

# AN ANALYSIS OF THE AXIOLOGY OF EDUCATION FOR SECURITY

Janusz ŚWINIARSKI  
Arnold WARCHAŁ

WOJSKOWA AKADEMIA TECHNICZNA

**Abstract.** In the article, authors semantically analyze the expressive norms of “value” in respect to the axiological concepts of happiness, beauty and security, embedding modern “education for security” in the tradition of Aristotle’s study of the necessary, useful and beautiful things. The attention is then turned to the resulting military and pacifist entanglements of such education. In following deliberation, there is a reference to the recognition by Stefan Kunowski of the three systems of being, and the three philosophies of education, evolving namely around the following values: Christian – rooted in Love, socialist – rooted in Struggle, and liberal – rooted in Freedom. Through a critical re-evaluation of these philosophies and systems, one can notice that they point to the fourth system implied in the philosophy of security. It is a system of contemporary “education for security” based on custody, care and control, and, control over oneself and others. In resulting final part of the article, authors outline the paradigm of this modern education for security, and place it in respect to both, the universal axiological value plain, and the four pillars of the Delors Report entitled “Education has a hidden force in it”. The pillars recommended by this Report are general and refer to: knowledge, cooperation, and acting, as well as, being. According to the authors, the implementation of education resting on these pillars is intentional and creative, of the equally, the cognitive civilization (the civilization of rational people), and the enlightened – one that is secure.

**Keywords:** Aristotle, *cognitarians*, happiness, peace, pillars of education in Delors Report, security, value, war.

## Introduction

There is a widespread understanding that security is equally the human essential necessity, conceivably the primary social prerequisite, and the merit qualifying contemporary world. For people, the augmentation, enhancement and solidifying knowledge about its significance and standard – of security/safety – affects many areas of life’s routines, including educational activity, adaptation and adjustment to social life, and its performance, simply implying – the socialization. While initially the primary understanding of security was associated with the military dimensions, initiating rearing, preparation and military training, the multi-expansion of modern security researches bonds its meanings with the diverse dimensions,

different objects and objectives, and non-military practice. This association still generates a holistic and synergistic understanding of security. And, there seems to be a reasonable account of modern education for safety as rooted in the critical reevaluation of the military education tradition, with apparent tendency of *irenic* edification. Consequently, this intentional contemporary approach to education for security is holistically designed towards the both, warfare and peace awareness. In axiological terms, this approach includes principles traditionally contradictory, indeed embracing the value and anti-value split. The reason being for this rests in the Western Culture tradition where the universal norm includes peace, with righteousness, regarded as the outmost value and virtue, whereas its opposite, the war, as an malevolence, or anti-value, even if it may be necessary – still the unwanted social fact. Furthermore, the contemporary education for security arises from the critical reevaluation and continuation of the three philosophies, or education systems, as discussed by the Polish pedagogue Stefan Kunowski. Namely, the education towards: Love (the Christian system), Conflict (the socialist system) and Liberty (the liberal system). The critical conjunction and synthesis of these three philosophies and educational systems (for Love, Conflict, and Freedom) raises the philosophy of security and embedded in it the education for cognitive-self process (of reasoning), the exercise of protection with supervision, and control with dominion: security.

The European educational dimension, with its integrated problems of contemporary education, and the intentional grounding of European citizens, is an education towards the culture based on reason – the civilization of rational people. It is a civilization focused on creating the rational self (individual entity), the individual human rights (citizenship), the prosperity within the rule of law, and, above all, on the four pillars of education specified in the, so-called, Delors Report – “Education has a hidden force within”. These pillars advocate teaching towards knowledge, interaction with practice, and existence. Such process seems to be conducive of security based on acquiring knowledge, competence and skills, in order to care for, organize and control both, for oneself and for the others. The main concern is to continue, develop and improve own life and life of others, including the life of the community. From an axiological point of view, it is about sharing the choices of elementary values (intellectual, moral-ethical and aesthetic, as well as hedonistic satisfaction). This reciprocity seems to constitute the axiological paradigm of education for the sake of security, that in intentional manner focuses on the life embedded in truth, goodness, beauty, and in achieving both, the individual and collective pleasure.

## 1. Security as value

In the axiological terms (the *αξιος* – worthy, valuable + *λογος* – science) the normative outlook comes from an ethical concept of good, and implies that, which

is worth choosing by virtue of being a human being. A choice of this kind is at the same time a choice for something and against something, entailing in the ambivalent world negation of the other choice. The former, in Western culture, is rather commonly identified with good, and the latter with evil. Some, identify the first with value (because it is worthy of a man), and the second with an anti-norm (because it is unworthy of a human being). This means that what is good is worthy of a man, and what is bad is unworthy. In the ancient and medieval times, the term “value” is used interchangeably with “good” (Lat. *bonum*). It is only with the XIX c. literature that “value” begins to appear as the subject of axiology – the science of value. In modern philosophical language, instead of the term “value”, the synonyms such as “idea”, “goal”, “perfection”, “norm”, or the aforementioned “good”, are often used interchangeably. These synonyms overlap with the meaning range of “value”, but not always and not completely<sup>1</sup>. It does not change the fact that there are many definitions of the “value”, and not only in the philosophical literature. The Polish philosopher Roman Darowski recognizes this multiplicity within three categories, namely those that adhere to the following:

- (1) “... valuable (desirable, worthy of desire or possession, obligatory, necessary etc.), or that, what makes something valuable (desirable, etc.), or price or “value” (being wanted, etc.)”<sup>2</sup>. Hence, it is a type of form (trait), which immanently contains some perfection, arousing in humans the desire to strive for it, and achieve it.
- (2) it is the quality of being, “... if this is the object of intentional cognitive-lustful acts”<sup>3</sup>.
- (3) it is such a being, “...which, by its objective-qualitative properties, is recognizable by man, and then what is longed for and also often realized; value always corresponds to human needs of a psychophysical person. Speaking of the human needs, we not only have biological and life needs in mind, but also, above all, the higher, or psycho-spiritual, needs (e.g. moral, ideological, religious)”<sup>4</sup>.

“The value is sometimes considered to be all that allows to give meaning to human existence; what contributes to making a human being the fully humane person. One should distinguish between the **things**, that is, material and spiritual beings as the carriers of values (*bona*), and the **reason** why these things, or beings, constitute **good** (*valor = ratio bonitatis*). The value, then, is this right, this dimension of a given being (aspect of good). The good and values are respectively: beings, and an element of value found in beings. Value is the basis by which the thing (being)

<sup>1</sup> Vide: S. Kowalczyk, *Filozoficzne koncepcje wartości*, „Collectanea Theologica” 56 (1986) f. I, pp. 37-40.

<sup>2</sup> Qtd.: A.B. Stępień, *Wstęp do filozofii*, wyd. 4, TN KUL, Lublin 2001, p. 426.

<sup>3</sup> Qtd.: M.A. Krąpiec, *Filozofia bytu a zagadnienie wartości*, [in:] *Odzyskać świat realny* as *Dziela*, t. 23, ed. 2, TN KUL, Lublin 1999, p. 262.

<sup>4</sup> Qtd.: S. Kowalczyk, *Człowiek w poszukiwaniu wartości. Elementy aksjologii personalistycznej*, TN KUL, Lublin 2006, p. 133.

appears as good. In other words, the value is the property (feature) of the object, and good is the object that owns it (contains)”<sup>5</sup>.

Among the many definitions of good and the denial of evil are those, embedded in the philosophical thought of antiquity proclaiming, that good is connected with the actualization of human needs, desires and intentions; valiant, persevering and persistent pursuit of a free form of being chosen by man, or his own essence; whereas evil, being a denial of good, is connected with the non-realization or lack of possibility of realizing human desires, needs and intentions; cowardly, inconsistent, and aligned with, so-called, “a flash in a pan”. Evil is that, “which is not”, because it cannot be realized or perpetuated when there is good. Indeed, as was stated by St. Augustine, following in the footsteps of Plato’s thought – evil is a lack of good, and goodness is a lack of evil. Hence, in the view of many supporters of axiological phenomenology, we find the conviction that man first of all experiences evil (lack of good) *a posteriori*, and good has the character of something *a priori* and constitutes the essence of things, intellectually and abstractly understood as things in themselves.

The human beings have a lot of needs, desires and intentions. Philosophers who wonder about human choices have often divided these needs into natural and unnatural, or necessary (natural) and unnecessary (unnatural). But not only did they divide them differently, since also trying to indicate the basic need and intention appropriate for every human being, what they called “the highest good” – *summum bonum* (“sum of good”). This good, according to the principle underlined by Aristotle, stands at the head of the hierarchy of all goods – defined by needs, desires and intentions – and is called happiness (*eudaimonion*). According to him, every human being aspires to this “the highest good” – happiness, although it is not always given to everyone. This “highest good”, the leading value, and the universal need include – according to Aristotle – the joint possession of three types of goods, namely: spiritual (intellectual-dianoetic), somatic (physical-ethical) and material. Hence, happiness as the “highest good” is a complex good, on the one hand, of intentions of a more intellectual nature, and on the other hand of needs of a more material nature, and finally, of the third, of desires of a bodily and habitual nature. Not everyone, however, shares the view of the tri-sum of goods that make up happiness, which is rooted in having the more reasonable (dioetic) and the more emotional (ethical) and material (instrumental).

For the Stoics, happiness is the satisfaction of the current reality, no matter what the reality is, and that, what can be interpreted as having possession of the feelings of satisfaction, and the absence of dissatisfaction. Whereas in the thought of the Cy-nics, happiness consists in the maximum limitation of the bodily and material needs, and maximization of intellectual and spiritual intent to achieve perfection, which can be understood as possessing intellectual and spiritual perfection, by eliminating the imperfection associated with the care of the world of material things. Epicurus,

<sup>5</sup> R. Darowski, *Filozofia człowieka. Zarys problematyki. Antologia tekstów*, Akademia Ignatianum Wydawnictwo WAM, Kraków 2015, pp. 117-118.



on the other hand, associated happiness with the feelings of pleasure and limitation of suffering, which can be identified with possessing (feeling) both, the pleasure and lack of suffering. In this Epicurean bond, pleasure is understood as the good and value, and suffering is the opposite, the evil and anti-value.

And finally, in the eschatological perspective of Christian philosophy, happiness is the final coexistence with God the Father, even having the individual relationships with him, what is closely related, all the more to the happiness and, consequently, to sacred life. St. Thomas Aquinas wrote that the absolute happiness is a direct contact with God, and Boethius, that God is the Happiness, and that people can be happy thanks to participation in the happiness of God. It is also worth mentioning that according to the teachings of Islam, happiness is associated with the conduct consistent with the will of Allah in both temporal and afterlife. However, in other religious views – according to the teachings of Buddhism, it is not possible to achieve happiness by following the desires, because their complete satisfaction is impossible. The only way to achieve lasting happiness is to get rid of these desires, which allows one to enter *nirvana*<sup>6</sup>.

Apart from many other semantic proposition, one can say about the happiness – following the Polish philosopher and the historian of philosophy – Władysław Tatarkiewicz – that it is generally a matter of satisfaction, but not of every single one, but one that is persistent, permanent and justified<sup>7</sup>. If the justification of this contentment is to possess intellectual and spiritual goods related to the intentions of achieving perfection, and the stability of this contentment is associated with the possession of material goods, and existential needs, the durability of this satisfaction seems to be set on somatic goods, and the desire to have above all the physical goods, health and immanent well-being. Of course, the multiplicity of identification of happiness results from the fact that in the general sense good as a value, or a positive value, for many thinkers is undefined<sup>8</sup>. Nevertheless, by trying to define happiness, following the Aristotelian philosophy, we can identify and present its main points, as is shown in the table below.

Table 1. Happiness as a joint possession of three types of goods

Happiness according to Aristotle		
„THE HIGHEST GOOD”		
Spiritual-intellectual goods	Somatic goods	Material goods
<b>Intention</b> of perfection	Desire for good health	Existential <b>needs</b>
<b>Legitimation</b> of satisfaction	<b>Permanent</b> satisfaction	<b>Constant</b> satisfaction

Source: Own research

<sup>6</sup> Vide ex.: <https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Szcz%C4%99%C5%9Bcie> [4.04.2017].

<sup>7</sup> Vide: W. Tatarkiewicz, *O szczęściu*, Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa 2010, p. 26.

<sup>8</sup> Vide: W. Tatarkiewicz, *O bezwzględności dobra*, [in:] *Pisma zebrane*, t. 1: *Droga do filozofii i inne rozprawy filozoficzne*, PWN, Warszawa 1971.

The appreciation of happiness as a “supreme good”, which is the joint possession of three types of important and valuable goods of being human, seems to either go beyond the axiological tendency to the hierarchy of values, or is the basis for this hierarchy. The first alternative is that in Aristotelian understanding, there are no more important, or less important, or less valuable goods. All three are necessary for happiness and “the highest good”, and none individually, apart from the absence of any particular, makes it possible to say that man is good and of value. Nevertheless, in the history of axiological thought, numerous attempts have been made to prioritize the values and norms by indicating more imperious and subordinate ones. Attempts of this kind, however, seem to be based on the aforementioned distinction of Aristotle, indicating what in the triad of joint possession of goods is more important, and consequently, less important. These indications were fixed by the Platonic hierarchy of values and virtues. In it, it is best when the intellectual-rational dominates and directs the emotional-physical, and they care for the material and produced by farmers and craftsmen, and the relationship between these values determines giving each part of it, what does it belong to her. Otherwise, it also means that the values implied from the rational part of the human soul are the first, and the second implied from the hasty part (emotional), and finally the third, from the lusty part, and the relations between these parts the fourth. It is a hierarchy of such values as: Truth-Good-Beauty-Charity. But this stands as truth only in the souls of philosophers, because the souls of their helpers (soldiers) are dominated by the values flowing from the hasty part (of Truth-Good-Beauty-Charity), and in the souls of farmers and craftsmen are the values embedded in lustful tendencies (towards Truth-Good-Beauty-Charity). Such is Plato’s argument in the *Republic*, although, according to broader interpretations, Platonism distinguishes four values such as goodness, beauty, truth and justice. There are interpretations proclaiming that Plato, in a dispute with Aristotle during his intercourse at the Academy, accepted and argued “the priorities of good over the truth”, which Aristotle did not agree with, and argued for “the primacy of truth over good”.

## 2. Security in the hierarchy of values, the staining of anti-values and its antinomies

In the contemporary philosophy, the more extensive classification and hierarchy of values has been developed by Max Scheler, for whom there are five modalities (modes of existence) of values which in order from the highest to the lowest are following; (1) religious; (2) spiritual; (3) vital; (4) utilitarian; (5) hedonistic<sup>9</sup>. On the other hand, Władysław Tatarkiewicz, when addressing the problem of value, specified internal simple values, which he also called elementary, namely: (1) moral (based on cardinal virtue such as Good), (2) aesthetic (based on Beaut), (3) intel-

<sup>9</sup> Vide ex.: P. Brzozowski, *Wzorcową hierarchia wartości polska, europejska czy uniwersalna? Psychologiczne badania empiryczne*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin 2007, pp. 27-28.

lectual (based on Truth) and (4) hedonistic (based on Pleasure)<sup>10</sup>. Undoubtedly, Józef Tischner, another Polish philosopher, referred to these hierarchies, and as the lowest he recognized such values as: (1) hedonistic, (2) after those, the vital, and (3) spiritual, finally at their head of those he placed (4) the divine, that are for believers as the source of religion, and for non-believers the “humanly holy”, i.e. such as humanity, nation and homeland<sup>11</sup>. It is worth noting that he did not indicate utilitarian values in his hierarchy. The mentioned hierarchies can be embedded in the general definition of Aristotle’s happiness. And so, religious and spiritual values (1, 2) can be associated with intellectual-spiritual goods, and vital (3) with somatic, and finally hedonistic (5 or 4) material (external).

Table 2. Hierarchisation of values according to Max Scheler, Władysław Tatarkiewicz and Józef Tischner

Values according to Max Scheler	Simple values – elementary according to Władysław Tatarkiewicz	Values according to Józef Tischner
1. religious	<b>1. intellectual (Truth)</b>	1. divine or „humanly holy”
2. spiritual	<b>2. moral (Good)</b>	2. spiritual
3. vital	<b>3. aesthetic (Beauty)</b>	3. vital
4. utilitarian	<b>4. hedonistic (Pleasure)</b>	4. hedonistic
5. hedonistic		

Source: own research

The importance of the Aristotelian approach consists in the fact that happiness as a synthetic union of three values and the “highest good” is trapped simultaneously not only as what every human being aspires to, but also as the goal of the state. For him, the goal of the state is the happiness of the citizens, to ensure that they “live well” and “have a good time”. The same task of the state is to care for citizens to have both permanent, lasting and reasonable satisfaction with the functioning and life in it, as well as spiritual and intellectual good, bodily goods and material goods. While in the philosophical thought of Dante Alighieri, the goal of every man is happiness (Aristotelianism), it is for the State “to provide residents with a safe and prosperous life” that most fully fulfills “in a universal room... which best serves our happiness”<sup>12</sup>. The State, as is also pointed out in modern thought by, among the others, Thomas Hobbes, has such a goal. This goal is a guarantee of security that is implemented by the state through universal consent to limit the natural freedom of people in exchange for care, care and control and supervision.

<sup>10</sup> Vide: W. Tatarkiewicz, *O bezwzględności dobra*, Wyd. Gebethner i Wolff, Warszawa–Lublin–Łódź, Kraków 1919.

<sup>11</sup> Vide: P. Brzozowski, *Wzorcowe hierarchie wartości polska, europejska czy uniwersalna? Psychologiczne badania empiryczne*, op. cit., p. 28.

<sup>12</sup> A. Dante, *Monarchia*, transl. by W. Seńko, Wyd. HACHETTE, Warszawa 2010, p. 58.

While in ancient times happiness was one of the highest values because all people aspired to it – as Aristotle wrote – and it is a perfect state (characteristic of a god, beast or a state) because it combines all goods, then – as it was explained at the turn of antiquity and the Middle Ages by Boethius,<sup>13</sup> belongs to God. And nowadays – according to Zygmunt Freud's statement – it was replaced by a value such as security<sup>14</sup>. Perhaps under the influence of this observation Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz in one of his *Italian Novels* wrote that happiness is "... a concept too primitive for a modern man"<sup>15</sup>. For a modern man, according to a large group of neofreudists, security is one of the first social needs that arises after satisfying the needs of biological existence. And such needs according to Plato are necessary and include food, drink and reproduction. And for the undoubted tracer of this recognition of the American psychologist Abraham Maslow, the essence of happiness is successive implementation of needs (which make up the value as such – holistically included in the so-called Maslow Pyramid describing what happiness is): (1) physiological (such as hunger, thirst and sleep, which are the denial of lack of food, drink and rest); (2) security; (3) belonging and love; (4) respect; (5) self-fulfillment<sup>16</sup>. Also this hierarchy can be associated with the general definition of Aristotle's happiness. While the physiological needs are embedded in material and somatic goods, such needs as security, belonging and love as well as respect and self-realization are embedded in intellectual and spiritual goods.

Initially concluding and accepting the thesis that such value and "highest good" as happiness is replaced today by such value as security, it can be reasonably stated – inspired by Aristotle's statement – that:

- (1) all modern people aspire to security, although not everyone is involved in it;
- (2) security is the joint possession and fair disposition of what is:
  - (a) spiritual and intellectual, expressed in the choice of Truth and striving for it;
  - (b) somatic-emotional, expressed in choosing Good and striving to realize needs, desires and intentions;
  - (c) material, expressed in the choice of beauty and creating it.

In short and more abstractly, security is a common pursuit of having and just disposing of Truth, Goodness and Beauty and Charity. At the same time, it is the pursuit of such cardinal virtues as: Wisdom, Bravery, Moderation (Prudence) and Justice. In this context, it seems legitimate to define the security and "highest value" of contemporary people in the Aristotelian spirit as the joint possession of a legitimate Truth, lasting real Good and permanent use of both multiplying Beauty (products of human action) and due sharing of what is real (what is known

<sup>13</sup> Vide: Boecjusz, *O pocieszeniu, jakie daje filozofia*, transl. by G. Kurylewicz, M. Antczak, Wyd. Marek Derewiecki, Kęty 2006.

<sup>14</sup> „Człowiek cywilizowany w zamian za wyrzeczenie się pewnej dozy możliwości szczęścia otrzymał pewną dozę poczucia bezpieczeństwa” (Z. Freud, *Kultura jako źródło cierpień*, [in:] *Pisma społeczne*, t. IV, transl. by R. Reszke, Wyd. KR, Warszawa 1998, p. 204).

<sup>15</sup> Qtd.: W. Tatarkiewicz, *O szczęściu*, op. cit., p. 48.

<sup>16</sup> Vide ex.: [https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hierarchia\\_potrzeb](https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hierarchia_potrzeb) [4.04.2018].

more theoretically), good (known more practically) and beautiful (what is known in more technical terms – manufacturing – technical and technological). Thus, falsehood, evil and ugliness, and injustice determine such anti-value as danger. Therefore, a look at education for security in the perspective of value distinctions and anti-values allows to embed it in an intentional manner: (1) **TRUTH**; (2) **GOOD**; (3) **BEAUTY**; (4) **CHARITY** (as a pleasure giving).

Assuming in general that security is a value manifested in the choice of: (1) **Truth** (but not in a sense of arguments and convincing the others about things, what was proposed by the Sophists), (2) **Good** (yet not abandonment of needs, desires and intentions) and (3) **Beauty** (and not ugliness, lack of harmony, symmetry and clarity in things produced) and (4) **Giving** (but not taking), it should be consistently stated that education in such cases is entangled in the above choices. Thus, the ideal of a person who chooses security as a need (something more objective), desire (something more subjective and objective) and intention (something more subjective) is a person seeking the: (1) **Truth** and possession of intellectual and spiritual goods, (2) **Good** as characterized by bravery and consistency in action, of denying the so-called “a flash in a pan”, i.e. a lack of consequence, and (3) **Beauty** with having technical and artistic skills, and moreover (4) **Giving** and feeling pleasure because of charity, which fosters a pro-social attitude. This is the ideal and entanglement of universal education.

In contemporary times, this also finds expression, among other things, in the concept of building peace and security on earth, laid out in the encyclical writing of Saint John XXIII *Pacem in terris* and the numerous messages of the Popes after him, on the occasion of the World Day of Peace. The condition of this peace and security on Earth is the appropriate education, supported by four pillars expressed in such values as: **Truth, Love, Freedom and Justice**. At the same time, it is an education liberating from such anti-values as: Lie, Hatred, Bondage and Injustice. Because these anti-values foster war, which is something irrational in recognizing the social doctrine of the Church<sup>17</sup>, which was also emphasized by Saint John Paul II at the beginning of his pontificate in the Message for the 11th World Day of Peace (1979). In this message, he stated that: to achieve peace identified in idealistic terms with security should be an education towards it<sup>18</sup>.

Such an education is one whose “task and the first boon of education worthy of the name is to look beyond the sad mundane reality, or rather to learn to recognize among the unleashed deadly rapes, the discreet paths of peace, which never

<sup>17</sup> Vide: Jan XXIII, *Encyklika Pacem in terris*, [http://www.opoka.org.pl/biblioteka/W/WP/jan\\_xxiii/encykliki/pacem\\_in\\_terriss\\_11041963.html](http://www.opoka.org.pl/biblioteka/W/WP/jan_xxiii/encykliki/pacem_in_terriss_11041963.html) [4.04.2017]; J. Świniarski, *O skłonności do idealistyczno-realistycznego pojmowania bezpieczeństwa w myśli Jana Pawła II i jego adherentów*, [in:] *Chrześcijaństwo i bezpieczeństwo. Znaczenie Jana Pawła II w dyskursie polemologiczno-irenologicznym*, edit. by T. Kuśmider, K. Gąsiorek, C. Smuniewski, Instytut Papieża Jana Pawła II, Warszawa 2014, pp. 213-236; Z. Struzik, *Pokój i bezpieczeństwo w nauczaniu Jana Pawła II. Perspektywa aksjologiczna w wybranych orędziach na Światowe Dni Pokoju*, [in:] *Chrześcijaństwo i bezpieczeństwo...*, op. cit., pp. 305-318.

<sup>18</sup> Vide: Jan Paweł II, *Osiągniemy pokój, wychowując do pokoju*, Orędzie na XII Światowy Dzień Pokoju 1 stycznia 1979 r., [in:] [http://www.nonpossumus.pl/encykliki/Jan\\_Pawel\\_II/sdp\\_12/](http://www.nonpossumus.pl/encykliki/Jan_Pawel_II/sdp_12/) [4.04.2018].



gives up, continuously heals wounds, supports and gives life growth. The march towards peace will turn out to be not only possible, but worthy of desire, already victorious (...) according to more real schemes than those that depict them as an uninterrupted coil of wars and revolutions. Indeed, the jaws of a weapon drown out the currents of history. Let's remember, however, that the inter-war period allowed for the creation of permanent works of culture, which are the glory of humanity. Moreover, even if in wars and revolutions one can find factors of life and progress, they were the result of other longings rather than rape, the spiritual longings such as the will to recognize all human dignity and to save the spirit and freedom of a given nation. Wherever these longings worked, they brought moderation into the very heart of conflicts, they did not allow final splits, they sustained hope and prepared new possibilities for the emergence of peace. On the other hand, where they did not exist, where they weakened in the heat of violence, they left open the field of destructive anti-logic that led to a permanent economic and cultural decline, and death of entire civilizations. You who bear responsibility for the nations, learn to educate yourself to love peace, recognizing and paying special attention to the great pages of national history, for example your ancestors, whose glory was the growth of the fruits of peace. "Blessed are those who bring peace"<sup>19</sup>. They are happy and safe because they have permanent, lasting and justified satisfaction with life, which gives dignified survival, development and improvement – life that fits into real progress and not its illusion.

Such concepts of building peace and security are also embedded in the idea of a society that primarily implements human security (or for human beings, or people, or individuals). Because, as we read in the *United Nations Development Program of 1994*, there was seen a chance to organize XXI societies in such a way as to improve the tendencies arising from the tradition of Western Civilization, to realize human rights and freedoms and individualism. This is a tendency that arises from the belief (*aporia*) that man is not only a human or social being, or individuality and a unique nature, but above all a person, or person composed of the flesh (somatic), and inner self (psychic). Undoubtedly under the influence of this tendency embedded in Western civilization – in the indications of this program – security requirements include six such main and hierarchically arranged categories, from basic (more material) to higher (more intellectual-spiritual), as:

- Economic security – development of basic and necessary human income;
- Food security – development of access to food, its resources in the physical as well as economic sense;
- Health security – development of prevention and access to medical services, and hygienic lifestyle;
- Personal safety – eliminating physical violence on the part of the state and other people;

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibidem.

- Security of social bonds – maintaining and improving traditional relationships and values;
- Political security – development and improvement of civil liberties<sup>20</sup>.

The abovementioned classification defines six main scopes, extents and possessions involved with security, and efforts of its assertion in view of the traditional concepts of happiness. Those are namely based on, firstly, individual assets, such as economic, food and health goods, and, secondly, more structural properties of a person – approximating social and political rights. Those seem to be similar but differently compose the accents, and are more elaborative, as compared to Barry Buzan's specification from the early eighties of the twentieth century. According to Buzan, security covers five areas, such as: political, economic, ecological, military, and social, in a more collective sense<sup>21</sup>. Thus, it can be stated that education for security is basically involved in political, economic, ecological and military education, but in general it is a social education. The intention of these listed areas of education for security, the way citizens of the liberal-democracies associate with, is in the pursuit of lives with expanding dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity, and the rule of law. In this way, not only the state institutions, but also additional – of the local government, international, supranational, and non-governmental institutions play an important role. At the same time, it also seems that such approach is the way the liberal-democratic and republican political cultures are struggling to overcome the traditional predicaments of the modern societies' striving to overcome fear, destruction or total annihilation, in favor of a sensible attempt to minimize fear (freedom from fear), destruction that promotes poverty (freedom from hunger), and annihilation (freedom from intentional and amassed killing). This pursuit is expressed in response to the question of whether these societies manage to emerge from the cultivation of killing, unified under the expression of the "civilization of death"<sup>22</sup>.

According to Michał Hempoliński, we are not able to evolve from the civilization of death, although we can advance away from the civilization of treachery, that is, from a civilization in which people exploit the methods of killing, as the easiest and simplest approach to solving problems<sup>23</sup>. In this perspective, modern theologians pay attention to, not very satisfactory, translation of the fifth commandment of the Decalogue. A more accurate explanation seems to be one intensive of the prohibition of premeditated murder<sup>24</sup>. To underline such understanding it is worth

<sup>20</sup> Vide: *United Nations Development Program*, [in:] *Human Development Rapport 1994*, Oxford University Press New York–Oxford 1994.

<sup>21</sup> Vide: B. Buzan, *People, States and Fear*, Harvester, London 1983, pp. 214-242.

<sup>22</sup> **Death civilization** is a term first used by the St. John Paul II as the term opposite to „civilization of love” used by Pope Paul VI. Death civilization or culture of death are described by such phenomena as abortion, euthanasia, murder, genocide, anti-conception, and in vitro methods of conceptions. (Vide ex.: [https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cywilizacja\\_%C5%9Bmierci](https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cywilizacja_%C5%9Bmierci) [4.04.2017].

<sup>23</sup> Vide: M. Hempoliński, *Czy zdołamy wyjść z cywilizacji zabijania?*, [in:] *Ekologia ducha...*, op. cit., pp. 51-52.

<sup>24</sup> Vide ex.: J. Bocian SVD, *Piąte przykazanie dekalogu i nakaz miłości nieprzyjaciół a „słuszna wojna”*, [in:] *Chrześcijaństwo i bezpieczeństwo. Znaczenie Jana Pawła I w dyskursie polemologiczno-irenologicznym*, edit. by T. Kośmider, K. Gąsiorek & C. Smuniewski, Instytut Papieża Jana Pawła II, Warszawa 2014, pp. 188-191.

noticing that those involved in artificial intelligence observed that in experiments conducted with the use of more complex networks of neural silicon algorithms (computers), primary choice is to shoot the competitors. Hence their conclusion states: with more complexity within cognitive systems there is a tendency to kill<sup>25</sup>. What's more, Stephan Hawking anticipated that the appearance of full artificial intelligence will entail the end of the human race<sup>26</sup>. And as such possibility the Israeli historian – Yoav Noah Harari considers this in his numerous publications<sup>27</sup>.

In its axiological layer the contemporary recognition of education favoring such values as prime happiness and security is entangled in the critical concept of overcoming the education considered as a process of preparation to war, in favor of education for peace. It is a concept that has its foundation in Aristotle's view expressed in the statement that life as a whole, and its happiness as a whole, have three types of properties that are divided into action and rest, war and peace, necessary – useful and beautiful things. Therefore, recommending educational tasks in his *Politics* he affirms: "(...) citizens must work and fight, but to rest and live in peace as well. They have to do what is necessary and useful, but even more what is beautiful"<sup>28</sup>. For every beautiful thing "needs to have its parts in harmony (...) accordingly to [appropriate] size and order"<sup>29</sup>. Moreover, he states in *Metaphysics* that "(...) the main forms of beauty are order, symmetry and expressiveness"<sup>30</sup>.

Therefore happiness and security as a whole are expressed in the beauty created by necessary elements (war or work), and useful (peace or rest). To this wholeness expressed in happiness – beauty and security, the attempts were intentionally made to bring citizens in unison with Aristotle's recommendation, so it seems that contemporary education for security should continue to follow the line of this holistic and synergetic security.

Table 3. Necessary, useful and beautiful things as parts of security according to Aristotle

Necessary things	Useful things	Forms of beauty, happiness and security
• <b>War</b> (acquiring property)	<b>Peace</b> (using property)	• <b>Expressiveness</b> • <b>Symmetry</b>
• <b>Work</b> (ownership production)	<b>Rest</b> (contemplating and using property)	• <b>Proportionality</b> • <b>Arrangement</b>

Source: Own research based on Aristotle's works

<sup>25</sup> Vide ex.: *Czy powinniśmy bać się agresywnej sztucznej inteligencji?*, [in:] <https://www.spidersweb.pl/2017/02/eksperyment-agresywna-deepmind.ht>. [6.11.2018].

<sup>26</sup> Vide ex.: <http://www.rp.pl/Nowe-technologie/302149906-Sztuczna-inteligencja-robi-się-agresywna.html>. [6.11.2018].

<sup>27</sup> Y.N. Harari, *Homo deus. Krótka historia jutra*, transl. by Michał Romanek, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2018; Idem, *21 lekcji na wiek XXI*, przeł. Michał Romanek, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2018.

<sup>28</sup> Arystoteles, *Polityka* (VII, 1333a), transl. by L. Piotrowicz, Wyd. Nauk, Warszawa 2004, p. 206.

<sup>29</sup> Arystoteles, *Retoryka. Retoryka dla Aleksandra. Poetyka*, Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa 2004, p. 328.

<sup>30</sup> Idem, *Metafizyka* (1078 a), [in:] *Dzieła wszystkie*, t. 2, Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa 2003, p. 827.

Considering the above, it is rightly argued that contemporary education for security in the axiological perspective is entangled in intentional attempts to educate for, on the one hand, war and work, and on the other, peace and rest, in order to make life beautiful, happy and secure.

### **3. Military and pacifist entanglements of education for security**

Undoubtedly, the present intentions to abandon the civilization of bloodshed, and civilization of death, are expressed in the axiological tendencies of contemporary people to prefer pacifism, anti-war actions or “operations other than war”, with humanitarian operations, etc. These preferences in Western Civilization are expressed by intentions of eliminating deadly fighting, which changes the axiology of security and values important for the armed forces. This inevitably influences, to a greater or lesser extent, the way military education for security, including education in the armed forces of the Republic of Poland – being the part of the NATO alliance, cooperate with the UN and implement, according to media observations, the leading strategy of the Western civilization. There are many arguments for the statement that strategy of contemporary education for security in Western Civilization includes the dialectical submission (overcoming) of such earlier and traditional strategies, as education to: (1) Love, which is the source of peace; (2) Fight, which is the source of war; (3) Freedom, which is a source of solidarity; because a free human being rejects fighting, but involves in it, nonetheless, out of love for another human, and care for his worthy shape of social life (this strategy includes the slogan of war “for own freedom and the others”, which is very much rooted in the tradition of Polish patriots, during the absence of state sovereignty, the slogan of struggle for “Our and Yours freedom”, or the other way round).

These strategies are distinguished in the latest philosophy of education and pedagogy, disciplines dealing with upbringing, and other disciplines dealing with edification. This philosophy examines the problems of holistic education, and one who cultivates this approach prospectively searches for the sense of education<sup>31</sup>. This captures the systems of pedagogy in certain trends, called the great trends in the education of nurture. Among those practicing such advance is Polish educator Stefan Wołoszyn. He distinguishes following philosophical and theoretical trends of modern pedagogy, such as: psychological, sociological (social pedagogy), humanistic (culture) and materialistic<sup>32</sup>. Parallel to these trends, there were also several other varieties of ideological pedagogy developed in Poland. According to the cited author, the most important of these varieties are such pedagogical approaches, as there are various types of education: national, state, liberal-democratic, socialist (communist), or religious – with the dominance of Catholic educa-

<sup>31</sup> Vide: S. Wołoszyn, *Nauki o wychowaniu w Polsce w XX wieku. Próba zarysu encyklopedycznego*, PWN, Warszawa 1993, pp. 124-127.

<sup>32</sup> Vide: *ibidem*.

tion<sup>33</sup>. In recent decades in Poland, the approaches to education have been influenced by the different Western trends, such as school of radical criticism, educational reforms, *educational society*, and alternative humanistic pedagogy<sup>34</sup>.

This and other classifications<sup>35</sup> can be reduced to three basic educational systems – as Stefan Kunowski<sup>36</sup> synthetically describes. It is a reduction based on the three most important values of things chosen and deemed worthy to be passed on to the future generations. These values simultaneously define the essential elements of systems. In view of those values, the aim of education is understood as the one leading towards:

1. **Love** (according to Kunowski, this is a system built primarily on the Christian system of values, and therefore *theistic realism*, which prefers education towards the knowledge of what is eternal and unchangeable, and educates towards devoutness, and how to achieve it based on life modeled on the teaching of Jesus Christ, and the sanctity). Education of this type is correlated with the concept of conservative democracy, which recognizes the obligation of the authorities to “establish prohibitions and orders aimed at protecting tradition and building a homogeneous ethnically, psychosomatic political community”<sup>37</sup>.
2. **Freedom** (according to Kunowski, this is a system built primarily on the liberal system of values, that is *naturalism, pragmatism, utilitarianism*, and *existentialism*, which prefers a free choice of knowing what serves life and self-love, what is beneficial and useful, and educates towards tolerance, self-fulfillment, and mainly individual responsibility). Education of this kind is correlated with the concept of liberal democracy, which emphasizes the important role of institutions and procedures protecting citizens, and minorities from the arbitrariness of power. “It emphasizes the rule of law, independence of courts, protection of minorities, political and personal freedoms as well as an open, pluralistic society with unhampered development opportunities”<sup>38</sup>.
3. **Fighting** (according to Kunowski, this is a system built primarily on the socialist system of values, prefers learning towards the knowledge of what serves the development of work, shared well-being, and struggle to realize a perfect society), and educates to fight and free mankind from poverty and humiliation). Education of this type is correlated with the concept of socialist democracy (social democracy), which emphasizes the role of equality in various spheres of social life, and the fight for it. It means a fight for

<sup>33</sup> Vide: ibidem, pp. 73-88.

<sup>34</sup> Vide: ibidem, pp. 63-71.

<sup>35</sup> Vide ex.: M. Nowak, *Główne nurty współczesnej filozofii wychowania*, „Kultura i Edukacja” 1993, nr 2.

<sup>36</sup> S. Kunowski, *Podstawy współczesnej pedagogiki*, PWN, Warszawa 1993.

<sup>37</sup> A. Antoszewski, *Postrzeganie demokracji w Polsce*, [in:] *Demokratyczna Polska w globalizującym się świecie*, edit. by K. Wojtaszczyk, A. Mirska, Wyd. Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2009, p. 7.

<sup>38</sup> Ibidem, pp. 76-77.



“protection and equalization of opportunities for groups of victims who are deprived of access to the goods that are used by [rich] minority”<sup>39</sup>.

These basic systems distinguished by S. Kunowski arise from various philosophical anthropologies, mainly conservative, socialist and liberal views. Education for love has strong roots in conservative religious anthropologies, including Christian *personalism*. Therefore, the sense of upbringing is an intentional determinant is based on shaping love (to God, other people and oneself), developing and improving altruism, implementing a rational *civilization of love*, respect for the social, natural and metaphysical environment. Education for the civilization of love implies pacifist preferences, which have a settling in axiological justification, both in the pacifism of the first Christians, and in the Encyclical of Pope Saint John XXIII *Pacem in terris*, and the papal annual messages for the World Day of Peace.

At the same time, education for freedom has strong roots in individualistic anthropologies (utilitarianism, pragmatism and existentialism), and in the many varieties of liberal philosophies. These outlooks are based on anthropology interpreting human nature as that of a being, who is free by nature, *open and unfinished*, and necessarily has the possibility and ability to individually shape own life. Those convictions uphold the view of Protagoras, who said that “man is the measure of all things, (...) a blacksmith of his own destiny, and that the essence of human nature heralds existence”. Therefore, the sense of education as an intentional persuasion consisting in releasing the potency of a free human nature, promoting individual activity and responsibility, ready for growth and improvement, as the realization of a liberal society, respecting freedom and dignity.

And finally, education for the fight has strong roots in the critical interpretation of socialist and materialistic anthropologies that prefer combat. Those are the anthropologies that read nature as a process of constant struggle and fight. Their source may be aligned with the conviction of Heraclitus and his statement that “(...) War is the father and king of all things, some makes masters, other slaves, and other gods”. There is a similar notion in philosophy of Hobbes, *that man is a wolf to a man* and necessarily *must fight for his existence* in order to survive (social-Darwinism), while improving both, oneself and the world. Therefore, the sense of education as an intentional preparation for ways of fighting and war, in permanent effort for the survival of people that are by nature equal and good.

At the end of the twentieth century there appeared the ideas calling for re-evaluation of these educational systems (conservative-religious, liberal and socialist). The call for re-evaluation in general is expressed by education for, or towards security. It is embedded in the philosophy of security and recommends a holistic outlook of: **War**, and the ability to use the methods of war; **Love**, and to be able to use the peace methods; **Freedom**, and skills of using both the non-war methods, and the non-peace methods. In short, the education for security is an intentional

<sup>39</sup> Ibidem, p. 76.

way of teaching the subject of education in acquiring knowledge, skills and competences in the use of the four methods mentioned, namely: the war method – embedded in such an ambivalent composition of simple actions where the effects are conservation-destructive (deconstructive); methods of peace – embedded in such an ambivalent composition of simple actions, the effects of which are constructive and prophylactic; non-war methods – embedded in such an ambivalent composition of simple actions, the effects of which are destructive and preventive; non-peace methods – embedded in such an ambivalent composition of simple actions where the effects will lead to conservation and construction<sup>40</sup>.

The indicated methods are immanent in praxeology of “good work”, according to Tadeusz Kotarbiński, leading to happiness and security<sup>41</sup>. Its semantic and etymological essence is based more on the exercise of custody and control, than on the absence of threats. It is achieved through the care, supervision and protection, and control, which adequately expresses the old Polish word of security (*przezpieczeństwo*, loosely understood as *through-security*), rather than the misleading definitions binding the meaning of its value just with the lack of threats<sup>42</sup>. However, for the adherents of bio-politics, the era of security associated with the dominance of the current ideology of liberal democracy is described by the “control society” or “surveillance society”. In the societies with ideological outlook, security is understood as shaping the ambivalent control and supervision of both the ruled (free citizens) over the rulers (the government and those who exercise power), and also, by the rule of inversion, (power) over the citizens. A certain disadvantage and drawback of such contemporary liberal-democratic approach is that while the control and administration of the citizens is relatively permanent and continuous, provided by law, the control of citizens is relatively occasional, provided only by the periodic democratic elections. Therefore, in order to implement security and mutual control in the systems of liberal democracy, one must defend the society as a whole<sup>43</sup>. For, as it is interpreted by Michael Foucault: “The problem of security lies in protection of the common interests against the individual interests. But also the vice versa: one must defend individual interests against everything that looks like the expansion of the common interest. And also to ensure that the freedom of economic processes does not pose a threat, both for enterprises, and for workers, so that the mechanism of interests should not pose a threat to either the individual, or the community (...). Freedom and security, the game of freedom and security – that is what we find at the very center of a new reasoning (...), in the societies of Western liberal democracy, the age of security”<sup>44</sup>.

<sup>40</sup> Vide ex.: J. Świniarski, *Filozoficzne podstawy edukacji dla bezpieczeństwa*, MON, DS.-W, Warszawa 1999.

<sup>41</sup> Vide: T. Kotarbiński, *Traktat o dobrej robocie*, Ossolineum, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1969.

<sup>42</sup> Vide: J. Świniarski, *O znaczeniu nazwy złożonej bezpieczeństwa*, „Studia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego. National Security Studies” 12/2017, pp. 17-46.

<sup>43</sup> M. Foucault, *Trzeba bronić społeczeństwa*, transl. by Małgorzata Kowalska, Wyd. KR, Warszawa 1998.

<sup>44</sup> Idem, *Narodziny biopolityki*, transl. by Michał Herer, Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa 2011, p. 89.

Hence, in education for security, there is also the question of what kind of a citizen we should have, considering the conditions of contemporary societies, what would be the values and what would constitute the human dignity. Answers to these questions are clear, if we accept the constancy and immutability of human nature, although those are not the simple and unambiguous questions, if we construe its changeability and dynamism embedded in a changing and developing world, or that the essence of true human nature is individual freedom allowing for improvement, or degradation of humanity.

Assuming the constancy of human nature, and following the conviction of Polish philosopher Józef Maria Bocheński about its immutability, it is rightly to point out about the universal virtues of those characters, already exposed in the thought of Aristotle and Saint Thomas Aquinas. These virtues, according to the recommendations given by Bocheński, should characterize both, a good warrior and a good citizen-civilian. Those are namely the three skills: bravery, obedience and efficiency of decisions<sup>45</sup>. The efficiency of bravery, according to those thinkers is implied by the value of GOOD, while the efficiency of obedience by the value of BEAUTY, while the combat efficiency is based on TRUTH (knowledge). Thus, education for security can be seen as an intentional effort to shape the prowess of bravery (being a good warrior and citizen), obedience (being a beautiful warrior and citizen) and decisive ability (being a true and right warrior and citizen).

Undoubtedly, the choices made by our ancestors shaped the contemporary culture, which is steeped in the idealized desire for peace, and the actual struggle of war. For centuries in this culture, the preference has been given to peace, as opposed to war, although there are indeed ongoing wars justified by striving for peace, its defense, etc. War is often treated as something irrational, in contrast to a rational and dignified human peace. This specific schizophrenia or hypocrisy are explained differently. In these explanations the most often opposes a man of nature – a man of culture; barbarian – a man of civilization; a bad man – a good man; bloodthirsty murders – humanity, etc. But in these explanations the human nature for some aggressive and warlike, for others – altruistic and pacifist. Thus, for the first, the man of culture, one is altruistic and limiting his natural aggressiveness (belligerence), while for the other, is warlike and aggressive. On the other hand, for the supporters of, not only the philosophy security, human nature is ambivalent, torn and balancing between good and evil, aggression and altruism, entangled in the drive of both love (Eros) and death (Thanatos). Therefore, in education that takes into account the nature of man and, his perfecting nature, it is necessary to take into account this ambivalence, the natural inclination to both, the altruism and egoism, both, those caring for others, and for oneself.

<sup>45</sup> J.M. Bocheński, *De virtute militari. Zarys etyki wojskowej*, Philed, Kraków 1993, p. 16.

#### 4. Towards a paradigm of contemporary education for security

The philosophy of security and education for security is opting for a conjunction, as it seems, overcoming and synthesis the ideal of a man of nature (militant) and a man of culture (steeped in love, altruism and concern for others). It is a conjunction and synthesis of what Aristotle called intentional manner to what is necessary (war and work), and useful (peace and rest), what is beautiful and giving happiness and security, expressed in custody and control of a dual mode, of citizens by authority, and of democratically elected authority by citizens. The struggle (war) and work seem to serve primarily utilitarian values, the lowest in the hierarchy presented by Max Scheler's, and freedom – hedonistic, higher than the lowest. Whereas, Love and a useful desire for peace is considered to be higher as the spiritual value. And finally, beauty (combining what is necessary and useful), happiness (joint possession of three types of goods) and security (identified with every care or control and domination) embedded seem to be in the highest in this hierarchy of values, namely those, that belong to religious ideological, holistic and synergetic. These values define the shape of a collective life, in which the *care for the successors*, their proper and appropriate upbringing has always been important. Because of this concern, political power and every human being ensures their continuity, and in common create the future shape of social life – create security. Hence the importance of this care (security) and education, to uphold life, and to keep improving it, refraining from its possible deterioration. Its improvement in the European educational sphere is reduced to four pillars, and is based on the desire to know, to act, to interact and to exist<sup>46</sup>. This is what the so-called UNESCO Delors Report, who recommends that we should "(...) transmit massively and effectively more and better knowledge and evolving skills, adequate to cognitive civilization, because they are the basis for the competences of tomorrow"<sup>47</sup>. In this program, it is recommended to protect the public and private spheres from the flood of information, more or less ephemeral. This protection – in the opinion of the authors of the Report – seems to provide an improvement of the educational space so that it is a source of knowledge for every individual throughout their lives, was anchored in four pillars:

- to learn the knowledge, in order of acquiring the means of communications;
- to learn, in order to act, to be able to interact with own surroundings;
- to learn, in order to live in community, so as to participate and cooperate with others on all levels of human activity;
- and finally, to learn in order to exist, the pursuit that is related to the three above.

<sup>46</sup> J. Delors, *Raport: Edukacja: jest w niej ukryty skarb*, Stowarzyszenie Oświatowców Polskich, Wyd. UNESCO, Warszawa 1998.

<sup>47</sup> Ibidem.

“Of course, these four ways of knowledge form the holistic realm [determining also: security – footnote of J.Ś. & A.W.], because they have many convergent points, intersecting and complementing each other. Usually, formal education is oriented mainly, if not exclusively, on learning to know” [read also: religious-ideological or intellectual values – footnote of J.Ś. & A.W.] to a lesser extent, to: learn to act [read also: hedonistic values – the footnote of J.Ś. & A.W.]... “The two other pillars of knowledge are usually from accidental circumstances [also considered as: spiritual and utilitarian – the footnote of J.Ś. & A.W.], if they are not treated as some kind of natural continuation of the first two. And, according to the Commission, each of the “four pillars of knowledge” should be the subject of equal care in structured education, so that education would appear as a global and lifetime experience, both cognitively and practically, to every citizen as a person and a member of society”<sup>48</sup>.

The indicated pillars of cognitive education arise from the Enlightenment tradition, and are based on a postulate recommending that we use our own reason and thus gain knowledge about own needs – knowledge in Kant’s autonomous language, not a heteronomous, as learned from other people. The latter – as it is emphasized by Descartes, can be sometimes false, or – as Francis Bacon wrote – is contaminated with the idol of market and theater, inadequacy of words and false philosophical theories. Hence the postulates from the age of Enlightenment call for the subjective knowledge, and for living in accordance with own, personal purpose, which allows to acquire anything that is possible, “to live – according to Aristotle – in accordance to what is best in human being”<sup>49</sup>. This life is not enough, however, only the theoretical contemplation, (...) “but one also needs physical health, and food, and related needs”<sup>50</sup>.

Hence and the conclusion that education for security requires subjectivity in individual thinking, avoiding the traps of market and theater idols, falsehood and hypocrisy. From the point of view of the subjectivity of individual thinking one can, following the line of Kant’s, point to two understandings of security and its “arranging”, the first one which he identified with certainty, and has the character of enlightened security, and the other – unenlightened<sup>51</sup>.

The condition of the first is freedom, and subjective thinking about what one wants and how wants it, this includes the obedience to the categorical imperative, the other is based on the lack of courage (virtue) in using one’s own reason, in humanity’s childhood, enslavement and servitude, to which human beings “fell out of own fault. Adolescence is the inability of a person to use his own reason, without outside directives. This infirmity is committed when the

<sup>48</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>49</sup> Arystoteles, *Etyka nikomachejska*, [in:] *Dzieła wszystkie*, t. 5. Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa 2001, p. 292.

<sup>50</sup> Ibidem, p. 294.

<sup>51</sup> Vide: J. Świniarski, *Bezpieczeństwo w ujęciu filozoficznym*, [in:] *Nauka o bezpieczeństwie. Istota, przedmiot badań i kierunki rozwoju. Studia i materiały*, ed. Lech Grochowski, Arkadiusz Letkiewicz i Andrzej Misiuk, vol. 1, Wyd. Wyższej Szkoły Policji, Szczytno 2010, pp. 122-124.



mind is not lacking in reason, but lack the decision and courage to use it without some leadership”<sup>52</sup>.

To Kant, this enslavement to a large number of people, who want to remain immature throughout their lives, seems to be very convenient, but requires caregivers who replace individual, courageous, virtuous, and subjective thinking related to the use of own, personal reason. But such enslavement, and expectation of security guarantees and, both, good and long life, requires – as Kant writes – “(...) a spiritual guardian who has, instead of me, a conscience, a doctor who, instead of me, determines my diet, etc. – I do not have to care for anything. I do not need to think if I can pay for everything; others will deal with this difficult predicament instead of me. That the majority of people (and among them all the beautiful gender) would take a step towards their maturity, already difficult for themselves, also dangerous – this is what their caregivers are doing, who have taken care of the hardships of supervision. Once they had succeeded in fooling up their home inventory and took care that these peaceful creatures who would not dare to make a step without a baby cot, to which they had put themselves, show them also the dangers that they would face if they tried to walk by themselves. Such danger is not (as we know it) very serious, and after a few falls they would learn to walk, but usually one example of such a fall, is enough to intimidate and scare away from all further such attempts. Therefore, it is difficult for every single person to get out of immaturity [read also: unenlightened security guaranteed by illusory guardians – footnote by J.Ś. & A.W], what became almost his second nature. They even like this, own immaturity, and are not really able to immediately use own reason (...) only a few people managed to get out of immaturity thanks to their own work of their spirit, and stood up firmly on their own feet [read also: to guarantee for oneself the enlightened security – the footnote by J.Ś. & A.W]”<sup>53</sup>. The condition of abandoning immaturity, lack of courage in using one’s own reason and expectations for guaranteeing security identified with certainty of existence, life and experience is freedom. On the other hand, as Kant states: “To enter the path of Enlightenment, you need nothing but freedom: and this freedom that is the most harmless of all that can be called freedom, namely the freedom to make comprehensive public use of your reason”. It is not easy, because tradition and historical experience make us not to think and seek security guarantees from carers who successfully convince their flock. The problem is common, as Kant wrote, “(...) on all sides I hear shouting: do not think! The officer exclaims: do not think! exercise! Financial adviser: do not think! pay! Priest: do not think! believe!”<sup>54</sup>. Abandoning expectations that someone guarantees security requires freedom expressed in ordered mind, and how much one has to and wants to obey for the public benefit. The slogan of a civil society of the enlightened people

<sup>52</sup> I. Kant, *Co to jest oświecenie?*, [in:] <http://www.humanizm.net.pl/kantsa.html> [27 I 2019].

<sup>53</sup> Ibidem, pp. 166-167.

<sup>54</sup> Ibidem.

(the republics of the *ein Freistaat*) is: “think how much you want and desire, but obey!”<sup>55</sup>. It seems to be a slogan very fitting to a society functioning with fuzzy power and knowledge – functioning in the manner described by the model of exercising sexuality, as it is described by Foucault. Thanks to this, enlightened, brave and secure people (concerned about themselves and others, controlling themselves and the authorities), citizens of a new type are increasingly acquiring the ability to act in freedom – beneficial to a man who turns out to be something more than a machine (a tool and an object of concern for others, masters or guardians, or tyrants) or an animal, or a beast, treated as human dignity requires, because it is no longer *homo sacer*. This is a being who cannot be killed with impunity, or even sentenced to death or torture. A human being or a citizen of a new type of “security organization” functioning in society where it is required to do what Kant’s categorical imperative orders: conduct in such a way, as it is expected from others, what allows it to become the universal law, norm and model and the expectation of all people. This expectation can never result from treating humans as a means, tool and mindless force – slaves – but always as a rational, free and responsible subject. Someone or such entity that does not need a custody, supervision and control – using the terms of Foucault – wielding the power of madmen and criminals. Hence, later on, education for security in the perspective of bio-politics can be expressed in the necessity of an intentional approach to subjective and individual thinking. It is a way of expressing in the philosophy of life of a new type of citizen who thinks subjectively, and seeks wisdom, goodness and beauty. The way to such thinking denies the usurpation, the disposition of the only truth, and the one-rule. This way of doing and such education is conducive to the creation of civilization of cognitive knowledge, action, cooperation and enlightened security – existence of an enlightened beings, self-thinking and free.

*Table 4. Pillars of good society, education of cognitarians for safety and the hierarchy of values in axiological terms*

Pillars of good society	Pillars of education and education for security – education towards	Fundamental axiological values
• Truth	• Care, control and dialogue and power – „knowledge”	1. Religious-ideological – intellectual
• Love	• Love – „cooperation”	2. Spiritual – moral and ethical
• Freedom	• Freedom – „activity”	3, 4. Vital and hedonistic – aesthetical
• Justice	• Struggle, war and work – „existence”	5. Utilitarian – aesthetical

Source: Own research

<sup>55</sup> Ibidem, p. 169.

The tendency to improve the Enlightenment security is expressed in the development of both, the right to war, during fighting, and after the war, and to responsible intervention, and the right to peace, not only in Western but in global culture. The first – the right to war – has for a time been generally banning armed aggression, and laws in the war generally protect and exclude non-combatants from armed activities, while laws after the war, prohibit the persecution of the defeated, and finally, the law of responsible intervention or responsible protection – *The responsibility to protect* – “R2P” obliges to intervene, also armed intervention in cases of genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes and crimes against humanity<sup>56</sup>.

At the same time, the right to peace recommends renouncing (armed) violence, and persecution, applying and taking responsible help. Thus, the security sphere is filled with: on the one hand, the right to just war, its proper conducting and ending, responsible intervention, and on the other, the right to just peace, building justice and improvement, and responsible refraining from intervention. At the same time, these pillars of justice are either made concrete or, perhaps, they are supported by love, some cooperation, integration and solidarity. An expression of this are, among others, the statements contained in the Message for the World Day of Peace on January 1, 2002, under the meaningful title: There is no peace with justice, there is no justice without forgiveness. In the Message the Saint John Paul II clearly emphasizes the conviction that: “Forgiveness is in no way opposed to justice, because it does not consist in resignation from just claims, that the violated order/law be repaired. Forgiveness aims rather at full justice, leading to peace flowing from the order, which is not an impermanent and temporary cessation of warfare, but a thorough healing of bleeding wounds of the soul”<sup>57</sup>. According to the author of this Message, peace “based on justice and forgiveness, is attacked today by international terrorism (...). Terrorism is born of hatred and causes isolation, distrust and closure. Violence entails further violence and creates a tragic spiral, also involving new generations, which in this way inherit the hatred that divided the previous ones. Terrorism is based on contempt for human life. That’s why it leads to crimes that cannot be tolerated, (...) he is a real crime against humanity”<sup>58</sup>.

<sup>56</sup> Particularly, the facts of mass genocide following the Cold War, mainly in Somalia, Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia, prompted the Canadian government, with the support of UN officials, to create the International Commission on State Intervention and Sovereignty. In the report issued in 2001, the Commission introduced a new term „Responsibility to Protect”, which was included in the recommendation issued in 2004, in the so-called *Of the High Level on Threats, Challenges and Change*, as recognized by UN Secretary General Kofi Anan, and as was adopted a year later (2005) as the principle of UN action.

<sup>57</sup> St. John Paul II, *Nie ma pokoju bez sprawiedliwości, nie ma sprawiedliwości bez przebaczenia. Orędzie Ojca Świętego na Światowy Dzień Pokoju 1 stycznia 2002 roku*, (3), [in:] *Orędzie Jana Pawła II na Światowe Dni Pokoju*\*\* – [papiez.wiara.pl/.../378733](http://papiez.wiara.pl/.../378733) [4.04.2018].

<sup>58</sup> Ibidem.

In the above context, it can be stated that the paradigm of modern education for safety is the intentional preparation of *cognitarians*<sup>59</sup> “thoughtful multidimensional warriors (“in uniforms and without” – as they were called by the Tofflers in the book *War and Anti-War. How to survive on the threshold of the 21st century*), *cognitarians* who are able to cope intellectually and creatively also with the so-called wars of the XXI century (dispersed, terrorist, hybrid and cyberspace or IT wars, etc.) that are able to acquire skills of action that philosophy and ethics of security is associated with four methods: war, non-war, peace, and non-peace”<sup>60</sup>. On these methods, it seems to be resting the rationality of coping with threats, fulfilling the mission of realizing security with respecting one’s and other’s lives as much as possible. In sensible coping with the implementation of security, killing, murdering and destroying, and destruction is not the only one-dimensional, and one-sided predisposition of warriors who should equally well use the non-war, peaceful and non-peaceful methods.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] ANTOSZEWSKI A., *Postrzeżanie demokracji w Polsce*, [in:] *Demokratyczna Polska w globalizującym się świecie*, edit. by Konstanty Wojtaszczyk & Andżelika Mirska, Wyd. Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa 2009.
- [2] ARYSTOTELES, *Etyka nikomachejska*, [in:] *Dzieła wszystkie*, t. 5, Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa 2001.
- [3] ARYSTOTELES, *Metafizyka*, [in:] *Dzieła wszystkie*, t. 2, Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa 2003.
- [4] ARYSTOTELES, *Polityka*, transl. by L. Piotrowicz, Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa 2004.
- [5] ARYSTOTELES, *Retoryka. Retoryka dla Aleksandra. Poetyka*, Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa 2004.
- [6] BOCHEŃSKI J.M., *De virtute militari. Zarys etyki wojskowej*, Philed, Kraków 1993.
- [7] BOCIAN J., SVD, *Piąte przykazanie dekalogu i nakaz miłości nieprzyjaciół a „słuszna wojna”*, [in:] *Chrześcijaństwo i bezpieczeństwo. Znaczenie Jana Pawła I w dyskursie polemologiczno-irenologicznym*, edit. by Tomasz Kośmider, Krzysztof Gąsiorek & Cezary Smuniewski, Instytut Papieża Jana Pawła II, Warszawa 2014.
- [8] BOECJUSZ, *O pocieszeniu, jakie daje filozofia*, transl. by G. Kurylewicz, M. Antczak, Wyd. Marek Derewiecki, Kęty 2006.

<sup>59</sup> According to Józef Koźielecki, *cognitarians* are those who professionally process knowledge, and model it to its value and meaning. They are characterized by a high degree of individualization, show distrust for a hierarchical and unshakeable system of values, meanings and forms. One of the most important features of mentality of this class is the open mind and openness to various behavior patterns. This openness of mind and freedom of thought is associated with their more global thinking and humanistic approach. In general, they cross the boundaries of the backwater and their own state, they analyze social reality in terms of mega-state structures, in universal and global perspective. The *cognitarians* are set on the opposite of the service worker.

<sup>60</sup> Vide: J. Świniarski, *Geneza i rozwój filozofii bezpieczeństwa*, „Mysł Wojskowa” 2004, no 1, pp. 138-146.

- [9] BRZOZOWSKI P., *Wzorcową hierarchia wartości polska, europejska czy uniwersalna? Psychologiczne badania empiryczne*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin 2007.
- [10] BUZAN B., *People, States and Fear*, Harvester, London 1983.
- [11] *Cywilizacja śmierci*, [https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cywilizacja\\_%C5%9Bmierci](https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cywilizacja_%C5%9Bmierci) [4.04.2017].
- [12] *Czy powinniśmy bać się agresywnej sztucznej inteligencji?*, [in:] <https://www.spidersweb.pl/2017/02/eksperyment-agresywna-deepmind.ht>. [6.11.2018].
- [13] DANTE A., *Monarchia*, transl. by W. Seńko, Wyd. HACHETTE, Warszawa 2010.
- [14] DAROWSKI R., *Filozofia człowieka. Zarys problematyki. Antologia tekstów*, Akademia Ignatianum / Wydawnictwo WAM, Kraków 2015.
- [15] DELORS J., *Raport. Edukacja: jest w niej ukryty skarb*, Stowarzyszenie Oświatowców Polskich, Wyd. UNESCO, Warszawa 1998.
- [16] FOUCAULT M., *Narodziny biopolityki*, transl. by Michał Herer, Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa 2011.
- [17] FOUCAULT M., *Trzeba bronić społeczeństwa*, transl. by Małgorzata Kowalska, Wyd. KR, Warszawa 1998.
- [18] FREUD Z., *Kultura jako źródło cierpień*, [in:] *Pisma społeczne*, t. IV, transl. by R. Reszke, Wyd. KR, Warszawa 1998.
- [19] GROCHOWSKI L., LETKIEWICZ A., MISIUK A., *Nauka o bezpieczeństwie. Istota, przedmiot badań i kierunki rozwoju*, „Studia i Materiały”, t. 1, Wyd. Wyższej Szkoły Policji, Szczytno 2010.
- [20] HARARI Y.N., *21 lekcji na wiek XXI*, transl. by Michał Romanek, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2018.
- [21] HARARI Y.N., *Homo deus. Krótka historia jutra*, przeł. Michał Romanek, Wydawnictwo Literackie, Kraków 2018.
- [22] HEMPOLIŃSKI M., *Czy zdołamy wyjść z cywilizacji zabijania?*, [in:] *Ekologia ducha*, red. Józef L. Krakowiak, Centrum Uniwersalizmu przy Uniwersytecie Warszawskim, Warszawa 1999.
- [23] [https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hierarchia\\_potrzeb](https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hierarchia_potrzeb) [4.04.2018].
- [24] <https://pl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Szcz%C4%99%C5%9Bcie> [4.04.2017].
- [25] *Human Development Rapport 1994: United Nations Development Program*, Oxford University Press, New York–Oxford 1994.
- [26] JAN PAWEŁ II, *Nie ma pokoju bez sprawiedliwości, nie ma sprawiedliwości bez przebaczenia. Orędzie Ojca Świętego na Światowy Dzień Pokoju 1 stycznia 2002 roku*, [in:] *Orędzie Jana Pawła II na Światowe Dni Pokoju\*\** – [papiez.wiara.pl/.../378733](http://papiez.wiara.pl/.../378733) [4.04.2018].
- [27] JAN PAWEŁ II, *Osiągniemy pokój, wychowując do pokoju. Orędzie na XII Światowy Dzień Pokoju 1 stycznia 1979 r.*, [in:] [http://www.nonpossumus.pl/encykliki/Jan\\_Pawel\\_II/sdp\\_12/](http://www.nonpossumus.pl/encykliki/Jan_Pawel_II/sdp_12/) [4.04.2018].
- [28] JAN XXIII, *Encyklika Pacem in terris*, [http://www.opoka.org.pl/biblioteka/W/WP/jan\\_xxiii/encykliki/pacem\\_in\\_terr\\_11041963.html](http://www.opoka.org.pl/biblioteka/W/WP/jan_xxiii/encykliki/pacem_in_terr_11041963.html) [4.04.2017].
- [29] KANT I., *Co to jest oświecenie?*, [in:] <http://www.humanizm.net.pl/kantsa.html> [27 I 2019].
- [30] KOTARBIŃSKI T., *Traktat o dobrej robocie*, Ossolineum, Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków 1969.



- [31] KOWALCZYK S., *Człowiek w poszukiwaniu wartości. Elementy aksjologii personalistycznej*, TN KUL, Lublin 2006.
- [32] KOWALCZYK S., *Filozoficzne koncepcje wartości*, „Collectanea Theologica” 56 (1986), Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie.
- [33] KRAKOWIAK J.L. (edit.), *Ekologia ducha*, Centrum Uniwersalizmu przy Uniwersytecie Warszawskim, Warszawa 1999.
- [34] KRĄPIEC M.A., *Filozofia bytu a zagadnienie wartości*, [in:] *Odzyskać świat realny jako Dzieła*, t. 23, wyd. 2, TN KUL, Lublin 1999.
- [35] KUNOWSKI S., *Podstawy współczesnej pedagogiki*, PWN, Warszawa 1993.
- [36] KUŚMIDER T., GĄSIOREK K., SMUNIEWSKI C. (edit.), *Chrześcijaństwo i bezpieczeństwo. Znaczenie Jana Pawła II w dyskursie polemologiczno-irenologicznym*, Instytut Papieża Jana Pawła II, Warszawa 2014.
- [37] NOWAK M., *Główne nurty współczesnej filozofii wychowania*, „Kultura i Edukacja” 1993, nr 2, PAN ISP, Warszawa 1993.
- [38] STĘPIEŃ B., *Wstęp do filozofii*, wyd. 4, TN KUL, Lublin 2001.
- [39] STRUZIŁ Z., *Pokój i bezpieczeństwo w nauczaniu Jana Pawła II. Perspektywa aksjologiczna w wybranych orędziach na Światowe Dni Pokoju*, [in:] T. Kuśmider, K. Gąsiorek, C. Smuniewski (edit.), *Chrześcijaństwo i bezpieczeństwo. Znaczenie Jana Pawła II w dyskursie polemologiczno-irenologicznym*, Instytut Papieża Jana Pawła II, Warszawa 2014.
- [40] *Sztuczna inteligencja robi się agresywna*, <http://www.rp.pl/Nowe-technologie/302149906-Sztuczna-inteligencja-robi-sie-agresywna.html> [6.11.2018].
- [41] ŚWINIARSKI J., *Bezpieczeństwo w ujęciu filozoficznym*, [in:] *Nauka o bezpieczeństwie. Istota, przedmiot badań i kierunki rozwoju. Studia i Materiały*, edit. by Lech Grochowski, Arkadiusz Letkiewicz & Andrzej Misiuk, t. 1, Wyd. Wyższej Szkoły Policji, Szczytno 2010.
- [42] ŚWINIARSKI J., *Filozoficzne podstawy edukacji dla bezpieczeństwa*, MON, DS.-W, Warszawa 1999.
- [43] ŚWINIARSKI J., *Geneza i rozwój filozofii bezpieczeństwa*, „Myśl Wojskowa” 2004, nr 1, Ministerstwo Obrony Narodowej.
- [44] ŚWINIARSKI J., *O skłonności do idealistyczno-realistycznego pojmowania bezpieczeństwa w myśli Jana Pawła II i jego adherentów*, [in:] T. Kuśmider, K. Gąsiorek, C. Smuniewski (edit.), *Chrześcijaństwo i bezpieczeństwo. Znaczenie Jana Pawła II w dyskursie polemologiczno-irenologicznym*, Instytut Papieża Jana Pawła II, Warszawa 2014.
- [45] ŚWINIARSKI J., *O znaczeniu nazwy złożonej bezpieczeństwa*, „Studia Bezpieczeństwa Narodowego. National Security Studies” 12/2017, Wydawnictwo Wojskowej Akademii Technicznej.
- [46] TATARKIEWICZ W., *O bezwzględności dobra*, [in:] *Pisma zebrane*, t. 1: *Droga do filozofii i inne rozprawy filozoficzne*, PWN, Warszawa 1971.
- [47] TATARKIEWICZ W., *O bezwzględności dobra*, Wyd. Gebethner i Wolff, Warszawa–Lublin–Łódź, Kraków 1919.
- [48] TATARKIEWICZ W., *O szczęściu*, Wyd. Nauk. PWN, Warszawa 2010.
- [49] WOJTASZCZYK K.A., MIRSKA A., *Demokratyczna Polska w globalizującym się świecie*, edit. by Konstanty Wojtaszczyk & Andżelika Mirska, Warszawa 2009.
- [50] WOŁOŻYŃ S., *Nauki o wychowaniu w Polsce w XX wieku. Próba zarysu encyklopedycznego*, PWN, Warszawa 1997.

## AKSJOLOGICZNE UJĘCIE NOWOCZESNEJ EDUKACJI NA RZECZ BEZPIECZEŃSTWA

**Streszczenie.** Po semantycznej analizie znaczenia nazwy wartość i jej ukonkretnieniu w aksjologicznym pojęciu szczęścia, piękna i bezpieczeństwa autorzy osadzają nowoczesną edukację na rzecz bezpieczeństwa w nauce Arystotelesa o rzeczach koniecznych, pożytecznych i pięknych. Następnie rozważają wynikające z tych rzeczy uwikłania militarne i pacyfistyczne tej edukacji. W rozważaniach tych przywołują rozpoznanie Stefana Kunowskiego o istnieniu trzech systemów i trzech filozofii wychowania, a mianowicie: chrześcijańskiego osadzonego na Miłości, socjalistycznego na Walce i liberalnego na Wolności. Przez krytyczne przewartościowanie tych systemów i filozofii wskazują na czwarty system implikowany z filozofii bezpieczeństwa. Jest to system nowoczesnej edukacji na rzecz bezpieczeństwa osadzony na pieczy, trosce i kontroli oraz panowaniu nad samym sobą i innymi. W końcowej części artykułu autorzy starają się zarysować paradygmat tej nowoczesnej edukacji na rzecz bezpieczeństwa i osadzają go zarówno na uniwersalnych wartościach aksjologicznych, jak i czterech filarach Raportu Jaques'a Delors'a zatytułowanego *Edukacja: jest w niej ukryty skarb*. Są to takie rekomendowane przez ten Raport filary jak: wiedza, współdziałanie i działanie oraz bycie. Zdaniem autorów realizacja edukacji wspartej na tych filarach intencjonalnie sposobi zarówno do cywilizacji kognitywnej (cywilizacji ludzi myślących), jak i na rzecz bezpieczeństwa oświeconego.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Arystoteles, bezpieczeństwo, filary edukacji wg Jaques'a Delors'a, *kognitariusz*, pokój, szczęście, wartość, wojna.