Juliusz Iwanicki
Faculty of Social Sciences
Adam Mickiewicz University
ORCID: 0000–0002–9391–1545

Philosophy and religion vs. upbringing: between secular and religious teleological concepts

Abstract

This paper is an attempt to analyse the problems of education from the perspective of teleology. Teleology is a subdiscipline of philosophical and religious reflection. Thinking over a purpose is a fundamental act of man. This type of reflection is also needed in education. The paper presents four possible types of relations between philosophy and religion in culture. These various possibilities result in various solutions possible for upbringing. Depending on the adopted value system, a young man will have a different vision of the world. The paper also provides a historical analysis referring to various classical philosophical and religious systems.

Keywords: teleology, philosophy, religion, purpose in education

The impact of philosophy and religion on upbringing

The complex social & cultural reality in which the human being participates is a permanent object of reflection for various philosophical and religious systems, including both historical and contemporary systems. Great thinkers and spiritual leaders marked new trends of development and understanding of reality with their authority[1]. However, the significance of philosophy in the modern world has decreased, partly as a result of its internal transformations (new non-systemic philosophical currents[2]), but also because psy-

---

[1] Cf. JASPERS, K., *Socrates, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus*, Polish translation: *Sokrates, Budda, Konfucjusz, Jezus*. Warszawa 2000.

[2] Modern philosophy is most often a conglomerate of various non-systemic currents. These trends are characterised by the prefix "post", e.g., postmodernity (Bauman), postsecularism (Habermas) or posthumanism. In

chology, sociology or pedagogy have emancipated themselves and created their own detailed ways of interpreting reality.

Also the modern world, so dynamic in global changes, expects the quick and concrete evaluation of a given phenomenon rather than the slow but profound reflection that characterised classical philosophy. In spite of the long-term crisis affecting this field of study[3], the need to understand the world in its comprehensive dimension will not vanish. The more new social and cultural problems resulting, among others, from the development of technology along with the emergence of new but particularistic concepts concerning the human being[4], the more necessary it becomes to prepare a reasonable synthesis that would contain various experiences, not only sensual ones[5]. It happens because contemporary people are still inclined to think in terms of purposefulness. Even if philosophical or religious reflection is disappearing from the horizon of the modern human being, who focuses on current tasks and challenges, teleological thinking within the scope of earthly life still remains deep inside. Depending on stages of life and upbringing (and later self-upbringing), the human being has different, usually material and social goals. The goal of a young pupil is often to receive good education (sometimes also easy and fast education) that would give him/her a chance for further development. Another goal, so desirable and important in the modern world, is to find a job that will create satisfactory professional and financial possibilities. Depending on expectations, the parallel goal of the young human being is often personal development (the attitude of singles), but starting a family is still a primary goal for many people. The moment of becoming a parent also involves special goals, such as passing one's values and good education to the new human being and protecting the offspring's development.

Sooner or later, every human being experiences certain "border situations" described by existential philosopher Karl Jaspers[6], various difficult moments that involve suffering, such as his/her own disease or a disease of someone close to him/her, an accident, the death of someone close to him/her, or mental difficulties, such as a sense of guilt over something, or the sense of impossibility of fulfilling all personal dreams. Each choice made by the human being involves narrowing the field of possibilities – it is not always possible to return to the previous situation. In such cases, the question about the sense of life is justified not only within its particularistic meaning (work, family, entertainment),

---

this text, I refer more often to classical philosophy, where I see broader opportunities to rebuild its relations with the theories of upbringing.

[3] Cf. HUSSERL, E., *Philosophy and the Crisis of European Humanity*, Polish translation: *Kryzys europejskiego człowieczeństwa a filozofia*, Warszawa 1993.

[4] The development of cognitive sciences and the sciences of cognition is an example of the creation of new but reductional concepts on humanity.

[5] I assume after philosopher William James that we can speak not only of experience in the empirical dimension, but also of experience in the extrasensual (mental or spiritual) dimension. See SAWICKA, J., ("Osobliwość empiryczna doświadczenia religijnego. William James i duchowy pragmatyzm" (The empirical strangeness of religious experience. William James and spiritual pragmatism), *Idea. Studia nad strukturą i rozwojem pojęć filozoficznyc*h, vol. 24, 2012, pp. 101–117.

[6] See KOLOSA, D., "Sytuacje możliwe a sytuacje graniczne w filozofii Jaspera" (Possible situations vs. border situations in Jasper's philosophy), *Studia z Historii Filozofii*, no 1/2010, pp. 135–145.

but also in its existential and metaphysical meaning. Hence the need to reflect on the purpose in its various profound aspects.

The category of purposefulness and the area of teleology devoted to this concept is an issue that would require a separate subject of consideration. Let us, however, assume after the author of the entry that the purpose is something that, firstly, concludes an activity; secondly, the purpose is an activity by means of which the intended good is achieved; thirdly, the purpose is a motive that generates a certain activity[7]. Thus, within the meaning of the philosophy of upbringing, the purpose would be a supreme value that crowns the person's efforts; at the same time, such value (whether philosophical or religious) would be the good in itself that would give the pupil the motivation to act.

Philosophies and religions have delivered most teleological (purposeful) conceptions so far, so it is worth returning to the cultural repository of humanity that is constituted by various philosophical and religious concepts. It is easy to notice the overwhelming impact of these systems on human upbringing and education. From classical times, along with the supreme concept of *paidei*, through the Middle Ages and their idea of *artes liberales*, till the times of optimistic Enlightenment, many researchers have already stressed the significant impact of philosophy and religion on education in its historical sense[8]. This is an obvious conclusion, but it must be assumed for the purpose of continuing reflections on purposefulness. Pedagogy is not only an empirical and purely practical science; it has its long relations with philosophical and religious traditions that are worth recollecting and examining.

The purpose in philosophy

Assuming that the purpose is the good that helps the human being to undertake his/her activities and gives him/her the motivation to act, we must wonder: what are the purposes in various conceptions of reality in which philosophy, religion and upbringing operate?

The issue of the purpose in philosophy seems particularly problematic because an insight into the history of philosophical thought shows that there is actually no single philosophy – there have been different philosophies that may interpret reality in completely diverse ways. In many handbooks, a sort of razor cutting across theories of great thinkers is the question whether a given conception represented the idealistic current or the materialistic current?[9] The consequences of diametrically different methods that will be adopted towards the world by an idealist and a materialist translate into methods of upbringing, because a young man brought up under the influence of "invisible" ideas and a pupil who received materialistic values focusing on the earthly and sensual world in their purposefulness will seek different values in their actions.

---

[7] GONDEK, P., *Cel (Purpose)* (entry), in: *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozoficzna*, vol. 2, Lublin 2001, p. 68.

[8] Cf. KUPISIEWICZ, CZ., *From the history of the theory and practice of upbringing* (*Z dziejów teorii i praktyki wychowania*), Kraków 2012.

[9] SUCH, J., SZCZEŚNIAK, M., *Natural ontology* (*Ontologia przyrodnicza*). Poznań 2001, p. 13–14.

Nevertheless, it is possible to determine certain elementary common purposes that are specific even to the entirely diverse methods of practising philosophy. This overarching purpose in various concepts is the need to understand reality. That was basically the "first reason" for the emergence of philosophy, because the main inspiration for the first Greek thinkers was the will to explain how the world functions, how it came into being and why it is. The subsequent "anthropocentric turn" in the history of thought, which had its sophistical foundations[10], still oscillated around the need to understand reality, this time with the human being in its centre. At the same time, philosophical anthropology gave inducement to the development of the first pedagogical and upbringing ideas, because the consideration of the problem "who is the human being?" was inevitably followed by the question: "what values should be shaped in the human being?". In spite of internal differences, classical Greek philosophy unanimously asserted that a pupil must be brought up in the spirit of rationality – developing the skill of rational thinking was aimed at supporting the young human being and giving hope for the further successful continuation of Greek culture that it is difficult to imagine without this Socratic element, an inclination to explain various problems and issues rationally[11].

The purpose in religion

Another issue necessary for the further consideration of teleological fundamentals of upbringing is to understand the purpose of religion as such. Looking from the religious perspective, which was also familiar to the first philosophers, we have dealt with cultural and, consequently, religious diversity in the world since ancient times. Already Herodotus stressed peculiar differences between civilisations and other models of beliefs and behaviours among tribes living far away from Hellas[12]. This sometimes led to sceptical consequences: since there are so many different gods and cults, can any of them be ontologically real? We can assume after Xenophanes that, if it is possible at all to find the common element of various perspectives in religions, we would have to identify it in non-anthropomorphic concepts of God[13]. Although ascribing monotheistic tendencies to this thinker may be regarded as premature[14], this was a sort of turning point in the perception of the mosaic of contemporary beliefs.

---

[10] Cf. GAJDA, J., *Sophists (Sofiści)*, Warszawa 1989.

[11] This did not mean that the religious element was marginalised in Greek culture. Many researchers stress that Socrates was a religious person. See MCPHERRAN, M. L., *The Religion of Socrates*, Polish translation: *Religia Sokratesa*, Warszawa 2014.

[12] See HERODOTUS, *The History of Herodotus*, Polish translation: *Dzieje*, Warszawa 2007.

[13] REALE, G., *A History of Ancient Philosophy*, Polish translation: *Historia filozofii starożytnej*, vol. 1, Lublin 2000, pp. 127–138.

[14] The adoption of faith in one single God, particularly in early beliefs, is not always clearly connected with monotheism. At a certain stage, a henotheistic belief may be maintained: it is necessary to worship one God, but other gods also exist.

In modern times, along with the development of cultural anthropology, cultural diversity was appreciated again, and some thinkers indicated the tendency to self-question one's own values among the multitude of other civilisational values as a virtue in itself[15]. This carries an important theological problem for followers of particular religions: should we assume, like many conservative religious thinkers did, that the whole truth lies only in one exclusive religion, or are at least some elements of truth and saving power hidden in other religions, too? This is a sort of religious dispute between confessional exclusivity, which may turn into religious fundamentalism in its extreme forms, and spiritual inclusivity, which recognised profound value in other religious positions. In Roman Catholic religion, exclusivistic tendencies prevailed until the Second Vatican Council, which initiated an ecumenical perspective that has been continued with variations until today[16]. However, extreme inclusivity may lead to relativistic pluralism[17], where all religions and cults are mutually equal and it does not matter within which religion a given follower functions. In such case, belonging to a given confession becomes only a question of tradition.

In spite of these religious disputes of huge importance (is there anything more important to a believer than in which religion he/she may achieve salvation?), it seems that we will find a common spiritual denominator and the same purpose of all searching individuals in all religions. We can assume that the purpose of religions is to establish a relation with Transcendence, i.e., something that goes beyond the earthly world. The word "transcend" etymologically meant crossing a border, and the word "religare" meant establishing a bond with gods. However, we cannot assume with full certainty that God is something that connects all religions: there are spiritual systems devoid of attachment to God in the theistic sense, such as Far-Eastern Buddhism or Confucianism[18]. But even in these last religions there is a tendency to perceive the world as non-self-sufficient. Buddhism lays emphasis on reflection on suffering as a permanent and irremovable fragment of reality. Only through proper self-upbringing and working out the truth about suffering, which always arises out of some desire, can we "transcend" the limitations of existence. On the other hand, in a metaphysical Chinese Confucionism, the world succumbs to chaos and unpredictable anarchy if it is not put in order (i.e., transcended) in a harmonious social hierarchy and a reasonable ethics of virtues, where the biggest value is self-composure and obedience.

In monotheistic religions it is easier to recognise the transcendental; God exists under various names both in Judaism, Christianity and Islam[19]. In transcendental Hinduism, the

---

[15] KOŁAKOWSKI, L., *Looking for a barbarian. Illusions of cultural universalism (Szukanie barbarzyńcy. Złudzenia uniwersalizmu kulturowego)*, in: L. Kołakowski, *Can the devil be saved? and 27 other sermons (Czy diabeł może być zbawiony i 27 innych kazań)*, Kraków 2006, pp. 11–31.

[16] MINNERATH, R., *Councils (Sobory)*, Warszawa 2004, pp. 129–145.

[17] WĘCŁAWSKI, T., *The common world of religions (Wspólny świat religii)*, Kraków 1995, pp. 277–281.

[18] See BAATZ, U., *Buddhism*, Polish translation: *Buddyzm*, Warszawa 2002, pp. 32–61; CONFUCIUS, *Analects*, Polish translation: *Dialogi*, Warszawa 2008, pp. 345–364.

[19] See ARMSTRONG, K., *A History of God*, Polish translation: *Historia Boga*, Warszawa 1998, pp. 227–272.

transcendental purpose is the principle of Atman (conscience) and Brahman (absolute); in shamanistic religions, this reality is transcended by the rich world of ghosts[20].

The purpose of upbringing

After recognising what the elementary teleology of philosophy and religion is, it is time to reflect on the purpose or purposes of upbringing. As in the case of the above systems, a large number of which has emerged in the history of civilisation and culture, we currently deal with a multitude of schools and pedagogical and upbringing concepts. Is it proper to bring up a child in the spirit of strictly instilled hierarchy and order, or, as in Rousseau's thought [21] to leave the almost unrestricted freedom of development to a pupil? Should education be based on the idea of universality and interdisciplinariness, or should we train experts and specialists who are narrowly specialised but adequately prepared for their occupation? These and other important questions are an inherent part of pedagogy, and these are not apparent problems, but issues with serious practical implications.

Regardless of these different conceptions, it is possible to indicate the inclination to pursue the same generalised purpose in many antagonised theories of upbringing. This purpose may also be the will to help and support development and the need to develop values in the young (and sometimes also older) human being. The *leitmotive* of all pedagogical concepts is undoubtedly the will to help the developing individual according to the adopted model of upbringing. The philosophical side of the upbringing process is the axiological socialisation of people and an attempt to convey metaphysically and practically important values that should be respected in the given community and culture and treated as an inherent part of myself and my personality.

The effort of philosophical and religious systems would be senseless and entirely fleeting without the continuation and accumulation of cultural achievements, which would be impossible without an effective upbringing and education process. Besides, there is no better indicator of effectiveness of the given philosophical & religious concept than its creative undertaking and development in the young generation. Sometimes researchers find out that certain ideas are dying or vanishing. This happens exactly when the upbringing and education process fails, when a given idea is not passed down to further generations attractively enough or when it becomes strange to young people. Is the crisis of philosophy and religion that we partly deal with in modern society not a consequence of inadequate education and wrong upbringing? The shortage of philosophical and ethical education in modern schools combined with religious education that insufficiently engages

---

[20] See KELLER, J., (ed.), *Religions of Asia. Africa, America, Australia and Oceania* (*Religie Azji. Afryki, Ameryki, Australii i Oceanii)*, Warszawa 1980, pp. 219–267.

[21] IWANICKI, J., *From evangelical religiousness to civic religiousness. Antinomies of the concept of religiousness in Jean Jacques Rousseau's philosophy* (*Od religijności ewangelicznej do religijności obywatelskiej. Antynomie koncepcji religijności w filozofii Jean-Jacques'a Rousseau)*, "Humaniora. Czasopismo internetowe" no. 4(4)/2013, pp. 43–44.

pupils (even at the price of creative polemics – after all, authentic religious thinking is not afraid of doubts, as doubting is a part of mature faith[22]) results in the multiplication of superficial attitudes among a part of today's young people.

Teleologies of upbringing are different and dependent on philosophical & religious concepts underlying them. In the earlier part of this paper, we have presented separate primary purposes of philosophy, religion and upbringing. Thus, another trail of thought to be analysed at this moment is the reflection on the relation between philosophy and religion that occurred in historical times. At this stage of reflection, I put forward the thesis that, depending on the course of these relations, specific upbringing concepts were created on their basis. These relations[23] should not be interpreted as closed – a large part of them can be readily transposed also to modern times.

The unity of religion and philosophy as a teleological basis of education

The first of the proposed historically occurring relations between religion and philosophy is the relation of unity between these areas. In such an approach, teleological differences are of secondary importance. In the approach proposed in the earlier part, the purpose of philosophy would be to understand the world, and the purpose of religion would be to establish a bond with transcendence. In the relation of unity of these systems, this would mean that these purposes would become identical. When the world is perceived through the holistic and comprehensive prism, the aforementioned divisions are unimportant, because the true understanding of the world and the establishment of a bond with transcendence going beyond it means one and the same. For supporters of this kind of settlement of connections between philosophy and religion, it would be even false to understand the world without establishing communion with God or to have a sense of relationship with the divine being without understanding the world.

This type of philosophical and religious thinking has already occurred in ancient times in Plato's works, although in an undeveloped form. Plato hesitated in which direction philosophy should develop – many researchers indicate that this thinker initiated genuine rational thinking and the first developed system based on intelligible extrasensual ideas[24]. However, there is also quite a justified view that the same Plato did not discard mythical thinking entirely. He proposed bringing children up on the basis of properly selected myths about heroes and improving their moral and axiological development on the basis of the development of mythical & aesthetic imagination. Actually all works by Plato are

---

[22] WIŚNIEWSKI, L., *The light of freedom* (*Blask wolności*), Kraków 2015, pp. 16–18.

[23] The relations between religion and philosophy proposed in this paper arose partly from the following inspiration: ANZENBACHER, A., *Introduction to philosophy*, Polish translation: *Wprowadzenie do filozofii*, Kraków 2003, pp. 31–35.

[24] See REALE, G., *A History of Ancient Philosophy*, Polish translation: *Historia filozofii starożytnej*, vol. 2, Lublin 2001, pp. 88–112.

permeated with mythical poetry and full of numerous and beautiful metaphors with the best-known legendary "cave"[25]. Thus, we can observe the interpenetration of rational and mythical elements in philosophical works of the Greek thinker.

It is not a coincidence that the subsequent continuation of his system was proposed by Plotinus – the author of *Enneads*. This neo-Platonist proposed the concept of One – the ideal being from which lower hypostases and other beings emanate, and our material world emerges out of them, too[26]. In Plotinus' vision, the world assumes the form of a "ladder", a structured being; in other words, reality is subjected to the gradation process. It is still, however, one world; although matter is the last level of emanation, it has its source in the divine One through intermediating hypostases. Plotinus lived in times of developing Christianity, so he was also concerned with the mystical capacity brought by the "One" philosophy. The purpose of a returning individual should be to return to oneness and climb again the ladder of the being from which we derive. In Plotinus' view, in order to do this, it is necessary both to understand reality and to reunite with God.

In Christian version, the relation of unity between philosophy and religion was proposed to the fullest extent by St. Anselm of Canterbury in the Middle Ages. This co-founder of scholasticism wrote that he "believes in order to understand"[27]. In his opinion, every human being already has the idea of God – the idea of the most perfect being – in his mind. The non-existence of such a being is not possible, because the most powerful being must contain the attribute of existence; otherwise, this would be a conceptual and logical contradiction. Understanding this concept allows us also to establish a relation with transcendence and deepen our faith intellectually. To paraphrase Anselm's maxim, a pupil should also try to understand metaphysical questions in order to believe in the existence of God.

The above concept of unity between philosophy and religion also seems to be directly transposable to the religious language of the philosophy of the East. It is worth noting that the discipline of philosophy as such did not emerge as a separate subject of inquiry in non-European cultures. Therefore, Buddhism is often described both as a philosophy and a religion in literature; sometimes there are disputes to which of these areas it belongs to a larger extent. The same goes for Hinduism – an artificial cluster of ideas that actually contains a conglomerate of various beliefs and philosophical schools founded in the Indian Peninsula long before Christ. Thus, it was (---) for Indians engaged in metaphysical disputes to understand anything and, at the same time, to establish communion with the divine Brahman or any of its incarnations. Their discussion referred mainly to the degree to which we can establish this communion between our own self and the Absolute[28].

---

[25] PLATO, *Republic*, Polish translation: *Państwo*, Kęty 2003, pp. 220–250.

[26] KROKIEWICZ, A., *Aristotle, Pyrrho and Plotinus* (*Arystoteles, Pirron i Plotyn*), Warszawa 1974, pp. 228–270.

[27] See HEINZMANN, R., *Philosophy of the Middle Ages*, Polish translation: *Filozofia średniowiecza*, Kęty 1999, pp. 157–168.

[28] See KNOTT, K., *Hinduism (Hinduism)*, Warszawa 2000, pp. 47–57.

How important for the teleology of education is this first type of relation between philosophy and religion, which occurred in different ages and in different religions? I think it is very important because the idea of unity is the supreme value that should be instilled in a pupil on the basis of this concept. A child, a young man or a self-educating older man should be particularly aware of the fact that the visible intellectual reality and the spiritual reality are profoundly interconnected. In the anthropological sense, the powers of the mind and the soul should not be separated from each other, either. In the field of education, it is also good to stress during the teaching process that all subjects and branches of knowledge are interrelated and make sense on the basis of the metaphysical unity from which they derive[29]. In the modern world, the teleology of upbringing based on unity is in deep retreat. Today's education usually prefers the segmented and splintered world of many specialisations and unrelated areas of reality. General and versatile knowledge is sometimes ignored as useless; the methodological possibilities that are carried by a combination of methods based on imagination and reason in the field of education are not recognised, either. Elements of the teleology of upbringing based on the value of unity have survived probably only in the trend of Waldorf education.[30]

The common area of philosophy and religion as a basis of the teleology of upbringing

The second possible relation that occurred in the history of philosophical and religious systems and that has a certain impact on upbringing in modern times is the relation between philosophy and religion on the one hand and the common area of reality connecting them on the other hand. In this proposed model, the autonomy of philosophy and religion as separate orders of knowledge and faith is preserved. Thus, the previously assumed definitions where the purpose of philosophy is to understand the world and the purpose of religion is to establish and maintain a bond with transcendence are adequate here. The origins of this conception appeared already in *Metaphysics* by Aristotle – Plato's most important disciple. Aristotle generally abandoned mythical elements in his works and rationalised the description of reality by abandoning extrasensual ideas in favour of materially perceptible forms. The world of things and phenomena contains forms that do not exist away from the mundane world. At the same time, there was room for the idea of the divine being in Aristotle's system. God appears in his thought as the Prime Mover that sets the world in motion while remaining unmoved himself. The philosopher from Stagira was also the first to elaborate the concept of "theology" as a science about God, which was

---

[29] See GUTEK, G., *Philosophical and ideological fundamentals of education* (*Filozoficzne i ideologiczne podstawy edukacji*), Gdańsk 2003, pp. 30–36.

[30] Cf. JOCZ, A., *Eschatological pluralism of neo-Gnostic religious movements – anthroposophy of Rudolf Steiner and "Lectorium Rosicrucianum" by Jan van Rijckenborgh* (*Eschatologiczny pluralizm neognostycznych ruchów religijnych – antropozofia Rudolfa Steinera i "Lectorium Rosicrucianum" Jana van Rijckenborgha*), in: Z. DROZDOWICZ, Z.W. PUŚLECKI (ed.), *Adaptation through transformations* (*Adaptacja przez transformacje*), Poznań 2001, pp. 337–350

a sort of culmination of his philosophical searches[31]. The concept of purposefulness was also systematised for the first time in his theory of four causes (material, formal, efficient and final causes). Today the modern human being thinks mainly about the cause of something in terms of agency. In a chronology of events, point A should be preceded by point B. For Aristotle, the full metaphysical dimension of a given being was the perception of this problem from a broader perspective. If we transpose this concept onto the teleology of upbringing, the material cause of a child is its embryo. The formal cause is the model of humanity, which is universal for all people (today we would refer to DNA as such a model). The efficient cause is the child's parents. The final cause is probably the desire to become a mature human being and a legitimate citizen of the *polis*.

Aristotle's metaphysics is perceived by researchers as the philosophy of order where every being has its specific place. While Plato's philosophy left some room for assumptions that the world is chaotic (the educational shock caused by "coming out of the cave" essentially shatters the hierarchy of values existing until that moment for an unprepared pupil), Aristotle's world is an orderly reality without the extremity of remote ideas and the ostensibility of the material world.

Aristotle's thought was taken up in its religious aspect by Saint Thomas Aquinas. It was not without reason that, quoting Aristotle in his 13th-century works, he simply referred to him as a "philosopher" without specifying his name. The quality that Thomas Aquinas inherited from Aristotle was the inclination to think in terms of order. Thus, the being can be arranged in a systematic and comprehensible manner without the need for mystical experiences. We can try to prove the existence of God without referring to faith, taking only the natural world into consideration. In the first place, is it possible to separate reason from faith[32]. In Thomas' view, the order of reason and the order of faith are basically two different areas that should not be mixed together, as this involves various risks, including educational risk. The matter of reason is to ask about material things, but also about God from the philosophical position. The matter of theology and religion is truths of faith, such as original sin, the secret of incarnation or the dogma of the Holy Trinity. Thomas Aquinas assumes that these are inexplicable truths that cannot be grasped by the secular mind without faith. At the same time, the Thomistic doctrine contained an important securing element that truths of reason and faith cannot be in conflict with each other. If this happens, then it is either the error of reason having claims to infinite knowledge, or the error of faith falling into a sort of fideism: irrational religious faith not based on reason.

The relation of order between philosophy and religion has basically translated into a certain type of teleology of upbringing. The purpose in education based on this relation would be order. Unlike in the previous concept, the unity of reason and faith cannot be pursued at any cost, because this may lead to a conceptual chaos and the blending of various problems that would be dangerous for a pupil. In times of Counter-Reformation, the

---

[31] ARISTOTLE, *Metaphysics*, Polish translation: *Metafizyka*, in: *Collected Works* (*Dzieła Wszystkie*), vol. 2, Warszawa 1990, pp. 712–716.

[32] CHESTERTON, G.K., *St. Thomas Aquinas*, Polish translation: *Święty Tomasz z Akwinu*, Warszawa 1974, pp. 146–162.

model of Thomistic education was Jesuit education[33], which tried to instil the principles of Aristotle's philosophy and teachings of Thomas Aquinas, showing the separate complexity of philosophy and theology without questioning the need to practice both fields separately. The carefulness and methodicalness of Jesuit teaching, which encompassed also language & rhetorical education, became a recognisable symbol of the power of this formation at the peak of its excellence. However, the influences of the teleology of upbringing based on the value of order are rather absent, except for some modern confessional schools. Although religion is present in the curricula of modern schools, the teaching of this subject does not always bring effective results; various studies show that a large part of today's youth has limited religious knowledge or has a critical attitude to acquired religious contents[34]. At the same time, philosophical education is neglected to an even larger extent, being often unjustly associated with ethics as the only alternative to religion.

The polemics of philosophy and theology as an inspiration for the teleology of upbringing

The history of the relation of religion and philosophy towards upbringing would be certainly incomplete if we did not take into account modern secularisation processes that accelerated along with the formation of the French Enlightenment and the events of the French Revolution in the 18th century. The thinkers of this epoch proposed a new naturalised way of thinking about the world in which concepts such as humanity, matter or progress were valued. Voltaire – one of the best-known philosophers and writers of this period – regarded the decrease of the influence of Jesuit education and the dissolution of this order as his personal success. He promoted educational values based on the assumption that reason is independent of religion. The advocates of the Enlightenment in its French version considered it necessary to liberate the human being from the chains of superstition and tyranny[35]. They regarded the influences of the Catholic Church, which were visible also in the sphere of education, as a restriction of human freedom. According to this formation, the human being could not develop fully his/her scientific, political and personal potential until he/she is retarded by backward institutions that are incompatible with the new reality of freedom.

In Rousseau's view, religious ideas should not be instilled in a child too early, because they can disrupt its development; besides, a child is unable to understand God's

---

[33] KUPISIEWICZ, CZ., *From the history of theory…* (*Z dziejów teorii…*), op. cit., pp. 102–106.

[34] BANIAK, J., *Religion and its role in the life of people in the critical outlook of young people. A sociological analysis* (*Religia i jej rola w życiu ludzi w krytycznym spojrzeniu młodzieży. Analiza socjologiczna*), in: E. JELIŃSKI, Z. STACHOWSKI, S. SZTAJER (ed.), *Ratio, Religio, Humanitas. Miscelanea dedicated to Professor Zbigniew Drozdowicz* (*Ratio, Religio, Humanitas. Miscelanea dedykowane Profesorowi Zbigniewowi Drozdowiczowi*), Poznań 2015, pp. 196–211.

[35] DROZDOWICZ, Z., *Philosophy of the Enlightenment* (*Filozofia Oświecenia*), Warszawa 2006, pp. 126–137.

idea from a certain age. Moreover, a pupil must not be indoctrinated in the field of philosophical values, either – which is an internal contradiction, considering the pressure laid on the value of freedom by Rousseau – bringing up a child in the spirit of negative values, i.e., being free of institutions, is already the exertion of a cryptophilosophical influence on a young individual. Another French thinker of this epoch – Condorcet – proposed a broad plan of secularisation of the contemporary education system, with the possibly maximum limitation of the Church's influence and the replacement of catechetic sciences with civic and moral upbringing on the basis of the secular ideas of the revolutionary Republic of France[36].

The influences of fighting reason in modern culture and society are visible and symptomatic. Requests for the liberation of school from religion are often perceived as fight for secular values in education. Postulates concerning upbringing in the spirit of humanism, science and reason appeared also in socialistic upbringing in the People's Republic of Poland[37]. In the West, we can still observe the popularity of the "new atheism" movement – a philosophical current that tries to prove again the superiority of secular reason over retarded religion that hampers the scientific view of reality. The social, educational and media activity of advocates of this philosophical current resembles the old "secular enthusiasm" of French encyclopaedists.[38].

A pupil brought up in the spirit of secular and purely intellectual values has particular respect for the achievements of natural and physical sciences. He/she does not combine respect for the secular state with the recognition of religion prevailing in society, which he/she treats with reluctance, if not with hostility. We must remark here that scientific philosophy based on liberation from superstitions may turn into ideology quite easily. And ideology is not characterised by[39] the tendency to the neutral understanding of reality, but the inclination to represent only the selected cultural option (secular reason), sometimes also with the use of violence and force.

What is important in the analysis of this relation between philosophy and religion, is the conclusion that this relationship is a sort of obverse of the other face of the coin that is the rejection of reason by religion. This second sub-type of this relation may be historically older. Already the act of putting Socrates to death in a democratic voting by the Athenian people, where one of the strictly pedagogical accusations was the "demoralisation of youth", had its anti-philosophical context, too. It is not without reason that

---

[36] IWANICKI, J., *Secularisation processes vs. secular and postsecular philosophy. Traditions and modernity* (*Procesy sekularyzacyjne a filozofia sekularna i postsekularna. Tradycje i współczesność*), Poznań 2014, pp. 40–48.

[37] MAREK, Ł., BORTLIK-DŹWIERZYŃSKA, M., *Following Marx without God. The secularisation of social life in Poland in the years 1945–1989* (*Za Marksem bez Boga. Laicyzacja życia społecznego w Polsce w latach 1945–1989*), Katowice 2014, pp. 73–94.

[38] ROSZAK P., CONESCA, F., *A new atheism: really new? An analysis of arguments and challenges for modern theology* (*Nowy ateizm: czy rzeczywiście nowy? Analiza argumentów i wyzwań dla współczesnej teologii*), "Teologia i człowiek", vol. 25, 2014, pp. 79–100.

[39] GUTEK, G., *Philosophical and ideological…* (*Filozoficzne i ideologiczne…*), op. cit., pp. 142–160.

Socrates is regarded as a sort of philosophical martyr – a secular counterpart of Jesus Christ. Another manifestation of anti-philosophical religious passions was the proto-fideistic attitude of Tertullian – an ally of Christians living at the turn of the 3rd century AD. Combining religion with reason was treated this patristic thinker as useless and harmful for Christian faith[40]. He thought this could only lead to heresies and meanders of theology. In this approach, faith does not need support from reason, because it contains the whole truth and there is no point in using pagan intellectual tools for its understanding.

Fundamentalist positions with an anti-philosophical and anti-intellectual attitude are also manifested in some currents in contemporary Pentecostal Christianity[41], which is a new Evangelisation movement in the American world. This wave is beginning to reach Poland, because charismatic movements, mass religious meetings at stadiums and other manifestations of Pentecostalisation of religious life are popular in Polish Christianity. These modern religious changes may make serious contribution to the reinforcement of the anti-rationalist current in Christianity.

An example of religiousness hostile towards reason that is largely highlighted in the media although still not experienced in Poland is the wave of new Islam religiousness, which abandons the interpretation of jihad[42] as the believer's internal struggle with his own sins in favour of a war understood literally as a physical fight against infidels. Paradoxically, although new Islamic fundamentalism is a modern movement (it uses Western technologies in spite of non-acceptance of Western values), it strongly condemns the apparently degenerated secular culture of the West.

Fundamentalistic upbringing is aimed at saving the human being at any cost. Thus, it is better to convince a pupil that the enemy must be destroyed than to allow him to live an independent and free life. In this model, upbringing would be based on instilling a strictly theocratic and dualistic view of the world, with chosen ones observing the rigorous principles of religion on the one side and infidels participating in the spoiled secular culture on the other side. This model of upbringing is very exclusivist and confrontational, but it proves successful to a certain extent in the modern world.

The third relation between philosophy and religion proposed in this approach contains two apparently contradictory sub-types. In the first variant, it is the cultural dislike of secular reason towards religion, which is rooted in the European Enlightenment. In the second case, it is the reversal dislike of believers towards the rationalised secular culture. In fact, both positions are the same world view, because both promote a kind of permanent antagonism: the confrontational vision of the world that should be instilled in pupils in the radically secular or fundamentalist version, depending on the orientation.

---

[40] TERTULLIAN, *The prescription against heretics*, Polish translation: *Preskrypcja przeciw heretykom*, Kraków 2012, p. 15.

[41] PASEK, Z., *Pentecostalism: a monograph attempt* (*Ruch zielonoświątkowy: próba monografii*), Kraków 1992.

[42] See GRABOWSKI, W., *Islamic fundamentalism in the Middle East* (*Fundamentalizm islamski na Bliskim Wschodzie*), Gdańsk 2013.

Conclusion. Towards the fourth dialogical teleology of upbringing?

The above three types of teleology of upbringing based on various relationships between philosophy and religion seem to exhaust the possibilities that have occurred in the modern social and educational world. It must be noted, however, that all proposed relations of synthesis, common area and confrontation between philosophy and religion in the field of upbringing and education are certain ideal types[43]. The ideal type – a term proposed by sociologist Max Weber – is the idealisation of a given phenomenon that does not occur in the real social world. Therefore, in modern education we rarely deal with pure synthesis, ideal order or full animosity of the relation between philosophy and religion. In the actual place of modern education, i.e., family, school and other institutions, there are various mixtures and diffusions of the above positions.

We also seem to encounter increasingly often the fourth relation between philosophy and religion, which translates into teleological consequences in upbringing. This relation can be called dialogical. In this type of upbringing, special emphasis is laid on the virtue of dialogue and mutual understanding, without the elimination of actual differences. In this variant, it is still possible to be, for example, an advocate of secular culture and humanistic and scientific values, but with certain respect for religion. The Polish writer Stanisław Lem showed this type of attitude at a certain stage of life[44]. Simultaneously, an attitude based on far-fetched understanding for scientific culture and the secular world is emerging in modern time on the part of religion. It is both a postsecular current seeking the possibility of expressing religious concepts by means of secular language[45] and an interesting direction of modern theology that wants a dialogue with science and a positive confrontation of the religious view with new scientific discoveries[46]. The teleological & upbringing potential of such new model of dialogue may be only beginning to develop. It is a new challenge for the philosophy of upbringing to implement the value of dialogue and understanding in educational practice – both for the religious output and for the output of reason and philosophical culture. Without such a dialogue, it is difficult to imagine further progress in the development of philosophy and religion and, consequently, upbringing in the modern world.

---

[43] WEBER, M., *Economy and Society*, Polish translation: *Gospodarka i społeczeństwo*, Warszawa 2002, p. 16.

[44] M. Wolańczyk (ed.), *What connects us? A dialogue with non-believers* (*Co nas łączy?: dialog z niewierzącymi*), Kraków 2002.

[45] J. Iwanicki, *Secularisation processes…* (*Procesy sekularyzacyjne…*), op. cit., pp. 91–110.

[46] M. Heller, T. Pabjan, *The creation and beginning of the universe. Theology-philosophy-cosmology* (*Stworzenie i początek wszechświata. Teologia-filozofia-kosmologia*), Kraków 2013, pp. 89–145.

Bibliography

Sources

ARISTOTLE, *Metafizyka*, in: *Dzieła Wszystkie*, vol. 2, Warszawa 1990.
CONFUSIUS, *Dialogi*, Warszawa 2008.
HERODOTUS, *Dzieje*, Warszawa 2007.
HUSSERL, E., *Kryzys europejskiego człowieczeństwa a filozofia*, Warszawa 1993.
PLATO, *Państwo*, Kęty 2003.
TERTULLIAN, *Preskrypcja przeciw heretykom*, Kraków 2012.

Studies

ANZENBACHER, A., *Wprowadzenie do filozofii*, Kraków 2003.
ARMSTRONG, K., *Historia Boga*, Warszawa 1998.
BAATZ, U., *Buddyzm*, Warszawa 2002.
BANIAK, J., *Religia i jej rola w życiu ludzi w krytycznym spojrzeniu młodzieży. Analiza socjolo-giczna*, in: E. JELIŃSKI, Z. STACHOWSKI, S. SZTAJER (ed.), *Ratio, Religio, Humanitas. Miscelanea dedykowane Profesorowi Zbigniewowi Drozdowiczowi*, Poznań 2015.
CHESTERTON, G.K., *Święty Tomasz z Akwinu*, Warszawa 1974.
DROZDOWCZ, Z., *Filozofia Oświecenia*, Warszawa 2006.
GAJDA, J., *Sofiści*, Warszawa 1989.
GRABOWSKI, W., *Fundamentalizm islamski na Bliskim Wschodzie*, Gdańsk 2013.
GUTEK, G., *Filozoficzne i ideologiczne podstawy edukacji*, Gdańsk 2003.
HEINZMANN, R., *Filozofia średniowiecza*, Kęty 1999.
HELLER, M., PABJAN, T., *Stworzenie i początek wszechświata. Teologia-filozofia-kosmologia*, Kraków 2013.
IWANICKI, J., *Procesy sekularyzacyjne a filozofia sekularna i postsekularna. Tradycje i współczes-ność*, Poznań 2014.
IWANICKI, J., *Od religijności ewangelicznej do religijności obywatelskiej. Antynomie koncep-cji religijności w filozofii Jean-Jacques'a Rousseau*, "Humaniora. Czasopismo internetowe" no. 4(4)/2013.
JASPERS, K., *Autorytety: Sokrares, Budda, Konfucjusz, Jezus*, Warszawa 2000.
JOCZ, A., *Eschatologiczny pluralizm neognostycznych ruchów religijnych – antropozofia Rudolfa Steinera i "Lectorium Rosicrucianum" Jana van Rijckenborgha*, in: Z. DROZDOWICZ, Z.W., PUŚLECKI, (ed.), *Adaptacja przez transformacje*, Poznań 2001.
KELLER, J. (ed.), *Religie Azji. Afryki, Ameryki, Australii i Oceanii*, Warszawa 1980.
KNOTT, K., *Hinduizm*, Warszawa 2000.
KOLASA, D., *Sytuacje możliwe a sytuacje graniczne w filozofii Jaspersa*, in: "Studia z Historii Filozofii", no. 1/2010.
KOŁAKOWSKI, L., *Czy diabeł może być zbawiony i 27 innych kazań*, Kraków 2006.
KROKIEWICZ, A., *Arystoteles, Pirron i Plotyn*, Warszawa 1974.
KUPISIEWICZ, CZ., *Z dziejów teorii i praktyki wychowania*, Kraków 2012.
MAREK, Ł., BORTLIK-DŹWIERZYŃSKA, M., *Za Marksem bez Boga. Laicyzacja życia społecz-nego w Polsce w latach 1945–1989*, Katowice 2014.
MCPHERRAN, M.L., *Religia Sokratesa*, Warszawa 2014.
MINNERATH, R., *Sobory*, Warszawa 2004.
PASEK, Z., *Ruch zielonoświątkowy: próba monografii*, Kraków 1992.

Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozoficzna, vol. 2, Lublin 2001.

REALE, G., *Historia filozofii starożytnej*, vol. 1, Lublin 2000.

REALE, G., *Historia filozofii starożytnej*, vol. 2, Lublin 2001.

ROSZAK, P., CONESCA, F., *Nowy ateizm: czy rzeczywiście nowy? Analiza argumentów i wyzwań dla współczesnej teologii*, "Teologia i człowiek", vol. 25, 2014.

SAWICKA, J., *Osobliwość empiryczna doświadczenia religijnego. William James i duchowy pragmatyzm*, in: "Idea. Studia nad strukturą i rozwojem pojęć filozoficznych", vol. 24, 2012.

SUCH, J., SZCZEŚNIAK, M., *Ontologia przyrodnicza*, Poznań 2001.

WEBER, M., *Gospodarka i społeczeństwo*, Warszawa 2002.

WĘCŁAWSKI, T., *Wspólny świat religii*, Kraków 1995.

WIŚNIEWSKI, L., *Blask wolności*, Kraków 2015.

WOLAŃCZYK, M. (ed.), *Co nas łączy?: dialog z niewierzącymi*, Kraków 2002.