

Jerzy Modrzewski

The Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

**From the pedagogy of the environment
towards the pedagogy of a society overwhelmed
by a state institution
This is our country – this is us – Polish society***

*The end justifies the means – these are Machiavelli's words,
but it is also worth remembering that Impure means
result in an impure end.*

Mahatma Gandhi

ABSTRACT: Pedagogical sciences, like many others, are interested in and create visions of socially-viable societies (educatively and educationally). This is one of the undisputed imperatives that justify their accepted presence in the pantheon of knowledge disciplines, identified as scientific. In this context, their critical reaction to the current and perceived political practice threats to the socialization condition of society is revealed as the inalienable duty of a theoretician and practitioner. The author of the article shares this view of such a specific pedagogical mission – especially social – proposing a rudimentary diagnosis of the current state of destruction of democratic order in Poland, with the indications of its socializing (and not only) consequences for generations, growing up in it.

KEYWORDS: Educating society, democratic order and its threats, pedagogization of entities in power.

* The article is a slightly modified version of the paper delivered at the 6th Social Pedagogues Congress in Poznań on September 17–18, 2018. The content of the paper was complemented by the presentation of about 70 slides containing and thus pointing to the arguments prompting the author to take a critical look at the current situation in Poland, full of phenomena and situations threatening the democratic social order.

Concepts, theories or visions (ideologies) of a pedagogically efficient society often appear in pedagogical works. This „pedagogically” may first of all mean – just as the substantive resources of pedagogical science evolved – an educationally, socially, and educatively effective society, preparing or supporting future generations growing up in their aspirations and efforts to obtain the possibility of:

- competent participation in community life, i.e.
- to the generational continuation of cultural heritage and
- continuation, or change, of the social order and civilizational model of successful management of one’s own and other’s existence.

This, as we know, is the reality of the educative – better to say socializational – practice of primary societies and peoples, ethnic groups, enjoying:

- a large dose of self-determination;
- existential autarkicity;
- relative, and even significant ecological and cultural isolation, regulating the course of its existence by natural laws (as would be described by W. G. Sumner) (Sumner 1993).

These are also features of the socialization practice of societies and communities oriented towards cultivating the prefigurative culture model – to a large extent unambiguously regulating these intergenerational educational relations and their socializing effects, and basically satisfying the societies that cultivate the values defined as conservative (Mead 2000).

As we know, a bit earlier – before that anthropological revelation – this model was described and given the value of scientific theory by young Florian Znaniecki, describing in his book *Socjologia wychowania (Educational sociology)* the vision and theory of the educating society (Znaniecki 1973), in which these educational relations were perceived as undisputed, as they were in a way historically and culturally determined, which justified the obligation on the educating generation (adults) to implement this existential and cultural imperative or mission, which is – exactly – to prepare the adolescent generation for its competent and socially acceptable participation in the life of adults, assuming, however, that this participation has the features of continuation of the civilizational and cultural model of existence of a given society¹ and its organization-

¹ Culture in this understanding is constituted by all kinds of meanings understood and applied by social persons in the course of their social being, direct and indirect communication – in this sense culture creates a kind of symbolic dimension of social being and social identity, while civilization is understood as all that is necessary for a given social system to successfully solve for its members the problem of their existence. In other words, we understand civilization as the way in which large social structures solve their existential problem.

al form, and especially the acceptance of the ideology and religious (in principle dominant) interpretation of the meaning of human existence justifying it.

This concept, in its rudimentary form, had already been articulated much earlier in various philosophical and ideological contexts, and generally in every more or less practiced and ideologically justified vision and practice of overpowering societies with a religious interpretation of their economic, stratification and organizational order, as well as a promise of their destiny made by the religious institution promoting it and the state organization of society that is subordinate to it.

This, as we know, has been more or less effectively verified not only in the history of European societies, but even to some extent – at times more significantly – overcame by:

- revolutionary uprisings (bourgeoisie – French revolution, Spring of Nations, proletarian revolution);
- intellectual movements (enlightenment, rationalism, communism, modernism and postmodernism);
- the evolutionary – as well as on the basis of pedagogical ideology – secularization of social life and its cultures;
- more or less total criticism of the ideological – religious indoctrination of societies, especially South American ones, deprived of their native culture by European colonizers – taken up and proclaimed by the initiators of the deschoolarization movement (e.g. Reimer 1971; Illich 1976, Zielińska 1996) – finally, a total criticism of those educational concepts which allowed these processes to persuade future generations to glorify their political and state identification (in this respect I have in mind the whole complex trend in pedagogical reflection, or pedagogical philosophy described as a critical or radical pedagogy) (e.g. Kwieciński and Witkowski 1993; Melosik 1995; Potulicka and Rutkowiak 2010; Kwieciński 2012).

In the scientific version, the idea of continuing the subsequent education (socialization) manifested itself, among others, in the Durkheim or Weber's concept of social division of labor and the market, serving society as a whole, its functionality and at the same time its intergenerational reconstruction – that is, education shaping specialist competences necessary to take up and perform appropriate and expected social roles in a state-organized society (Durkheim 1999; Weber 2002).

After all, the twentieth century extremely traumatic war experiences, mass murders and genocide of an unprecedented scale, the emergence and solidification of totalitarian, anti-humanitarian political systems, which

permanently threaten and violate the state of peace and social harmony in many areas of the modern world and which force institutional respect for the ideologies that justify them, generally revised not so much these concepts – the preparation of future generations to the social order they found themselves in, but the underlying political ideologies glorified in these processes, which exemplified and sanctioned the state organization of society.

These experiences were also complemented by earlier similarly tragic historical events, partially verifying and abolishing the cultural socialization imperative of societies reaching in their development in the 20th century, especially after the Second World War, dynamically progressing civilizational advancement and aiming at building a democratic order – favoring the objectification of individuals in their social roles, especially the civil role and other forms of their social participation.

This historically significant factor reconstructing the socialization practices of many – especially European and North American modern societies – has, as we know, been complemented by the two others, that is:

- ideological and philosophical visions and concepts of constructing the declared just – secular social order, and another one –
- the civilizational and thus also cultural transformations experienced by them more or less violently – remaining in dialectic relation to each other, referred to as the globalization process and giving contemporary societies the name of post-industrial, postmodern, network, fluid, risky, and thus, from an individual point of view, uncertain (e.g. Maslyk 1979; Bauman 2007; Castells 2010; Arnoldi 2011; Beck 2012).

Among the first ones, inspired by the distant historical utopian visions of justly ruled and, presumably, happy societies, we find those that have found their exemplifications in the practice of establishing contemporary state organizations. I have in mind such utopian ideologies, which have been defined as socialist and communist ones, without investigating whether and to what extent these systems, promoted and actually implemented have something and how much in common with those ideologies, as well as whether and to what extent the promises contained in them had or have any chance of being implemented. In fact, just like the promises present in other concepts of social order, developed since ancient times, which guarantee achieving universally felt and accepted justice and existential welfare in the course of their practice².

² In such ideal societies, so to speak, hence the utopian ones, there is no room for deviation or poverty. This was emphasized by ancient philosophers, Roman law theoreticians, doctors of the Catholic Church, utopists and sociologists practicing structural-functional approach (e.g. É. Durkheim) at an early stage of its construction and practice.

These visions of a „happy – justly organized and functioning society” were accompanied by such visions that, as is well known, suggested giving up political and ideological power in general – and thus, above all, the state power, retaining only its rudimentary functions – necessary to protect social existence and its identity features. They are also described, as is known, in various ways, including in their radical form as anarchist or advocating the anarchy concepts and, in a less radical form, as liberal and in their contemporary form – neoliberal concepts.

Among their founders and propagators (e.g. Kropotkin 2006), also present in the pantheon of native precursors of social pedagogy (Abramowski), there is again the person of Florian Znaniecki, a supporter and advocate of the need of the societies to renounce the authority and state organization, and the sanctioning and cooperating religious authority, in view of the benefit of their members and structures co-created by them³.

Since 2000 years, there has been a variety of visions or concepts of so-called democratic orders, i.e. of historically distant origins, different forms and strategies of their implementation, preservation and continuation or modification, which gain acceptance among many contemporary societies – which, in their international exposure, showcase and care for the preservation of values generally described also as democratic, that is those among which not only political pluralism and free elections are accepted, but human rights and civil freedoms are respected as well.

What seems to them to be common for them is, first of all, the promotion of establishing and practicing a specific kind of political relations between the center of society’s management – with its local and group or association representations – in order to transform the center into a federation of representation of their interests in return for bearing the burden of centrally planned and organized policy and practice that guarantees existential security for the society in a foreseeable perspective and thus preserving national sovereignty and, at the same time, the features of its cultural identity.

³ As mentioned by T. Szczurkiewicz, “The most extreme expression of his anarchist position was given by Znaniecki in 1937, when the then voivode Walicki organized a course for his officials, to which, as lecturers, he invited Prof. Znaniecki, Prof. Znamierowski, Prof. Peretiatkiewicz and me. The vice-voivode Walicki told me terrified that he had to resign from further lectures of Prof. Znaniecki, because he began his lecture with the following words: “I am very surprised that you, as representatives of the state authorities, invited me to give a lecture, because in my opinion even the best government is much worse than none, and that humanity will really be free only when all power has disappeared”.

Another extremely important feature of this political order is the constitutionally guaranteed, and thus not only postulated, but also obliging the main center of executive power to recognize its division into entities of legislative, judicial and executive power, with the suggestion of respecting the fourth, considered to be media, to which the embodiment of the will and conscience of society and execution of reliable lawfulness over the three first indicated ones is credited.

The promotion and attempts to practice this vision of the organization of social life significantly reconstruct also the relations of members of societies managed in such a way towards central and local authorities called civic, claiming and having the right to acquire social competences in educational processes, including in particular civic ones (e.g.: *Edukacja obywatelska w Europie 2012*; *Szczegóło 2013*; *Kopińska and Solarczyk-Szwec, 2017*) and creating opportunities and situations of their rational manifestation and use in everyday social life, in the course of satisfying one's needs, solving one's and others' problems, cultivating the values exhibited in this order and successful achievement of one's and others' socially acceptable goals (Theiss, Kurowska, Petelczyc and Lewenstein 2017).

The way in which these characteristics of a democratic social order are achieved in specific social conditions, as we know, is the subject of extraordinary intellectual interest of philosophers, political scientists, law theoreticians, sociologists, and so on. The authors discuss and consider the possibilities and conditions of implementation of these values in its aggregative model – Joseph Schumpeter (Schumpeter 1995)⁴, the model of deliberative democracy – in versions proposed by John Rawls (Rawls 1994, 2009)⁵ or Jurgen Habermas (e.g. Habermas 1966, 1993, 1996) and, for example, the model of agonistic democracy of Chantal Mouffe (Mouffe 2005, p. 118–123)⁶.

A lot has already been written about their shape, need and actual implementation, including the pedagogical aspect of the democratic order,

⁴ Democracy, according to Schumpeter, is a political, social system that makes use of the possibility of accepting or rejecting its leaders through a competitive electoral process. See also: Downs, 1957.

⁵ The supporters of this model of democracy in general accept the ideas of liberalism or neoliberalism, but advocate giving them a moral dimension, creating bonds between liberal values and democracy. See also: Kowalska, 2005; Matynia, 2008.

⁶ In this model it is proposed that the objectives of democratic politics should not be achieved through a fight between enemies (antagonism), but through a fight between opponents who recognize and consider consensually mutual arguments, positions and projections. See also: Sartori, 1994.

especially since John Dewey's publication of the treaty devoted to the upbringing of the next generations to and in the democratic system, revealing not only the concern for the implementation and strengthening of this political order, but the belief that it is the only socially just order that can be implemented, worthy of pedagogical acceptance and implementation in societies attracted by this vision, provided that they are genuinely democratically managed by their elected and functioning representations, exercising power that respects the provisions of the fundamental law, guarding firmly the rule of law, exercising power justly and wisely for the good of all their citizens and respecting unconditionally, thus protecting, the values exposed in this ideology (Sztompka 2007; Bogunia-Borowska 2015).

After all, what is also known, this social order, which gained acceptance also among pedagogues, not only the social ones, treating it, according to H. Radlińska, in terms of a specific model, and thus a kind of ideal worthy of achieving and consolidating in social and individual experience, for various reasons has not been fully implemented in any society overpowered by a state organization so far (Hoppe 2006).

Nevertheless, with a great deal of hope, including pedagogical hope, it is permanently recommended, and even in a way enforced, with the expectation of just organization and functioning of society as definitely competitive with other conceived and already implemented orders, also involving circles, institutions and teams of progressive educators to promote its successful implementation, which takes the form of a peculiarly understood pedagogization of state societies, and especially what seems to be the symptom and requirement only of this social order – also democratically selected by them – of various authorities, especially when their functioning reveals the intention and practice of striving to centralize power, for the appropriation of the state and its institutions by the party.

In fact, the pedagogization of historical and contemporary societies, which is worth noting, in general has been and is being undertaken in every social order, regardless of their civilizational advancement and the form of social, state organization. Its objective in these orders, however, was and is mostly the society itself, not its own sovereign representation, and its purpose was and is to justify and preserve the existing social order with the exception of those moments in the history of societies in which revolutionary movements known as progressive movements were born and have been successful.

This pedagogization, conforming to the form of social life, has been and is performed by various entities, particularly religious organizations and institutions, their subordinate educational institutions, servant philosophers and ideologists. The latter, on the other hand, by initiators and reformers

of social life, leaders of progressive social movements and opinion-forming circles, including in particular creators of culture and its propagators, as well as experts and expert teams, editors and media editorial staff, groups discussing and sharing their concepts and value systems.

In the first case, the essential role in this respect has been and is performed by the State's coercive apparatus, which has primarily served and serves the entities in power. It was only in special situations and in specific moments of history that this pedagogical message was directed to the centers of government with various consequences for its entities – mostly rather tragic or fatal for the initiators of this message⁷.

Pedagogy of society and its governing representations in the situation of experiencing still relative civil liberties may take two forms: as an activity supporting the achievement of this ideal, called the social democratic order, or as an attempt to counteract its destruction in the situation of faking actions supposedly aimed at making it present. Thus, it can accompany various forms of practice of achieving this order or its depreciation under the banner of democracy, in relation to both:

- the initiating and implementing entities, but also in view
- of the intentions contained in their actions, as well as
- the strategies applied, and the effects actually obtained in the course of their implementation.

In the first case the issue is who and by what procedure acquires and exercises power in a given society and

- what is the actual participation of citizens in its achieving and exercising, as well as how
- the mutual relations of those entities, whether authentically or only seemingly exercising power in the order, still persistently and cynically (hypocritically) – in spite of the realities – called as democratic.

The question is, *inter alia*, whether or not the entities constitutionally entitled to exercise power become an imitation of power after they have been constituted, and whether they actually exercise it by making autonomous decisions within their respective domains and with constitutional responsibility, or whether they serve the interests of hidden decision-making centers on a servile or bribery basis, camouflaging their real power, often having mafia-like features, and lack of criminal responsibility for its consequences, displaying only the characteristics of entities in a democratic order.

⁷ An example of such peculiar pedagogization – demanding the repair of the state can be the work and activity of A. Frycz-Modrzewski (Frycz Modrzewski, 2004).

Therefore, they either enjoy the same mutual recognition and respect, or they enforce this respect and recognition by force, threat, repression, bribery and lies. Such states of affairs in the political reality of an allegedly democratically managed society create and particularly justify the need to educate the entities of democratic power that are formally established and those sometimes camouflaged by them in various ways, claiming to be entities of democratic power and simultaneously fulfilling a specific function and role of a false educator of society, or in fact its doctrine propagator, against which Noam Chomsky warned so suggestively, formulating 10 indicators of this false pedagogy of societies supposedly managed in a democratic way⁸.

The second case is whether the entities in power – central and local – are guided by shared good, which is sometimes referred to as social justice, but not the way Thrasymachus understood it in his conversation with Socrates – saying that it is fair what is good for the stronger – to what Socrates said that no one can be fair in their judgments and actions if they do not seek the truth – and we add to this sentence – with only the own good in mind.

We can therefore speak about the need to pedagogize the political intentions of the entities in power. So, by asking questions about whose and what interest they have in mind, by exercising real and apparent power, whose good is achieved at the expense of what and whom, and how it is revealed in a form that raises no doubts as to its authenticity, or in a deceptive, twisted, vile form. Pedagogization in this aspect simply means uncompromising disclosure of this false, but publicly revealed intention, or its hidden form, and indicating the ethically fatal consequences.

If such a situation occurs in a given society, it raises the question of how, in this situation, to build morale of not only the young generation?

The third case refers to what is sometimes described as the style of governance, i.e.:

- transparency in its exercising and enforcement or secrecy in making decisions and discreetness in their implementation;
- in its justification – arising from discussion, dialogue or in its authoritarian, surreptitious exercising;
- exercised in mutual understanding and respect or in arrogant disregard, with the argument that „the blind masses will buy into anything” and „scoundrels” or „leftist scum”, the epithets used sometimes to describe, for example, the parliamentary opposition, do not deserve respect and partnership in its exercising;

⁸ <<https://www.google.com/search?q=Les+10+Strategies+de+Noam+Chomsky&ie=utf>> It is worth to mention here: Łukaszewski, 1983, pp. 203–209.

- the authoritarian abandonment of any control of the procedures used or the illusion of such control;
- governing while hiding behind the curtain of various services and activities undertaken transparently, revealing their rational argumentation, observing the rules of law and decency, with the fear of historical judgment, with respect for good manners, as well as respect for opponents and their arguments.

Therefore, we are dealing here with a pedagogical aspect of the applied procedures of governance in the democratic order – their substantive reliability, their transparency, efficiency and competence in their application, in the social recognition of the authority of all the entities exercising power, taking decisions in the course of dialogue with the opposition, listening to its concepts and arguments, thus respecting the voice of society, of the various representations of their citizens, their needs and postulates.

Pedagogization of the authorities in this aspect is nothing more than public stigmatization of the practice of disregarding the opposition's voice, e.g. in the parliamentary forum, or preventing the opposition from demonstrating its position on the issue, e.g. by physically (preposterous) blocking its participation in the parliamentary debate or depriving its representatives of the right to vote. Finally, resignation from attempts to convince the opposition to the postulates of the authorities in order to impose them in a manner that violates not only good manners, but also constitutional regulations of procedures for passing parliamentary resolutions or binding law.

Finally, the fourth case deals with whether the declared, accepted by the entities of democratic power and thus expected results of the power are the same as the real ones obtained in its course. If not, then the question arises as to whether such a situation is the result of negligence, omission or non-intentional error, or lack of competence in its exercise, or the result of playing a cynical, deceptive, interest-oriented or even mafia-like game.

The pedagogical aspect of the effects of exercising any kind of power is evident here, especially the power calling itself democratic, i.e. subject to judgment and the will of citizens. It is to call a spade a spade, without hesitation and without shying away from revealing false words, deeds, situations and artifacts identified with the illusion of democracy, or its authenticity.

The above mentioned hesitation in achieving this ideal of democratization of social life in many contemporary societies declaring and revealing concern for achieving and maintaining this order seems to be – among other no less important factors (see: Kowalska 2018) – a result of pedagogical indolence, deprivation or hypocrisy, and thus the successive loss of moral authority,

among other things, by those social forces which for thousands of years have claimed to be the unquestionable and extremely effective pedagogue of society.

Or, worse, their selfish consent to the illusion of the democratic order by the forces formally exercising power in it, as a result of an alliance between the throne and the altar. On the other hand, this hesitation may, to some extent, be the result of limited pedagogical efficiency of those who believed in the possibility of implementing the democratic order in its optimal form, but their involvement in its achievement is still insufficient, effectively marginalized, inadequate to the nature of the expected effect, relatively impossible in the current arrangement of forces determining the appearance of the actually experienced order and political awareness of a significant part of society.

It concerns both the intentions of the entities exercising power in these political realities, their ethical approach, as well as, in particular, the substantive competencies necessary to make optimal and consistent with declarations decisions and rulings in the decision making process. The pedagogization of entities in power, in any case, usually takes some form of ethical control over them and entering with them into agonistic discourse.

This role is fulfilled or should be fulfilled by:

- a democratically elected head of state, who unwaveringly protects the constitution as the depositary of society, not of the ruling party, or the guardian of their own interests and the interests of classified entities;
- also, independent media revealing, and not neglecting, camouflaging or discrediting facts;
- independent and efficient courts, for which this is somewhat of a natural task and role;
- chambers of parliament, debating and sitting in public.

This, however, is a not always recognized real function of grassroots social protests, especially those signaling significant threats to society's well-being. This is the task for many institutions, associations, authentic social benefit organizations, whose task is to protect society from manipulation of its historical memory, to protect its legacy, to prevent its squandering, to reveal areas of poverty, injustice and inability of the citizens in solving their own and other's existential problems.

Social educators have already made significant achievements in this respect (e.g. Pilch, 2018), but there are even greater, binding challenges if the postulate of the author and the social mission indicated by her are treated by them as their life mission, although their arguments in most cases give way to arguments of force, material greed, political rudeness and mere stupidity.

Poznań, August 2018.

Literature

- Arnoldi J. (2011), *Ryzyko*, Warszawa.
- Bauman Z. (2007), *Płynne czasy. Życie w epoce niepewności*, Warszawa.
- Beck U. (2012), *Spółczesność światowego ryzyka. W poszukiwaniu utraconego bezpieczeństwa*, Warszawa.
- Bogunia-Borowska M. (ed.), (2015), *Fundamenty dobrego społeczeństwa. Wartości*, Kraków.
- Castells M. (2010), *Spółczesność sieci*, Warszawa.
- Czyżewski M., Marynowicz-Hetka E., Woroniecka G. (eds.), (2013), *Pedagogizacja życia społecznego*, „Societas/Communitas. Pedagogika. Socjologia”, nr 2.
- Downs A. (1957), *An Economic Theory of Democracy*, New York.
- Durkheim É. (1999), *O podziale pracy społecznej*, Warszawa.
- Edukacja obywatelska w Europie. Fundacja Rozwoju Systemu Edukacji*, (2012), Warszawa.
- Frycz Modrzewski A. (2004), *Myśli polityczne Andrzeja Frycza Modrzewskiego*, Warszawa.
- Habermas J. (1966), *Three Normative Models of Democracy*, [in:], *Democracy and Difference*, S. Benhabib (red.), Princeton.
- Habermas J. (1993), *Obywatelstwo a tożsamość narodowa: rozważania nad przyszłością Europy*, Warszawa.
- Habermas J. (1996), *Between Facts and Norms: Contribution to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, Cambridge.
- Hoppe H.H. (2006), *Demokracja – bóg, który zawiódł*, Warszawa.
- Illich I. (1976), *Spółczesność bez szkoły*, Warszawa.
- Kopińska V., Solarczyk-Szwec H. (eds.), (2017), *Kompetencje społeczne i obywatelskie*, Toruń.
- Kowalska M. (2005), *Demokracja w kole krytyki*, Białystok.
- Kowalska M. (2018), *Polskie spory o demokrację*, [in:], *Spółczesność polskie dziś. Samoświadomość, uznanie, edukacja*, M. Saganiak i in. (eds.), Warszawa.
- Kropotkin P. (2006), *Pomoc wzajemna*, Poznań.
- Kwieciński Z. (2012), *Pedagogie postu. Preteksty. Konteksty. Podteksty*, Kraków.
- Kwieciński Z., Witkowski L. (eds.), (1993), *Spory o edukację. Dylematy, kontrowersje we współczesnych pedagogiach*, Warszawa.
- Łukaszewski W., (1983), *Czynniki decydujące o powodzeniu wychowania*, [in:] *Spółczesność wychowująca. Rzeczywistość i perspektywy*, B. Suchodolski (ed.), Wrocław.
- Majerek B. (2018), *Niepewność w społeczeństwie współczesnym*, Kraków.
- Masłyk E. (1979), *Pojęcie „niepewności” i jego zastosowanie w analizach socjologicznych* „Studia Socjologiczne”, nr 1.
- Matynia E. (2008), *Demokracja performatywna*, Wrocław.
- Mead M. (2000), *Kultura i tożsamość. Studium dystansu międzypokoleniowego*, Warszawa.
- Melosik Z. (1995), *Postmodernistyczne kontrowersje wokół edukacji*, Toruń–Poznań.
- Mouffe Ch. (2005), *Paradoks demokracji*, Wrocław.
- Pilch T. (2018), *Marzec 2018. Stanowisko Stowarzyszenia „Ruch Pedagogów Społecznie Zaangażowanych” wobec społecznych problemów naszego kraju*, „Pedagogika Społeczna”, nr 1.
- Potulicka E., Rutkowiak J. (2010), *Neoliberalne uwikłania edukacji*, Kraków.
- Rawls J. (1994, 2009), *Teoria sprawiedliwości*, Warszawa.
- Reimer E. (1971), *The School is Dead*, Middlesex.
- Sartori G. (1994), *Teoria demokracji*, Warszawa.
- Schumpeter J. (1995), *Kapitalizm, socjalizm, demokracja*, Warszawa.

Sumner W.G. (1993), *Naturalne sposoby postępowania w gromadzie*, Warszawa.

Szczegóła L. (2013), *Bierność obywatelska. Apatia polityczna w teorii demokratycznej partycypacji*, Warszawa.

Sztompka P. (2007), *Zaufanie. Fundament społeczeństwa*, Kraków.

Theiss M., Kurowska A., Petelczyc J., Lewenstein B. (2017), *Obywatel na zielonej wyspie. Polityka społeczna i obywatelstwo społeczne w Polsce w dobie europejskiego kryzysu ekonomicznego*. Warszawa.

Weber M., (2002), *Gospodarka i społeczeństwo. Zarys socjologii rozumiejącej*, Warszawa.

Zielińska H. (1996), *Ivan Illich. Między romantyzmem a anarchizmem pedagogicznym*, Toruń.

Znaniecki F. (1973), *Socjologia wychowania*, t. 1, 2, Warszawa.

Internet sources

<<https://www.google.com/search?q=Les+10+Strategies+de+Noam+Chomsky&ie=utf>>