

Kazimierz Pierzchała

The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin [kazimierz.pierzchala@kul.pl]

Axiological contexts of social rehabilitation of prisoners in the aspect of the assumptions of Christian personalism

*Dobro jednostki dobrem społeczeństwa,
czy dobro społeczeństwa dobrem jednostki?*

[The good of the individual as the good of society,
or the good of society good as the good of the individual?]

Markwart, Szymbalska 2013, p. 21

Abstract: **Personalism** is giving something a personal character, human personality, up-bringing a person, **axiology** means values, and **rehabilitation** is a transformation (change) of personality of an individual (person) directed towards freedom, independent decision making and performing social roles. The aim of the article is to develop (interpret, continue) the last paragraph of my publication, which is a scientific study, taking into account the achievements of modern pedagogy, penitentiary psychology and the teaching of the Magisterium of the Church, entitled: *Destygmatyzacja przestępców w świetle Magisterium Kościoła oraz poglądów na resocjalizację*. Within the framework of my pedagogical and rehabilitation considerations, in accordance with the meaning of the Magisterium of the Church, I have formulated a concept (which is consistent with the broadly understood humanistic and existential trend, including humanistic and positive psychology, as well as axiological education focused on the personality potential of a human), which I have called the **personalistic axiology of rehabilitation**.

The methodology used to write this publication was the conduct of a critical analysis of literature, including my own work and other documents, including available Internet resources.

Keywords: Axiology, Church, ethics, existentialism, life meaning, optimistic anthropology, person, personalism, personalistic pedagogy, prisoner, rehabilitation, repeated personalization, rehabilitation of values, socialization, social rehabilitation, social rehabilitation institution, values, upbringing.

Introduction

The aim of the article is to develop (interpret, continue) the last paragraph of my publication, which is a scientific study, taking into account the achievements of modern pedagogy, penitentiary psychology and the teaching of the Magisterium of the Church, entitled: *Destigmatyzacja przestępców w świetle Magisterium Kościoła oraz poglądów na resocjalizację* [Destigmatization of criminals in the light of the Magisterium of the Church and views on rehabilitation] (Pierzchała, 2016a). The scientific concept proposed there (Pierzchała 2016a, p. 178) called »**personalistic axiology of rehabilitation**« is, in the simplest terms, a transformation of the social misfit to the one prepared to live in freedom, in the context of contemporary pedagogy, penitentiary psychology and teaching of the Magisterium of the Church. **Personalism** is giving something a personal character, human personality, upbringing a person, **axiology** means values, and **rehabilitation** is a transformation (change) of personality of an individual (person) directed towards freedom, independent decision making and performing social roles.

The aforementioned text reads as follows: “The Magisterium of the Church, based on the knowledge of human nature and having the centuries-old tradition of religious-anthropological research, has developed fundamental principles of social life, characterized by a humanitarian depth and a great power of influence. Actual observance of them leads to healing of the psyche and interpersonal relations, i.e. mental health of the individual and the community, to harmonious coexistence rooted in higher values that give an ordering sense to the existence. Therefore, within the framework of my pedagogical and rehabilitation considerations, in accordance with the meaning of the Magisterium of the Church, I have formulated a concept (which is consistent with the broadly understood **humanistic and existential trend**, including humanistic and positive psychology, as well as axiological education focused on the personality potential of a human), which I have called the **personalistic axiology of rehabilitation**. However, this is only an outline of the proposal as a reference point for the issues of rehabilitation and its practice, **requiring further in-depth study and verification.**” (Pierzchała 2016a, p. 178).

The methodology used to write this publication was the conduct of a critical analysis of literature, including my own work and other documents, including available Internet resources.

Article glossary

Personalism – 1 phil. «philosophical concepts taking as their starting point the issue of human personality understood as an entity of spiritual nature, endowed with consciousness and will, creative, free and morally responsible; since the 19th century an independent field in philosophy»; 2 psych. «the psychological field in which the various psychological functions are closely interrelated and cannot be considered in isolation from the overall personality» (Bańko, 2014).

Axiology – 1 «a philosophy of values, a general theory of values that considers their nature, their mode of existence, their sources, and their valuation criteria»; 2. «specific value system» (Bańko, 2014).

Rehabilitation is the science and social practice that defines the scope of educational, caring and therapeutic activities. This is a process aimed at educating social misfits about changes in the area of self-awareness, self-confirmation and self-reflection (Pierzchała, 2017, p. 95).

Destigmatization is a process of social reaction that restores social misfits or criminally active people to positive social groups. Inclusive community changes take place by changing the motivation, thinking, perception, sensitivity and feelings towards people so far socially excluded (Pierzchała, 2018, p. 479).

Existentialism – «a philosophical trend which is also expressed in fiction, dealing with the problem of human existence in the world, proclaiming that man is free and that he bears full and absolute responsibility for all his actions, which, by casting on any external conditions (social, historical, religious), makes human existence inauthentic; by placing man in the face of the necessity of constant, as if undetermined choices, it brings out the tragedy of the situation of the individual in the world; existential philosophy» (Bańko, 2014).

Ethics – 1 «a set of rules and standards of conduct adopted in a given era and community; morality»; 2. «the science of morality, describing, analyzing and explaining the existing morality in a given era or community and establishing norms of moral behavior» (Bańko, 2014).

Ethics and axiology. Axiology is a theory of values, so it would seem that ethics is a narrower discipline, forming a part of axiology. This is not the case, however, because there are issues in ethics that are not strictly axiological in nature (in ethics, for example, the question of the structure of moral action). So neither ethics nor axiology form a part of each other. The term ‘axiology’ itself and the term ‘value’ began to be used in philosophy not earlier than in the 19th century – the term ‘value’ was taken over from economics. Since then, the term ‘goodness’ had been used in philosophy. Ethics usually occurs in a normative (e.g. Socrates’ ethical intellectualism) or descriptive (e.g. Ovid’s point of view) version.

Marian Nowak (similarly to Adam Maj) is of a slightly different opinion saying that “[...] axiology (indicates values, their ontological status and what values people prefer), in which two sub-disciplines are distinguished: ethics (science of moral values), aesthetics (science of aesthetic values).” (Nowak 2008, p. 96; cf. Maj, 2016, p. 82).

According to Marian Nowak, “**Upbringing**. It is one of the basic concepts in the tradition of pedagogy [...]. Although every person believes that from his or her own experience they know what upbringing is, it is ambiguous and used differently in terms of its category. Even educators use different approaches and definitions.” According to Janusz Tarnowski, “Upbringing is a whole range of ways and processes that help a human being, especially through interaction, to realize and develop their humanity.” (Nowak, 2007, pp. 839–849).

“Upbringing is often defined as a system, seeking to synthesize elements and types of definitions. In everyday language, the term “upbringing” most often refers to a system or a whole of social structures, institutions or processes (activities) in which (or through which) the previously mentioned meanings are realized, or at least partially realized. In this sense, we are talking about spatially, nationally and culturally diverse upbringing (European, Asian, American), historically diverse upbringing (ancient, medieval, modern), upbringing by different institutions, or in different situations (family, school, church), or upbringing differentiated by methods, structures, applied principles (private and public, secular and religious, centralized or decentralized). It is not infrequent that upbringing is seen as a school domain and therefore a more general term is used – schooling or school education.” (Nowak, 2008, p. 195).

“The basic concepts that denote phenomena quite close to upbringing or particularly important to it include primarily *teaching, learning, education and self-education*, but also *socialization, inculturation* («the gradual process of an individual’s growing into the culture of the surrounding society») (Bańko 2014) – note by K.P.), *self-fulfillment, personalization* («giving something a personal character», (Bańko 2014) – note by K.P.), *care, prevention, (new) evangelization, re socialization and re-education*.

In general, we can divide these categories into those related to:

- 1) mental and personality development (*teaching, learning, education and self-education* – in the educational sense),
- 2) social life (*education, socialization, inculturation*),
- 3) protective (*care, prevention*) and corrective (special and rehabilitation pedagogy domain, activity of religious groups: *new evangelization, rehabilitation, re-education*) interactions.” (Nowak, 2008, p. 204).

Socialization – a multi-stage process aimed at shaping in the individual a social personality and related identity and its ability to subjective, competent, full participation in social life (Wawro, 2016, p. 1073; cf. Pierzchała, 2015, pp. 154–170).

Prisoner is a person who has been convicted by a court order or who is remanded in custody (without a court order) and who is in a penitentiary institution (detention center or prison). The literature often does not distinguish between these terms. In most cases, the word “convict” should be understood as “prisoner”, unless a clear distinction is made between a “convict” and “provisionally detained person.” (Pierzchała, 2013a, p. 7).

Man – *homo sapiens*, a living being distinguished among others by the highest development of the psyche and social life, the only one who has a culture and is capable of creating it [...] (Encyclopedia... [2018]).

Anthropology – «the science of man, his origin, development and racial diversity»; **Philosophical anthropology** «the field of philosophy dealing with the essence and nature of man, his vocation and destiny, attitude towards the natural world, society, culture, values and the absolute; human philosophy; **religious anthropology** «the part of religious doctrine dealing with the origin, essence and destiny of man». (Bańko, 2014).

Teleology – the aims of rehabilitation

In the latest literature, the **subject of rehabilitation** is presented as “[...] social science and practice dealing with prevention and correction of faulty adaptation of a human to generally accepted social requirements and support of individual development of people threatened with social maladjustment or socially maladjusted. Its purpose is to prevent or minimize the dysfunctionality of these persons in their relation to themselves, the social and natural world (in behavioral, cognitive, emotional and spiritual dimensions), and to adapt the environment to the specific needs of social misfits (Pierzchała, 2016a, p. 15 after Jaworska, 2012d, p. 227).

This fully analytical and, at the same time, exhaustive definition given in Anetta Jaworska’s *Leksykon resocjalizacji* seems to be a detailed development of various approaches of a more synthetic nature taken by other authors. Marek Konopczyński, for example, writes that: “[...] the term «rehabilitation» as understood *ex definitione* means repeated social adaptation of an individual who is not socially adapted in order to enable them to function properly in commonly accepted life and social roles” (Pierzchała, 2016a, p. 15 after Konopczyński, 2015, p. 9).

In pedagogical sciences, teleology deals with the problem of defining educational goals. Anetta Jaworska is of the opinion that: “[...] the teleology of rehabilitation largely depends on the axiological assumptions adopted in rehabilitation education, placed, depending on the way the world is perceived and the science is practiced, in a functional-structural or humanistic paradigm. The basic and most readable **objective of rehabilitation**, referred to in the literature as the “**minimum objective**” (Pytko, 2009), is to stop criminals from committing

punishable acts and to eliminate socially harmful deviant behaviors by directing pupils towards socially desirable changes and inducing in them motivations for the process of self-transformation. These objectives, however, the importance of which is stressed both by the majority of society and by rehabilitation practitioners, are exceeded by theoreticians who, reaching for ideal objectives, determine the role of rehabilitation in stimulating self-realization and self-creation” (Jaworska, 2012c; cf. Konopczyński, 2010, pp. 172–174). The aim of rehabilitation is “to transform a human: to erase from their consciousness the existing contents and introduce new ones; to transform completely their current image of the world and themselves; to rebuild personality and change identity” of a prisoner [...] (Pierzchała, 2013a, p. 291 after Szacka, 2003, p. 154).

Personalism in the context of education

Słownik filozoficzny defines personalism as “any view amongst a wide range of views that emphasize the primacy of people (in the non-technical sense), human or divine, in the universe.” (Lacey, 1999, p. 208). The general concept of personalism will be a person (Greek *πρόσωπον*, Latin *persona*) (Kobierzycki, 2001, p. 245).

Emmanuel Mounier (1905–1950) is considered to be the creator of personalism in contemporary philosophy. Personalism has many varieties and trends, with a common feature of interest in the issues of upbringing, of a pedagogical nature, often called **personalistic pedagogy** (“He postulates a source – eidetic – approach to pedagogy, which should shape its identity not so much on the basis of ideological or methodological premises, but above all on the basis of the understanding of human existence as such. The basic determinant of personalism is the statement that a **human** – before being assigned any names, attributes or properties – **is a person**. Being a person, which is a primary and irreducible fact, is of an ethical nature, since the concept of “person” includes freedom, respect, equality, tolerance, but also responsibility. **Education in personalistic pedagogy has a nature of a meeting of two people, a teacher (master) and a student, who have the same ethical dignity**; this meeting takes place in a specific reality, hence the task of personalistic pedagogy is to reveal the basic sense of education, which is the meeting of people in its historical, social, political and cultural conditions. Personalistic pedagogy in the analysis of the situation of the meeting refers to the achievements of the pedagogy of dialog. Franciszek Adamski and Janusz Tarnowski spread the culture of personalistic and dialogic thinking in Polish pedagogy.” (Encyklopedia... [2018]).

Andrzej Miś is of the opinion that today “any philosophical doctrine which considers a human as an entity that cannot be reduced to a system of physical, biological, economic, cultural or historical dependencies, but which grants them the ability to go beyond all general structures, is considered to be personalism.

This power determines that human is a person [...] able to make autonomous and independent decisions". (Miś, 2006, p. 173).

Personalism in its history has been in the interest of many pedagogues and didactics, becoming an impulse for a number of scientific studies on the concept of school, education or didactics. For this reason, personalism also has a purely pedagogical connection, by virtue of understanding of the term "person", which is often expressed in a manner specific to Christian tradition, and with which it is often identified in the content of emphasizing the value and dignity of a human person.

In present times personalism is defined as:

- the doctrine emphasizing the autonomous value of human as a person, postulating total affirmation (consent to something, recognition of the positive value of something; consent);
- programmes of activities conducive to the development of a human person, subordinating economic and technical values to personal and spiritual values (Pedagogika... [2018]).

Personalism in its main elements is a concept that is consistent with the Christian vision of human (Christian personalism), which also refers to a "person". In the Christian faith, a human is an exceptional person because he/she simply is, and not because he/she has arisen from some complicated evolution (Mascall, 1962).

According to Mieczysław Gogacz, "the issue of »person« developed along with Christianity. The understanding of human was complicated by the person of Christ who, according to Christian Revelation, is both God and a human." (Gogacz 1974, p. 15). According to Janusz Tarnowski, it is the life of Christ that is the basis for the principles of personalism (Tarnowski 1982). Similarly, Joseph Ratzinger is of the opinion that the Bible (2002) is the foundation of human dignity and human rights. According to Joseph Ratzinger, this reasoning belongs to the legacy of humanism and is a completely different way of treating people than in the tradition of Greek philosophy, in which people were classified as intelligent animals (Ratzinger 1993, 75). For Józef Tischner, however, the fundamental claim of Christian personalism is that a human is a person, a free being, possessing an individualized and unique nature." (Tischner 1966; Pedagogika... [2018]).

Christian personalism

Christian personalism is a direction in contemporary philosophy that has laid the foundations for the development of Catholic social teaching³ This trend

.....
³ Catholic social teaching is an integral part of the Catholic doctrine. It was distinguished in 1891 – its official beginning is considered to be the encyclical *Rerum novarum* by Leon XIII. In *Rerum novarum*, the Pope discussed the social and economic changes taking place in the world at that time, argued with the programs of socialist groups and defended the principle of private property. (Katolicka... [2018])

is an extensive reflection on the concept of a human person. In the literature it is also referred to as integral or theocentric humanism. This trend grew out of criticism of the bourgeois civilization, the capitalist economy and the bourgeois values based on the primacy of ownership rather than on a “person”. Christian personalism was a kind of protest against the sacrifice of a “person” in the name of values such as nation, social class, or profit understood as the highest value (Personalizm... [2018]).

Marian Nowak (2017), after Wincenty Granat, emphasizes that the term “person” has a distant history, containing a specific strength, because it is constantly being clarified and expanded. Marian Nowak further points to the great diversity within the framework of personalism. Granat himself (1961), however, recognizes that personalism is every science without exception, attributing to the “person” an important place in reality. However, according to Mieczysław Gogacz (1987), “human-person” is a being in which there is existence and intellectuality. All this should be connected with dignity, which also belongs to a human being (Pedagogika... [2018]).

Eminent Catholic philosophers Jacques Maritain (1889–1973) and Emmanuel Mounier (1905–1950) are considered to be the creators of Christian personalism. They both pointed in their considerations to the superior value of a human person, their dignity and freedom. Personalism is a belief in the infinite value of a human and emphasizes personal individuality. Personalists stress that the temporal world should be organized in such a way that a “person” living in it can develop his or her personality (Personalizm... [2018]).

Christian personalism was of great importance for the decisions of the Second Vatican Council and for the definition of the modern concept of human rights in the context of the Catholic Church. The philosophy of personalism was close to Pope John Paul II⁴ and Fr. Józef Tischner (Personalizm... [2018]).

John Paul II marked out a direction of development in which a human realizes themselves and gives themselves in love (Nowak 2007, pp. 839–849). In the Catechesis he stated that “a human created in God’s image is a being composed of soul and body, a being which, on the one hand, belongs to the outside world and, on the other, is transcendent towards it. As a being composed of both body and soul – he or she is a person. [...] Human is the embodied soul, or, in other words, the body endowed with an immortal soul.” (John Paul II (1986)).

.....

⁴ In 1951–1953, Archbishop Eugeniusz Baziak granted research leave to Father Wojtyła in order to enable him prepare his habilitation dissertation (the title of the dissertation: *Próba opracowania etyki chrześcijańskiej według systemu Maxa Schelera* [An attempt to develop Christian ethics according to Max Scheler’s system]). The habilitation programme at the Faculty of Theology of the Jagiellonian University in Krakow was completed on December 3, 1953, after an extraordinary meeting of the Council of the Faculty. The future Pope became a lecturer in moral theology and social ethics at the Seminary in Krakow.

Axiology of rehabilitation

Proper relations between a human and the environment are among the most important **objectives of rehabilitation**. They depend on a large group of factors and processes in which a specific **target value system** has a significant meaning. Appropriate definition of axiological reference points, planned in the process of rehabilitation, enables theoretical segregation of educational efforts. At this point, it should be remembered that these conditions often change as social and political trends change. Looking through the prism of social rehabilitation of social misfits, the basic axiological goal is to move towards the social welfare, which was adversely affected by a morally or criminally disturbed individual. Locating rehabilitation activities in a paradigm (the adopted way of seeing reality in a given field, doctrine, etc.; pattern, model) of functional and structural (collective life of people), with a focus on the values of the social welfare, has resulted in the indication for the rehabilitation of an important task, aimed at **transforming the personality of a pupil in a socially desirable direction**. Changing one's personality, regardless of social and cultural changes, is an important value for rehabilitation (Pytko, 2005; cf. Pierzchała, 2006; Pierzchała, 2013a, p. 10 et al.). It seems that nowadays it is more important **to bring about homeostasis between the rehabilitated individual and the environment** in which they function, so that both parties can benefit from mutual relations in building social order, than to change the pupil's personality (Jaworska 2012a).

A slightly different opinion was expressed by Czesław Czapów (1978), a doyen of Polish rehabilitation, who considered the highest values in rehabilitation not to be the social order, but mainly the development of the personality of the individual and related development of human freedoms. Paradoxically, **the fundamental value of rehabilitation is the freedom of the individual**. It is a final, autotelic value (an objective in itself) in the life of every human being and, at the same time, a means of realizing other values and goods during fulfillment of daily needs of the individual. Andrzej Bałandynowicz is of the opinion that "[...] **freedom** is one of the principal axiological categories, which every human being is striving for and the meaning of which includes both physical elements and the experienced mental states." (Bałandynowicz, 2015, p. 16). Human as a rational individual (*homo sapiens*) is a "being" by nature relatively autonomous (resolution of their own affairs, self-determination, etc.) and as a constitutional characteristic has a defined range of freedom of thought and action and a range of negative and positive freedom. A person deprived of these attributes loses their subjectivity. **"Pathology and dehumanization of behaviors constitute extremely negative results of objectification, loss of freedom and subjectivity.** In case of the lack of freedom (when its level

deviated from the optimal one), people always tried to liberate themselves. The phenomenon of striving for individual freedom is noticeable already in school, in the form of resistance of the student manifesting behaviors commonly known as **social maladjustment**. Everything that becomes a routine, stereotype and is not resulting from individual human needs is considered (in a critical approach to pedagogy) as blocking their self-fulfillment tendency.” (Jaworska 2012a after Szkudlarek, Śliwerski, 2000; cf. Pierzchała, 2016b, pp. 199–214).

“The emphasis on individual freedom is at the same time in opposition to a vision focused on cultural transmission – a vision of individuality, a contrast between the uniqueness, individuality and creativity of every human – stereotypes and values given in advance.” (Jaworska 2012a; cf. Pierzchała 2016b, pp. 199–214). Rehabilitation institutions (all correctional units in particular), by fulfilling their utilitarian functions, drastically limit the freedom of choice that a ward (a prisoner) can make. “An essential characteristic (explication) of imprisonment and the institutions executing it is coercion. The convicted person feels it as imposed from above, against their will, organizational, physical and psychological actions within the scope of their own functioning, which they are inclined to perceive as violence.” (Bałandynowicz, 2015, p. 16). Lack of ability to make decisions is also a loss of opportunity to shape and develop personality. Rehabilitation institutions select and separate a human from the society. An individual whose life is filled with threats and fear of punishment cannot learn to take responsibility for themselves by being aware of all the effects and consequences of their actions. The authentic development of the pupil and their optimal social functioning can only be talked about if the individual’s freedom is fully respected in the rehabilitation process. Freedom of action and thought, the perspective of making choices, as far as the conditions in which the rehabilitation takes place allow, is the only chance to create in the pupil the willingness to “take responsibility for their actions, themselves and others, as well as to open a wide field of self-creation.” (Jaworska 2012a). Andrzej Bałandynowicz writes quite contrarily that “[...] penitentiary rehabilitation can only be an effective process if the prison system is brought to a state of social de-isolation. It can take place through the cellular process of minimizing internal isolation and integrating isolation institutions outside the prison social structure.” (Bałandynowicz 2015, p. 16).

“[...] When assessing the influence of various processes on the development of personality, one should not lose sight of the characteristic feature of imprisonment, which is the total entering into the sphere of individual freedom, as pointed out by almost all authors dealing with this issue. (Bałandynowicz 2015, p. 177).

Anetta Jaworska believes that the contemporary axiology of rehabilitation comprises three elements in one: values that emphasize the relationship between a human and the social world as well as the world of culture and their place in the natural world. “However, the structural and functional paradigm in which the **welfare of society is contrasted with the welfare of the rehabilitated individual**

remains the dominant theoretical paradigm on which the rehabilitation education is based (Jaworska, 2012a). Moreover, **ethics**, which is an inalienable component of honest education (as opposed to coercion and training), is manifested in homeostasis between the social welfare and the individual welfare. The guiding principle of such education is, on the one hand, the freedom and subjectivity of every person – including those who, through their own criminal activities, often denied this subjectivity, and, on the other hand, the common good. Recognition of the **dignity, freedom and subjectivity of the individual** is not so necessary in any other education as in rehabilitation education. “[...] Recognition of the dignity of the prisoner is, after all, a fundamental and integral condition for any rehabilitation and the associated destigmatization.” (Pierzchała, 2016a, p. 167). It is clear that it will not always be possible to respect this principle. “Bold analogies of animal–human, training–education have always stimulated the imagination.” (Baładynowicz, 2015, p. 171). Coercion in rehabilitation should be used in extremes. Rehabilitation cannot be based on humiliation of another human being. The general principle should be to arouse a sense of dignity, not enslavement, to show the possibility of choosing new life alternatives, and not to arouse fear, while limiting the oppressive and anxious situation (Jaworska, 2012a).

To sum up: social rehabilitation means building personal and social identity in a pupil, supported by **“optimistic anthropology, expressing faith in the goodness of human nature** – often deeply hidden as a result of drastic educational negligence in the course of the previous stages of development. From the point of view of such an approach to the axiology of rehabilitation, **it is not the most important thing »who a person is«, but »who he/she can become«** (Suchodolski, 1967, p. 31), stressing the self-creative dimension of human existence and showing the ability of a human (including those who have entered the path of crime) to shape themselves” (Jaworska, 2012a).

The added value of the social rehabilitation of a pupil is to make them discover the true sense of their own life, to shape the goal and to find true happiness, counteracting the ideologies of hedonism [«life attitude expressed in the pursuit of pleasure as the most important thing in life and avoiding or minimizing unpleasant matters» (Bańko, 2014)] and consumerism. Opening up to the world of values is for a human being an escape from nihilism [«views and attitudes that reject norms, principles, values, etc. adopted in the past» (Bańko, 2014)], (Tischner, 2011, p. 408–410). In the absence of true values, an individual is surrounded by emptiness and nonsense, leading to the search for impulses for life in crime and addictions (Jaworska 2012a).

Lower than expected effectiveness of rehabilitation results, among others, from underestimation in the theory and practice of rehabilitation pedagogy of the elements dependent on the individual’s **search for the meaning of life**. “A specialist is required [...] to know how to set appropriate norms for deviants, to facilitate their assimilation and to organize a new meaning of life based on

them.” (cf. Stepulak, 2016, pp. 1051–1057). “The loss of the meaning of life increases the likelihood that after [his – ed. by K.P.] release from prison he will notoriously act against the legal order.” (Bałandynowicz, 2015, p. 495). “In the social rehabilitation of offenders and socially maladjusted youth, the importance of internal (contemplative) experience in shaping self-awareness and real self image should be stressed. [...] In addition to this type of internal experience, first and foremost the experience of another human being remains, however, the essence of human experience.” (Jaworska, 2012a). The Tischner’s concept of the ethical experience of another human being, also called the concept of encounter or dialog, contains the philosophy of a human as a morally sensitive being capable of awakening within themselves a sense of responsibility that makes us come to help. A human turns out to be an individual, endowed with a sense of inner independence and at the same time incapable of loneliness, but who values and is compassionate to others, especially those who suffer. In rehabilitation, this applies, among others, to the need to enable and activate pupils to self-reflection (reflecting on themselves), as well as in all educational activities in which social misfits will have the opportunity to “experience another person” in aid behaviors for others (Jaworska 2012a).

The axiology of contemporary rehabilitation also uses anthropological assumptions the basis of which is the need for a person to recognize themselves as the highest value (Tischner, 2000).

Four opinions of famous people on the “lack of self-esteem”:

- “Too many people overestimate who they are not and underestimate who they are.” (Malcolm S. Forbes);
- “The desire to become someone else is a waste of the person you are.” Marilyn Monroe;
- “Anything that irritates us in others can lead us to understand ourselves.” Carl Jung;
- “You, like no one in the universe, deserve your love.” Buddha.

Lack of self-esteem of a person is one of the key determinants of deviant and criminal behaviors

Anetta Jaworska expresses the view that “the welfare of one person can never obscure the common welfare. Everyone lives in a community, and the fate of the community is also the fate of a human.” (Jaworska, 2012a). “Referring to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Mazurek, 1991, p. 273), Pope John Paul II recalled that its aim was to create the basis for the idea that the foundation of all political programs and systems is the **welfare of a human**, a person in community, who as the main measure of the common good must be the criterion of all concepts or systems. [...] In the papal assessment, »the violation of human

rights goes hand in hand with the violation of the rights of a nation with which a human is bound by organic ties, as if with a large family» (John Paul II 1979, 17). [...] For John Paul II, the source and **determinant of the *bonum commune*** (from Latin: the common good – ed. by K.P.) is **the welfare of a person**, so that human dignity becomes the criterion of the common good. [...] Referring to the category of *bonum commune*, John Paul II concludes that the Church has always called for action for the common good, and by doing this it has been trying to educate good citizens in every country, and teaching that the primary duty of authorities is to care for the common good of society, which is the basis of its powers.” (Sadowski, 2010, p. 273–274). John Paul II (1995), in his encyclical *Evangelium vitae*, pointed out that those involved in volunteering should renew in themselves the awareness of the dignity of every human being, especially while taking care for the weakest. In a democratic system, the basic law is the unanimous will of the majority of citizens and no one can free themselves from responsibility for possible decisions contrary to the real common good.

Rehabilitation aimed at real human change should open up to all aspects of the human condition. At the same time, it should be remembered that: “[...] people must not be changed at all cost. Education begins with the fact that, above all, [...] one allows the other to exist.” (Walczak, 2007, p. 157; cf. Potocki, 2007, p. 714–721).

In social sciences (including pedagogy) the concepts of **socialization** of an individual depend on the existence and activity of a social group (family, local community, nation), in which a social misfit finds arguments for the usefulness of human existence (meaning of life). A human functions as an element of the social system. Anetta Jaworska is of the opinion that “[...] in the **new approach to social rehabilitation** the group ceases to be the only determinant of the meaningfulness of human life – **it is a human who becomes the creator and executor of the goal of their own life** and it cannot be imposed on them by anyone other than themselves.” (Jaworska, 2012a). As Andrzej Bałandynowicz emphasizes, “[...] when a person is treated as a creator of self, and wants to change, it is not the punishment that is to force change, the person is to accept the punishment, as a result of which they will have to change, and society will only control this change.” (Bałandynowicz, 2011, p. 235). These words that speak about the fundamental and regulatory role that an internalized system of values and a developed axiological awareness can play in human life are of great importance. At the same time, it is an expression of a far-sighted belief in the positive dimension of human freedom. As Andrzej Bałandynowicz emphasizes, “[...] human is a person capable of development, which means that we must see positive elements that remain within the individual [...]” (Pierzchała, 2016a, p. 59–60 after Bałandynowicz, 2011, p. 235).

Summing up: rehabilitation should not only lead to the construction of a new social identity of a pupil, but should also help to shape their authenticity,

awareness of their own freedom and consequently responsibility for oneself and others and for the surrounding world in which one lives and functions (Pierzchała, 2013b, p. 475–500; Pierzchała, 2015, p. 154–170; Wawro, 2016, p. 1073–1079). Nowadays, only people who see their own value, their own developmental potential (Konopczyński, 2009, p. 82) and their own lives are able to appreciate the value of the surrounding natural space: social and natural. Everything that genuinely serves a human, leading to the satisfaction of their life needs (not desires), serves at the same time the good of the surrounding world. At the same time, **society**, the fundamental value for which should be the **welfare of every person**, and not only restrictions leading to submission, has the only possibility to build a lasting social order based on true justice (Jaworska, 2012a).

The process of social rehabilitation itself cannot exist in isolation from ethical issues. Everything that is ethical will never be relative – it should remain grounded in the prevention of unnecessary human suffering (Szkudlarek, Śliwerski, 2000; cf. Bałandynowicz, 2015, p. 193). **The axiology of rehabilitation** is located at the junction of **two paradigms – humanistic** (moral and intellectual attitude assuming that a human is the highest value and the source of all other values) and **functional** (meeting needs, well fulfilling their function), “without elevating either social, cultural or historical values, or those that emphasize the freedom, dignity and subjectivity of each person as a unique individual – having the right to happiness.” (Jaworska 2012a).

The humanistic and existential trend of rehabilitation

Rehabilitation in the humanistic and existential trend is a complex approach, drawing on many sources, in which the focus is on the human being as a unique individual. According to the humanistic and existential trend of rehabilitation, “[...] the **relationship between existentialism and personalism** is clearly visible. A human treated as a bodily and spiritual unity is first of all a person, not an individual (representative of the species). It exists subjectively, living and experiencing its relations with the world. Its subjectivity is also distinguished by the ability to reflect on oneself and the sense of one’s own existence. A human, as a dynamic whole, consists of mutually interacting spheres: biological, social, subjective and metaphysical. The first two spheres constitute the naturalistic dimension of human existence, and the last two – the spiritual dimension. This dimension also needs to be seen in the rehabilitation activities, and without taking into account in the rehabilitation process of offenders their spiritual identity, the image of rehabilitation will always remain incomplete. However, it should be noted that this dimension is intended to be an extension of, and not a replacement for, existing rehabilitation models.” (Jaworska, 2012b).

Every human being is unique, so **it is the task of the educator** to follow the social misfit, to adapt to their individual needs and to understand their world and experiences.

The teleological (purposeful) assumption of rehabilitation located in the humanistic and existential model is an educational strive for:

- directing pupils to discover the purpose of life and build its meaning;
- activating self-awareness and self-reflection of the individual through real contact with oneself, according to the idea of “know yourself” and activating the objective view of other people and the surrounding world;
- developing within oneself the acceptance (and not denial) of life difficulties, such as suffering, loneliness, etc.
- shaping the authenticity of one’s own life, consisting in the awareness of: oneself, one’s relationship with the world, possible choices and responsibility for them;
- developing skills to reduce emotional stress (anxiety, depression, etc.) that prevent the full involvement of pupils in the rehabilitation process;
- creating in the pupil a conscious motivation to act through the development of arguments for the change of their own life;
- stimulating a sense of freedom and responsibility for oneself and others (even in prison conditions);
- raising awareness of freedom of choice in the formation of new ways of life;
- developing the affirmation of existence (consent to something, recognition of the positive value of something; approval);
- activating the condition of subjective fulfillment and internal harmony (Jaworska, 2012b).

According to the idea of the humanistic and existential model, one of the main tasks in the field of repeated personalization of offenders is to build an adequate sense of confidence of a criminal (and thus also a **sense of guilt** for the harm done; emotional reconstruction, growing into a “culture”, satisfying needs; repeated personalization (a kind of rehabilitation) of an individual is a change “from a wild and unrestrained psychopathic beast, without conscience, suffering from moral madness – an individual changes in favor, obtains features of a full human person, aware of their humanity and responsible for themselves” (Pytko, 2012, p. 29–30). From a social point of view, there would be nothing wrong with a criminal shaping their self-esteem, drawing on social requirements and trying to adapt to them. A specific paradox in the subject matter, however, is that a criminal, unable to gain satisfactory social recognition in their life so far, starts looking for it in other spheres related to criminal activity, for which they receive adequate recognition of co-offenders and co-prisoners. The well-known truth that the self-confidence of criminals, associated with “being for others”, has always remained at an astonishingly high level (Jaworska, 2008), as it is shaped by the deviant community, whose recognition the criminals highly value (Jaworska, 2012b).

Summing up: the aim of rehabilitation in the humanistic and existential trend is to create conditions for the development of the pupil, as well as to make them reflect on their life choices. A person who decides to undergo the process of rehabilitation at the same time decides to learn the truth about themselves, deciding about the issues raised, pace and time of work. It is important to be aware that this model cannot be sufficient as a stand-alone form of rehabilitation and that there is a need to complement it mainly by models that are directly oriented towards society and based on society. As an independent form of social rehabilitation, it often does not bring about change because of the criminal's inconsistent perception of the world and their role in it. "The understanding of a person is dependent upon the understanding of the states they currently experience and upon the meaning they give to these experiences" (Jaworska 2012b).

Religious social ethics – according to Karol Wojtyła

Ethics according to Karol Wojtyła: "It is [...] a practical learning about human activity and behavior, but it is actually about how to give value of an objective good to this action or behavior. A human experiences different values, but with their actions they do good. It is the good of their own being, the objective perfection of the person. It is also the good of the world to which the human belongs and to which they are committed by their actions. Finally, it is the God's goodness in this sense [...]: a human, acting with the power of facts, reveals the perfection of the Creator every step of the way. [...] **Christian ethics teaches a human** how they can and should give value to their conduct as an objective good in each of these meanings. A human is aware of this goodness, and directly experiences the values. The entire human moral life is spent on experiencing values, from which they derive their own – if one may say so – color" (Wojtyła 1991, p. 80 and 81).

"Among the accusations made against religious ethics, and Christian ethics in particular, one can often hear the accusation that it deals primarily, or even exclusively, with one's personal life, and does not reach into the area of one's social life and activity". Karol Wojtyła is of the opinion that: "[...] Christian ethics, by its very nature, is not only a program of individual morality, but it also contains in itself, in its basic principles, **a program of social morality**. [...] The issue of social interaction with other people is not left to the arbitrary decision and choice of each individual human being, since social inclination is inherent in each human being regardless of their will. A person cannot want it or not want it [...]. People find in themselves a need to live with others, a need which they carry in themselves everywhere, even when they are separated from people. [...] It would seem that all this reflection has little to do with ethics. [...] If we place a human being first – an individual who by nature has

no basis for belonging to society – if society and social life are merely the result of an agreement, [...] then the individual also has the right to dictate their will to society in every issue. They can terminate the social agreement every step of the way and modify it at their discretion, for their own benefit. Any view that is based on such assumptions, regardless of the type of program propagated later, is an individualism. The individual in it is [...] more important than society, and society [...] is [...] exclusively for the individual [...]. If we consider this balance of power completely, we must conclude that justice and love – social virtues in the sense in which they are taught by Christian ethics – have no *raison d'être* in it. [...] Within the framework of an agreement or various social agreements, what is called justice or love can be imitated, but cannot be created. **A human, by nature oriented only towards their own individual good, is not capable of profoundly wanting the good of another human being, or even less the good of a common society [...].** In order for a human to implement them, they must find within themselves a natural basis for reference to others and to society. Without it, they will always create only **appearances of justice or love**, and will never achieve authentic virtues. **Without their implementation, there is no true social morality.** [...] A person is a being that is free in the social life. They use their freedom well when, on the natural basis of their tendency to social life, they develop real social virtues. At the same time, these virtues determine the implementation of the common good. A human being cannot develop and improve outside it.” (Wojtyła 1991, pp. 99–104).

When speaking of the religious and social aspects of the Christian ethic, “[...] it must be remembered that this ethics constitutes an organic unity: it is a religious social ethics. [...] Social moment lies in the religion itself. [...] The Christian ethics [...] contains the whole natural ethics, that is, the set of rules of conduct which promotes a common sense among people. Natural ethics is approved in the Decalogue and in the Gospel – morality based on Revelation cannot oppose morality based on a common sense, it can only complement it (“I have come not to solve, but to fulfill”) (cf. Mt 5,17 – ed. K.P.) [...]. Natural ethics does not mean [...] the same as independent, non-religious ethics. [...] This is not an ethic [...] resulting from negation of religion. [...] Religion, like ethics, essentially results from human nature. [...] Reasonable human nature itself is the basis not only for ethics but also for religion (Wojtyła, 1991, p. 119–123).

Final thoughts

“The full equivalence of punishment remains only an ideal to be pursued. The type and level of sanctions should therefore not be based on subjective social expectations but on an objective forecast of the progress of the punishment.” (Bałandynowicz, 2015, p. 219).

“The Magisterium of the Church, based on the knowledge of human nature and having the centuries-old tradition of religious-anthropological research, has developed fundamental principles of social life, characterized by a humanitarian depth and a great power of influence. Actual observance of them leads to healing of the psyche and interpersonal relations, i.e. mental health of the individual and the community, to harmonious coexistence rooted in higher values that give an ordering sense to the existence. Therefore, within the framework of my pedagogical and rehabilitation considerations, in accordance with the meaning of the Magisterium of the Church, I have formulated a concept (which is consistent with the broadly understood **humanistic and existential trend**, including humanistic and positive psychology, as well as axiological education focused on the personality potential of a human), which I have called the **personalistic axiology of rehabilitation**”. (Pierzchała, 2016a, p. 178).

I hope that this article brings you closer to the theoretical foundations of the personalistic axiology of rehabilitation, presenting the essence of the direction of my scientific work, research and practical inquiries.

References

- [1] Bałandynowicz A., 2002, *Probacja. System sprawiedliwego karania*, Wydawnictwo Kodeks, Warszawa.
- [2] Bałandynowicz A., 2011, *Probacja. Resocjalizacja z udziałem społeczeństwa*, wyd. 2, Lex a Wolters Kluwer Business, Warszawa.
- [3] Bałandynowicz A., 2015, *Probacja sprawiedliwość karząca*, Wydawnictwo Wolters Kluwer, Warszawa.
- [4] Bańko M. (red.), 2014, *Wielki słownik wyrazów obcych PWN*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- [5] Bednarski F.W., 1975, *Podstawy wychowania społecznego według nauki św. Tomasza z Akwinu*, „Roczniki Filozoficzne”, t. 23, z. 2.
- [6] Biblia Tysiąclecia, 2002, *Pismo Święte Nowego i Starego Testamentu*, PISMO-SW 3.0 BETA, Wydawnictwo Pallottinum, Gliwice 2002.
- [7] Czapów C., 1978, *Wychowanie resocjalizujące. Elementy metodyki i diagnostyki*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- [8] Gogacz M., 1974, *Wokół problemu osoby*, Wydawnictwo Pax, Warszawa.
- [9] Gogacz M., 1987, *Elementarz metafizyki*, Wydawnictwo ATK, Warszawa.
- [10] Granat W., 1961, *Elementy personalistyczne w egzystencjalizmie*, „Znak” nr 5(83).
- [11] Jan Paweł II, 1979, Encyklika *Redemptor Hominis* o Jezusie Chrystusie Odkupicielu człowieka, Rzym.
- [12] Jan Paweł II, 1986, *Człowiek – obraz Boży – istotą duchowo-cieleśną*, Katechezy.
- [13] Jan Paweł II, 1995, Encyklika *Evangelium Vitae* o wartości i nienaruszalności życia ludzkiego, Rzym.
- [14] Jaworska A., 2008, *Readaptacyjna wartość sztuki w zakładach karnych*, Akademia Pomorska, Słupsk.

- [15] Jaworska A., 2012a, *Aksjologia resocjalizacji*, [w:] *Leksykon resocjalizacji*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”, Kraków, s. 25–29.
- [16] Jaworska A., 2012b, *Resocjalizacja humanistyczno-egzystencjalna*, [w:] *Leksykon resocjalizacji*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”, Kraków, s. 229–236.
- [17] Jaworska A., 2012c, *Teologia resocjalizacji*, [w:] *Leksykon resocjalizacji*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”, Kraków, s. 381–385.
- [18] Jaworska A., 2012d, *Resocjalizacja – definiowanie pojęcia*, [w:] *Leksykon resocjalizacji*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”, Kraków.
- [19] Koberzycki T., 2001, *Filozofia osobowości. Od antycznej idei duszy do współczesnej teorii osoby*, Eneteia Wydawnictwo Szkolenia, Warszawa.
- [20] Konopczyński M., 2008, *Współczesne kierunki zmian w pedagogice resocjalizacyjnej. Destygmatyzacja dewiantów i kreowanie alternatywnych tożsamości*, [w:] *Resocjalizacja. Ciągłość i zmiana*, (red.) M. Konopczyński, B.M. Nowak, Pedagogium WSNS, Warszawa.
- [21] Konopczyński M., 2009, *Współczesne kierunki zmian w teorii i praktyce resocjalizacyjnej. Twórcza resocjalizacja – od korekcji do rozwoju*, „Probacja” nr 1, s. 63–87.
- [22] Konopczyński M., 2010, *Metody twórczej resocjalizacji*, Pedagogium WSNS – Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
- [23] Konopczyński M., 2013, *Kryzys resocjalizacji czy(li) sukces działań pozornych – refleksje wokół polskiej rzeczywistości resocjalizacyjnej*, Pedagogium WSNS, Warszawa.
- [24] Konopczyński M., 2015, *Pedagogika resocjalizacyjna. W stronę działań kreujących*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”, Kraków.
- [25] Lacey A.R., 1999, *Słownik filozoficzny*, Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, Poznań.
- [26] Maj A., 2016, *Aksjologia*, [w:] *Encyklopedia aksjologii pedagogicznej*, (red.) K. Chałas, A. Maj, Polskie Wydawnictwo Encyklopedyczne, Radom, s. 82–87.
- [27] Markwart A., Szymańska M., 2013, *Dobro jednostki dobrem społeczeństwa, czy dobro społeczeństwa dobrem jednostki? George Berkeley i Adam Smith o postrzeganiu i moralności*, „Etyka” nr 46, s. 21–34.
- [28] Mascall E.L., 1962, *Chrześcijańska koncepcja człowieka*, Wydawnictwo Pax, Warszawa.
- [29] Mazurek F.J., 1991, *Prawa człowieka w nauczaniu społecznym Kościoła (od papieża Leona XIII do papieża Jana Pawła II)*, Wydawnictwo KUL, Lublin, s. 181–182.
- [30] Miś A., 2006, *Filozofia współczesna, główne nurty*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR, Warszawa.
- [31] Nowak M., 2007, *Wychowanie*, [w:] *Leksykon pedagogiki religii*, (red.) C. Rogowski, VERBINUM Wydawnictwo Księży Werbistów, Warszawa.
- [32] Nowak M., 2008, *Teorie i koncepcje wychowania*, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne, Warszawa.
- [33] Nowak M., 2017, *Pedagogika personalistyczna*, [w:] *Pedagogika. Podręcznik akademicki*, (red.) Z. Kwieciński, B. Śliwerski, t. 1, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa, s. 542–553.
- [34] Pierzchała K., 2006, *Poczucie powinności i odpowiedzialności u młodzieży katolickiej*, wyd. 2, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.
- [35] Pierzchała K., 2013a, *Kapelan więzienny w procesie resocjalizacji penitencjarnej*, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, Toruń.
- [36] Pierzchała K., 2013b, *W poszukiwaniu związków pomiędzy zagrożeniem niedostosowania społecznego młodzieży a jakością życia*, [w:] *W poszukiwaniu jakości życia. Ujęcia interdyscyplinarne*, (red.) M. Jasiński, Niepaństwowa Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna w Białymstoku, Białystok 2013, s. 475–500.

- [37] Pierzchała K., 2015, *The process of social reintegration of convicts on the background of world penitentiary system. The analytical and synthetic outline of the issue* [Proces readaptacji społecznej skazanych na tle światowego systemu penitencjarnego. Zarys analityczno-syntetyczny zagadnienia], Polskiego Towarzystwa Nauk Politycznych i Polska Akademia Nauk, „Polish Political Science. Yearbook”, Vol. 44, s. 154–170.
- [38] Pierzchała K., 2016a, *Destygmatyzacja przestępców w świetle Magisterium Kościoła oraz poglądów na resocjalizację*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”, Kraków.
- [39] Pierzchała K., 2016b, *Stygmatyzacja i destygmatyzacja więźniów. Zarys analityczno-syntetyczny zagadnienia*, „Krakowskie Studia Małopolskie”, nr 21, s. 199–214.
- [40] Pierzchała K., 2017, *Wina – prawo – kara. Prawne i psychopedagogiczne aspekty resocjalizacji penitencjarnej* [Fault – law – penalty. Legal and psycho and pedagogical aspects of penitentiary rehabilitation], „Probacja”, nr 2, s. 91–117.
- [41] Pierzchała K., 2018, *Karać czy nagradzać w kontekście resocjalizacji osadzonych – w paradygmacie naukowego behawioryzmu* [Punishment or reward in the context of rehabilitation of prisoners – in the paradigm of scientific behaviourism], [w:] *Edukacja jutra. Wiedza i edukacja w egzystencji współczesnego człowieka*, (red.) A. Kamińska, P. Oleśniewicz, Wydawnictwo Oficyna Wydawnicza „Humanitas”, Sosnowiec 2018, s. 477–486.
- [42] Potocki A., 2007, *Socjalizacja religijna*, [w:] *Leksykon pedagogiki religii*, (red.) C. Rogowski, VERBINUM Wydawnictwo Księży Werbistów, Warszawa, s. 714–721.
- [43] Pytka L., 2005, *Pedagogika resocjalizacyjna. Wybrane zagadnienia teoretyczne, diagnostyczne i metodyczne*, Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej, Warszawa.
- [44] Pytka L., 2009, *Autonomia i uwikłanie transdyscyplinarne pedagogiki resocjalizacyjnej*, [w:] *Terapia w resocjalizacji*, (red.) A. Rejzner, P. Szczepaniak, Wydawnictwo Akademickie „Żak”, Warszawa.
- [45] Pytka L., 2012, *Wychowanie jako prowadzenie*, „Student niepełnosprawny. Szkice i Rozprawy”, nr 12(5), s. 13–32.
- [46] Ratzinger J., 1993, *Zagrożenia życia ludzkiego*, „Communio” nr 3(75).
- [47] Sadowski M., 2010, *Godność człowieka i dobro wspólne w papieskim nauczaniu społecznym (1878–2005)*, rozdz. 5: *Godność człowieka i dobro wspólne w nauczaniu Jana Pawła II*, Prawnicza i Ekonomiczna Biblioteka Cyfrowa, Wrocław, s. 269–359.
- [48] Stepulak M.Z., 2016, *Sens życia*, [w:] *Encyklopedia aksjologii pedagogicznej*, (red.) K. Chałas, A. Maj, Polskie Wydawnictwo Encyklopedyczne, Radom, s. 1051–1057.
- [49] Suchodolski B., 1967, *Świat człowieka a wychowanie*, Wydawnictwo „Książka i Wiedza”, Warszawa.
- [50] Szacka B., 2003, *Wprowadzenie do socjologii*, Wydawnictwo Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa.
- [51] Szkudlarek T., Śliwerski B., 2000, *Wyzwania pedagogiki krytycznej i antypedagogiki*, wyd. 3, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”, Kraków.
- [52] Tarnowski J., 1982, *Problem chrześcijańskiej pedagogiki egzystencjalnej*, Akademia teologii Katolickiej, Warszawa.
- [53] Tischner J., 1966, *Z problematyki wychowania chrześcijańskiego*, „Znak”, nr 11(149).
- [54] Tischner J., 2000, *Mysli wyszukane*, Wydawnictwo Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy „Znak”, Kraków.
- [55] Tischner J., 2011, *Myslenie według wartości*, Wydawnictwo Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy „Znak”, Kraków.
- [56] Walczak P., 2007, *Wychowanie jako spotkanie. Józefa Tischnera filozofia człowieka jako źródło inspiracji pedagogicznych*, Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”. Kraków.

- [57] Wawro F.W., 2016, *Socjalizacja*, [w:] *Encyklopedia aksjologii pedagogicznej*, (red.) K. Chałas, A. Maj, Polskie Wydawnictwo Encyklopedyczne, Radom, s. 1073–1079.
- [58] Wojtyła K., 1991, *Elementarz etyczny* (na podstawie wydania: K. Wojtyła, *Aby Chrystus się nami posługiwał*, Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy „Znak”, Kraków 1979), Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL, Wrocław.

Netography

- [59] *Encyklopedia PWN*, <https://encyklopedia.pwn.pl/> [dostęp: 12 czerwca 2018].
- [60] *Katolicka nauka społeczna – definicja, założenia* (Kościół wobec wojny, o prawach człowieka i in.), eSzkola.pl, <http://eszkola.pl/religia/katolicka-nauka-spoieczna-6724.html> [dostęp: 12.06.2018].
- [61] *Pedagogika personalistyczna*, Ściąga, http://sciaga.pl/tekst/49962-50-pedagogika_personalistyczna [dostęp: 10 czerwca 2018].
- [62] *Personalizm chrześcijański – założenia, charakterystyka, przedstawiciele*, eSzkola.pl, <http://eszkola.pl/religia/personalizm-chrzescijanski-6725.html> [dostęp: 10 czerwca 2018].