczenia z logiki historycznej*, Krytyka Polityczna, Warszawa.
- Malczewski J., Kaliński M., Eckhardt P. (2012), *Nacjonalizm Historyczne i współczesne oblicza*, Kraków, Przygotowalnia, https://ruj.uj.edu.pl/xmlui/bitstream/handle/item/16883/malczewski_kalinski_eckhardt_nacjonalizm_historyczne_i_wspolczesne_oblicza.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (access: 12.11.2018).
- Thatcher M. (1982), *A life in quotes*, <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2013/apr/08/margaret-thatcher-quotes> (access: 10.08.2018).
- To jest rewolucja. PiS zmienia imaginariusz historyczny. Wywiad z prof. Rafałem Wnukiem*, „Gazeta Wyborcza” <http://lublin.wyborcza.pl/lublin/7,48724,23842188,kto-nie-z-nami-ten-nie-jest-polakiem-tak-pis-buduje-wspolnote.html> (10.08.2018)