

ZDEŇKA BRAUMOVÁ
ORCID 0000-0001-9951-9707

PAVEL KLIMENT
ORCID 0000-0003-1757-103X

*Technical University of Liberec
Czech Republic*

REFLECTIONS ON INCLUSION. AN ESSAY ON IDEOLOGICAL CONTRADICTION, EXPECTATIONS AND A SEARCH FOR MEANING

ABSTRACT. Braumová Zdeňka, Kliment Pavel, *Reflections on Inclusion. An Essay on Ideological Contradiction, Expectations and a Search for Meaning* [Refleksje na temat inkluzji. Rozprawa o ideologicznej sprzeczności, oczekiwaniach i poszukiwaniu sensu]. *Studia Edukacyjne* no. 72, 2024, Poznań 2024, pp. 99-111. Adam Mickiewicz University Press. ISSN 1233-6688. Submitted: 13.02.2024. Accepted: 1.03.2024. DOI: 10.14746/se.2024.72.7

Is it widely known *what inclusion is*? Is there a difference between inclusion and integration? There are many opinions and answers that reveal a low level of understanding. The certain elusiveness of inclusion is both an advantage and a pitfall. The ambiguity of interpretation allows for greater reflection and exploration. However, it also hinders society-wide understanding since meaning is only given to inclusion by individuals through a unique understanding tied to individual experience and context of meaning. We present here our take on the issue, deliberately raising questions without requiring strict answers, as an inspiration for welcome discussion and reflection.

Key words: inclusion, idea, value, humanity, diversity, acceptance

Inclusion as an ideal – a path to humanity

The impulse to reflect on inclusion was the repeated experience of misunderstanding inclusion as such. The question: *What is inclusion?* often arouses embarrassment among interviewees and mostly evasive or unspecific answers. Inclusion itself is often burdened with prejudice and misunderstanding. It is mostly related to *school inclusion* and few find a broader dimension. For there is mainly an *a posteriori* attitude towards inclusion, which stems

precisely from experience, from how inclusion shows up in practice. In our country, how it is implemented in the school environment. Which proved to be the stimulus and challenge for writing a paper that reflects on its form and what the inclusive mindset consists of, what are the pitfalls and meaning contradictions on the way to understanding it. Often the way it is enforced in practice negates and ,destroys' it itself – its idea.

Inclusion is not a condition, a reality. It is a way of looking at the world, at others. This idea can be likened to knowledge and cognition. When knowledge is the achievement of wholeness in knowing, the achievement of knowledge of the world, the universe, everything. But this knowledge is not finite, it is constantly changing, evolving (or not evolving). Knowledge presumes a certain understanding and comprehension of knowledge that is constantly deepening and is not finite (Olšovský 2018, p. 447; Braumová, 2022, p. 102). Knowledge is therefore a process, a movement, it is ultimately changeable. Then all-encompassing knowledge is not realizable. However, knowledge is possible; it is a process leading to deepening understanding. Just as knowledge is not a graspable given, inclusion itself is not possible in the ideal. It is a process, preferably a society-wide one, which, to a greater (or lesser) extent, moves towards the ideal of inclusion. However, even this direction changes, it changes in time, place, but especially in relation to the bearer(s) (Braumová, 2023, p. 88). There should be an alignment of a priori and a posteriori cognition, where individual cognitions emerge from experiences and are directed back into them to establish (confirm/not confirm) the experiences. Experience is established/confirmed when it becomes knowledge (knowing, understanding). Apriori cognition forms the basic structure of a particular understanding, aposterior cognition brings about the concrete knowledge that saturates the understanding. Aposteriori attitude in relation to inclusion tends to prevail, where expectations feed it, and understanding of the new is shaped mainly or exclusively by previous experience.

Inclusion (sometimes called social) in its ideal form represents interaction, an interpersonal relationship that is based on a sense of belonging and acceptance (Simplican et al., 2015). A general definition is difficult to find and establish because, for example, according to Artiles, Kozleski, Dorn and Christensen (2006), the lack of an agreed definition stems from differences in perspective and context in inclusion research, which is reflected in the layering of ethnic, social and educational issues (Artiles et al., 2006). While this can be agreed with, there is still a need to try to capture the general meaning of the term. Inclusion in the *general sense* is not related to education. School inclusion is a certain niche, a way of practically grasping inclusive ideas. In general it is a social dimension, a human dimension. When society is shaped by individuals who are truly part of it. They are accepted in their diversity,

not just tolerated. They have a privileged position in their uniqueness. And society is the set of these individuals who are (should be) viewed inclusively (naturally). That is, individuals view others through an inclusive lens. But since inclusion itself is not a given, this optic is tied to the individual and the degree of inclusion tends (must) vary. Which of course corresponds to the above, true knowledge is not possible, but cognition is. *Inclusion is not possible, inclusive viewing of the other is. Seeing with elements of inclusion – accepting the other according to individual (human) possibilities. Inclusion would then be a kind of acceptance. We will come to the conditions of acceptance (what makes acceptance acceptance) later (= acceptance of diversity).*

In the context of *humanity*, we see inclusion as a transformative way to strengthen authentic interconnectedness, empathy and a sense of belonging among individuals in society. „Humanity is a precious commodity (...) It is true that Western civilization has made extraordinary advances in scientific and technological knowledge over the last century, bringing it unprecedented power and wealth. Humanity, however, is falling behind, even in crisis. The culture of abundance and prosperity contrasts sharply with the reality of the misery of millions of starving, destitute, illiterate or marginalised individuals and entire nations, whom the ‚civilised‘ world cannot help because it has enough problems of its own. Its advanced technocracy generates many „side“ dehumanizing effects such as the objectification of man, alienating individuation, indifference or the dehumanization of interpersonal relations. Instead of the hoped-for progress of humanity, sociologists point to the reality of a dramatic decline in moral literacy, a decline in social capital (man does not trust man), threats of global self-destruction, clashes of civilizations, various forms of extremism, etc. Man as a human person is even considered an „endangered species“ (Hábl, 2017, p. 10). The ideal of inclusion as a *path to humanity* goes beyond the mere physical presence of individuals and involves creating an environment that supports understanding, respect and acceptance of different perspectives and experiences. Through inclusion, individuals are encouraged to recognize and appreciate the unique qualities and contributions of themselves and others, leading to the cultivation of society. This journey towards humanity through inclusion and towards its essence is both a goal and a starting point (it gradually establishes itself in the mind). And it encourages individuals to move from tolerance to true acceptance and appreciation of the richness that diversity brings to the human experience. Moreover, the concept of *inclusion as a pathway to humanity* goes beyond individual interactions to encompass broader social structures and systems that promote equity, justice and equal opportunity for all. However, it cannot be assumed that application in the school setting is sufficient: The project of inclusive pedagogy – like all such radical projects – is itself essentially bipolar. It implies, at one pole, the unques-

tionable mission of a humanist pedagogy and, at the other pole, the equally unquestionable danger that, if applied inappropriately, it may harm the very people it seeks to help ..." (Lechta, 2016, p. 34).

The inclusive aspiration to achieve the maximum possible level of inclusion in society, and therefore in each of us, must extend to all areas of human life and coexistence with others. But especially to the *essence of individuals (self-definition)*. This ideal includes the pursuit of the promotion of the individual who is concerned about himself, who cares about his own being. Then also the effort to create an environment where all individuals are respected and recognized regardless of their gender, race, nationality, religion or other characteristics. Even with the knowledge and acceptance that this is ultimately not possible.

Humanity/acceptance of diversity – a metaphor for inclusion

The humanity that appears in inclusion and stems from inclusion is related to humanity, which is based on „the idea of a humanly appropriate, fulfilled relationship to another human being in the otherness of his or her being“ (Horyna et al., 1998, p. 177). Humanity is not given to a person, it is not found in this state automatically and naturally. It is the goal of educational efforts, to strive for the good in man. Humanity is a striving towards the good (Květoňová et al., 2020). Humanity is not goodness itself. Humanity is a movement, a fate of bonds in relationships. Humanity needs for its movement the other, the other in its otherness. There is clear evidence that difference is taken into account as an essential aspect of human development (Florian et al., 2013). Which is essential for an ever-changing society. Otherness and its acceptance can be enriching. „Otherness can stimulate the growth of new meaning; by making otherness (transcendence) available, truth is given to us“ (Olšovský, 2018, p. 172). The natural acceptance of diversity helps to truly dwell with others. Many „non-experts on inclusion“ are them without knowing it. Inclusive cues can be seen in all kinds of things, even where we would not primarily look for them (for example, in fiction). „Well, every thing becomes what we make of it“ (Thorén, 1942, p. 65). Recognizing that acceptance is the essence of inclusion, everyone is part of society, is a prerequisite for sustaining and thriving in 21st century society.

As already mentioned, „it can be assumed that an inclusive approach to the other is based on humanism, (...) in which the central place is occupied by the human being in his liberation to his own dignity and nobility, to a pure (ideal, honest) humanity“ (Olšovský, 2018, p. 143). This humanness/humanity is based on a genuine openness to differences. When we consider otherness

as what is bearing and desirable, what makes a person human. Whose existence we not only tolerate, but also create and support. The realization that the same is impossible sets us free. And it defines the essence of inclusive thinking. For it is by seeing others in their own uniqueness, being in relationship and respect, that we simultaneously embrace and create inclusive thought. We can live not only side by side, but especially together. It is natural to see the world through different eyes (Brumova, 2023). Diversely and respectfully.

However, there is a big „difference between *an inclusive and an integrative approach*. In integration, I look at the other through the lens of adaptation. Whether consciously or not, I demand that the other be defined by me or others. In doing so, I consider myself (or others) *to be a normal being*, i.e., a person whose defining does not take place in a border zone, standing on the edge of (or outside of) „normality.“ He is what I call an in-liner. I consider myself a person who claims to define „normality“ (or conforms to the social consensus). In an inclusive approach, there is no need to define „normality“ as such; we do not work with frequency of occurrence. We accept the person in his or her uniqueness, respecting both our own difference and the difference of others. We consider the norm to be precisely the realization that *sameness does not exist*. So no one adapts to anyone else. I may be getting to know you through me, but that doesn't mean that an evaluative attitude towards the other is in the lead. It only leads one's own way of grasping (perceiving) the world, reality. Integration can be seen as a kind of preparation. A stage that is a necessity on the way to inclusion in everyday life, practice. And this on condition that we respect the statement that inclusion is the highest named stage of approaches to individuals so far“ (Braumova, 2023, p. 89). Is it? However, even this acceptance has its limitations, relating to the other person needs the other person and „...one should not love someone else if the other person does not allow him to do so...“ (Thorén, 1942, p. 55). One cannot truly accept the other person if one is not being accepted or if one cannot be accepting and accept oneself. There is therefore, unfortunately, a very thin line of realizing/not realizing acceptance of diversity. For example, prejudices tend to be barriers to relationships. A prejudice is a preconceived notion, a critically unassessed judgment that is not based on one's own experience, and the resulting attitude (Hartl, Hartlová, 2010, p. 454), and the complex conscious work with them. This easily leads to stigmatization. Furthermore, one can cite, for example, the existence of positive discrimination, which in effect denies the acceptance of diversity, as it seeks to ‚normalise‘ or even suppress otherness. Thus, „normality“ is a state that corresponds to habituality, typicality, regularity, expectation; it is a state that corresponds to the norm (Kroupová et al., 2016, p. 35). „... it is more difficult to define the notion of a „normal“ personality, because such a definition also determines who, or why, is not normal. In our

own cultural settings, most of us are good at distinguishing the extremes – the person who usually thinks, feels, lives, behaves, from the person who is significantly different in some way. We understand the term usually as “normally” (Drtilová, Koukolík, 1994, p. 111). What may be “normal” for one group of people may not be for another, nor is it necessary to strive for it. One cannot remedy difference towards “normal” and talk about inclusion. Let’s be careful with the term ‘normal’, it is fundamentally incompatible with the idea of embracing diversity. Neither does the term ‘intact’. Both can be a fundamental contradiction in the search for the essence of inclusion. For inclusive education, for example, is a concrete tool for transformation, a human right and a democratic way of understanding values and forming beliefs that welcome (demand and celebrate) human diversity (Rieser, 2005). There is a need not to destroy diversity or ‘normalise’ it, to use the term under discussion.

Further, inclusion (not only in practice) is complicated by, for example, a lack of diversity (“variety”), not a real one. But diversity unconscious (unnamed) can undermine inclusive direction. Diversity reveals differences. Inclusion treats them towards humanity. The conditions of acceptance are what make acceptance acceptance. Strengthening respect and acceptance of difference must be based on the experiencing of difference and one’s own belief in its importance. From the experienced we can create another reality. It should be highlighted, but in moderation and sensitively, so that it does not turn into positive discrimination (“minorities”). The term discrimination must be treated with great care in the context of inclusion, as must the terms minority, majority, etc. There is a contradiction of the “minority/majority and normality” perspective, of difference. (Not only) in the extreme, there can be positive discrimination against “normality”. When “normality” becomes a “minority” and efforts are made to restore it. We can then move in an endless circle that is based on naming difference not for the sake of strengthening inclusive thinking, but for the sake of “artificial” support in building equality. “Pseudo-individuality” because it does not seek equality of opportunity and respect for the other, but the capture of groups and sub-groups of people for the purpose of their “development”. But it is not about the essence – capturing the uncapturable – of difference in its uniqueness. This acceptance of diversity as an uncapturable uniqueness must then be based on respect for diversity and a genuine belief that the diversity of individuals is natural and desirable. And that it is actually endowed with a certain amount of mystery. And then that social life also consists of the diverse lives of its members. Naturally.

Humanity seems to be an apt metaphor for inclusion/acceptance of diversity. Equally, however, inclusion is a metaphor for humanity/acceptance of diversity. We are moving in a circle of meanings where one meaning feeds and defines the other, and vice versa. It is a kind of encounter with the self, where I try

to „understand myself in relation to the other“ (Květoňová et al., 2020, p. 30). To reveal the true self. When I relate to another individual in dialogue (even silent). And recognizing that „the other also refers to himself or herself as „I“ is the basis of recognizing the other as someone who is „like me“, who is equal to me in terms of rights and responsibilities“ (Květoňová et al., 2020, p. 30). If I am in a relationship, I am expressing respect in a certain way, but this respect is based on self-respect, that is, on the ability to be in relationship with oneself. When, at the same time, „I cannot express respect for myself without assigning to the other the same possibility of respecting myself as a capable object“ (Ricoeur, p. 12). Thus, of course, the other contributes to my self-respect. Inclusion in the mind then manifests itself in *kindness, „goodness“ in deed, equally in trust in the possibility of encountering oneself.*

How to get closer to the ideal of inclusion?

Part of inclusion as a path to humanity is its promotion and reflection in social and institutional structures. Inclusion is not only a question of individuals and their individual behaviour, but also a question of policies, legislation and institutional practices and approaches. These structures must be designed to support and ensure the ideas of inclusion of all individuals through inclusive policies, programmes and environments.

Individualism versus *collectivism* seems to be a particular contradiction in the way and possibilities of achieving the maximum level of inclusion in society: some people prefer an individualistic approach that emphasises individual rights and freedoms. The individual, i.e. the person, is of central importance in different contexts. It is believed that inclusion should be based on the protection and support of individual autonomy and that group selfishness is a threat (Horyna et al., 1998). On the contrary, the collectivist approach emphasizes social solidarity and shared responsibility for supporting all members of society, regardless of their individual needs and abilities. Personal interests can be subordinated to the interests of society (Horyna et al., 1998), and individual interests suppressed. The question is whether personal interests then naturally clash with societal ones. It is suggested that this contradiction should not be seen as a source of conflict, but precisely as a source of richness and diversity in society. Then inclusion itself can be the link between individualism and collectivism. The search for a unique path allows us to draw on both approaches and to blend personal interests with societal ones. A certain focus on the individual must be maintained. It is individuals who are capable of embarking on a transformation of minds towards inclusion, according to their own needs, ways and preferences. The freedom of the individual is paramount, self-determination

and the use of one's own reason and reasoning with the assumption of oneself as a conscious subject – autonomous – is absolutely essential (Horyna et al., 1998). Then the individual can be *authentic* – trustworthy, responsible to oneself, to others. Only under this condition can the journey of inclusion be started, inclusive ideas spread among authenticities. At the same time, the journey must be directed towards the collective, without, of course, losing oneself, alienating oneself. This interpersonal cohesion must be built not on mere group membership, but above all on common good/humanity and relationships – authentic connections. Individualities are and must be part of groups, with the understanding that collective interests are very important, but not threatening to individual consciousness and freedom. There is still a degree of assertiveness, but with regard to personal and social responsibility. Responsibility is „a human moral characteristic arising (opening up) from one's conscience, happening within a certain moral reality and value order... the source of true humanity... is always responsibility to oneself... after all, it is responsibility for planet Earth“ (Olšovský, 2018, p. 262). We are clearly responsible to ourselves, but also to the whole, to others. The contradiction between individualism and collectivism can manifest itself in many areas, such as political systems, economic policies, the position of the individual in society, educational policies, etc. It appears to be a difficult task for individuals and society to find a solution, which is why inclusion itself is an ideal and the paths to it take different forms. It is the intermingling of individualism and collectivism that is a major challenge for society as a whole. Perhaps inclusion is the best link. Inclusion allows us to transcend barriers and prejudices and to develop relationships based on mutual respect and solidarity. When we are inclusive, we acknowledge diversity and embrace humanity in its many forms as a value. For it is only when value establishes certainty that action/decision-making then emerges from certainty (Janata, 2022, p. 78).

The inclusive-minded accepts, allows the other to enter into the relationship without assuming, believing, that the relationship will take place. He is *courageous* in his ability to enter into the possibilities of encounter. Which may seem irresponsible. However, responsibility is shown precisely in the desire and ability to relate without the knowledge of „successful“ consequences. In the ability to make choices. „(...) we make decisions at moments when we are unable to assess the consequences of our decisions. Therein lies the strength and weakness of man“ (Janata, 2022, p. 78). This inability also provides us with freedom to a certain extent. If I don't know the outcome, I don't know how it will turn out; to some extent I am free from being bound to knowing the outcome, which could narrow the range of my decision-making options. Uncertainty, however, accompanies this freedom (Janata, 2022). It is only values that point the way towards certainty, which guides our actions. Uncer-

tainty between decision and action is common. However, there are „situations where we are confident in our decisions. This ‚certainty‘ would not be itself if it were not supported by the values on the basis of which we arrive at certainty“ (Janata, 2022, pp. 78-79). „The purely value-rational is the person who, regardless of foreseeable consequences, acts in the service of his convictions about what duty, dignity, beauty, religious injunction, piety, or the seriousness of some ‚thing‘ of whatever kind seems to command. Only when human action is oriented towards such requirements – which happens in a varying, but mostly quite modest number of cases – can we speak of value rationality“ (Weber, 1998, p. 157). And in line with Weber’s reference to values, let us take inclusion as value-, not purpose-, rational. Because we are moving in the field of ideas, of the good, of acceptance. If we are convinced of the essence of inclusion, it is compelling to us, our actions will be directed towards inclusion. Not without error, directly, easily, but perhaps with partial success (in practical grasping). Inclusion can then be seen as an uneasy path to humanity. Because it emphasizes the importance of recognizing and respecting each individual regardless of their different characteristics, abilities or identity. This path has rational value. When individuals, society, tread this path, they strengthen the capacity for empathy, understanding and respect along the way. So that everyone can feel valued, respected, connected to others, safe, ... – to know and express the authentic self.

Education for inclusion – natural diversity

Inclusion can take place in a certain way throughout society, but the extent of it depends on the culture, politics, and maturity of the group. It is the state of mind of the individuals in a society. Raising and schooling, aspects that have a major impact on the functioning of society, are the main pillars for a well-functioning society. In a word, education. It is at the forefront of political, professional and general public interest. But what is education and schooling in inclusive terms? Upbringing as a deliberate action on an individual that is directed towards a specific goal (Čáp, Mareš, 2007, p. 247). Education that includes inclusive values should have as its main goal the guidance to accept the other in his/her uniqueness, without reservations, rejection, etc. Through education, although difficult to separate from upbringing, everyone can become who they really are (Olšovský, 2018, p. 466). But how? It should coincide with the stated goal, to teach the individual to accept, above all, the *SELF and the other* in uniqueness, originality, inimitability. Towards humanity. Education = some form of moving towards humanity/inclusion.

Education itself, however, is wrapped in many mysteries; man is a being who educates and is educated. It cannot be reduced to social (institutional) education. Together with Fink, we need to reopen the essence of education as such. He argues that all reflective education is dilemmatic – it involves the objective demands of education and its subjective possibilities (Fink, 1978, pp. 24-26), which stems both from the nature of education and from the (powerlessness) of the educator to capture life itself. Man in his conception is open (free), unfinished, imperfect, formless. And the task of education is to give oneself form (Fink, 1978). „Freedom is the basis that makes all education possible...Where a nation or humanity has decided to give itself form, a living and powerful self-understanding (Selbstver-ständnis) is realized, education (Bildung) is realized. Man is thus the site of the realization of education (Pelcová, 2001). Education is therefore a movement unknown in advance, which is unanchored, it is a movement of life (Pelcová, 2001). The unanchoredness creates the precondition for education, at the same time through education man acquires form, himself. Education is therefore the beginning and the goal of life cycles. According to Fink, the purpose of education is to create understanding and self-understanding. When understanding is shown in the question. Self-understanding, too. „Only the one who asks knows what is being discussed. Only the one who asks is interested“ (Pelcova, 2001, p. 148). Education also asks – in essence, only wonder feeds knowledge (self-understanding, understanding). Education involves inclusion. It must, always to some extent. If I ask for the essence of being human, of meaning, I also ask for a form of acceptance – of self, of the other. „Of all that lives and breathes on earth and under the heavens, man is the greatest enigma (...) by the mystery of human life, the problem of education is saturated, permeated, and determined (...) man has no essence within himself, he has it outside himself, he must seek it while he lives“ (Fink, 1978, pp. 35-46). Man is imperfect, education is a support in the search for oneself in imperfection, it is directed towards self-education. If inclusion is the ultimate form of self-acceptance, the greatest possible, then education-self-education becomes as a result of inclusion. Because, the essence – the purpose and goal of education is the greatest possible knowledge of self with self-acceptance and the ability to educate oneself. Humanity shows itself in inclusion and springs into and out of it (it is a movement). Thus, education is the pathway to humanity/self-education/inclusion and at the same time humanity/self-education/inclusion itself. When, of course, we are not striving for *the chimera of perfect beings*. We work with this awareness and strive to develop potential, especially for ourselves. Moving towards imperfection in the context of education (inclusion) can also encourage humility, empathy and respect for self and others, a certain relief in the demands of education. For we recognize that we are all in a developmental, life cycle, authentic interconnectedness. Unique in a unique life context.

Although it seems obvious that complete and unconditional acceptance of every individual in all situations is not possible in practice, there are many factors (e.g., personal assumptions and biases, cultural norms, social stereotypes, and emotional reactions) that can affect an individual's ability to accept another person. Thus, inclusion (the ideal) is not possible. Which is of course, paradoxically, its greatest task, to work towards the ideal self – that is THE task of education/inclusion. None of us are able to truly accept everyone. But it is still important to strive to create a respectful society that embraces diversity to the widest extent possible. This can include working to raise awareness, fostering empathy and understanding towards others, and actively working to overcome prejudice and stereotypes. These steps can lead to greater understanding, harmony. Let us try to return to the child's view of the other. Perhaps we can learn much. Children can be natural teachers, perhaps even parents (towards children). Children often „know“ how to look at the other through „inclusive“ eyes, they are closest to inclusion and actually educate the educator (roles are intertwined). And they do this in wonder and an attempt to relate. In their apparent imperfection, on the brink of socialization, they boldly enter into relationships. Let us observe them. Children directly accept in awe until they are socially burdened. Some adults can also do it from time to time. Those who carry the „soul“ of a child. Aren't they the ones closest to perfection? Maybe it's a way of being raised and thus educating. Education as a life movement emphasizes that it is not itself an unchanging process, but a continuous and dynamic movement that accompanies a person throughout his or her life. We move in a whirlwind of events and knowledge. Everyone is constantly exposed to new situations, challenges and opportunities, which have an impact on our thinking, behaviour and values. May inclusion be a value that we reinforce/strengthen together.

We, the authors of the article, who are value-rational (in relation to inclusion), are looking for specific ways to promote inclusive ideas in practice. We are not only moving in the theoretical field. We focus on the method of *dialogic reading*, which is relational reading. And it is based on an interactive behaviour that consists of consciously being with the other and involves asking open questions, actively following the child's interest and praise and encouragement from the guide (Lever, Sénéchal, 2011). Thus, we work consistently and intensively with a tool to reinforce an inclusive mindset, educating with fiction (books with stories) both children and teachers or interested members of the public. Because by discovering specific ways to promote the idea of inclusion, we see it as a unique (not the only) way to bring inclusion into the consciousness of society, in a non-violent, non-mentor and experiential way. We try, together with others, to recognize the deeper layers within us.

Finally and in hope

Moving towards inclusion seems necessary in today's world. Even the very idea (essence) of inclusion is, in our opinion, unquestionable, although perhaps only sometimes and not easily grasped. When the path to it is full of contradictions and difficulties. Obviously, it is difficult to really promote the ideas of something that we have little (no) understanding of. Terminology needs to be handled with care and sensitivity. Imprecise labels often lead to misunderstanding, fear and sometimes resistance to the ideas of inclusion. So do rigid and dogmatic statements. Perhaps and let us hope that the idea of inclusion is the solution. Let us wish that the paths are as least prickly as possible so that the idea of inclusion does not gradually fade away. Inclusion is confused with integration, for example. We often misunderstandably segregate certain groups under the assumption of inclusiveness, etc. May inclusion *not deny itself as a result* – if the ideal is unrealistic and the journey is sometimes the fulfilment of absurdities, it is no easy task. But even a difficult task has a solution. These solutions show up, for example, in the school inclusion steps. In willingness, effort and desire, examples of good practice can be discovered in oneself and others. Because inclusion is only revealed in practical grasping, in action. We will continue to deepen our knowledge of inclusion, specifically, for example, by looking for the paradoxes of inclusive education, but with the aim of motivating its promotion and application on a wider and better scale. After all, the meaning of inclusion is given by individuals, individuals who are part of society! The question remains whether this will be enough. Bottom of Form

Gratitude. We would like to thank Prof. Bogusław Marian Śliwerski for his expert advice and support.

Authors contributions

The authors confirms being the sole contributor of this work.

REFERENCES

Studies

- Braumová, Z. (2022). *Školní krůčky k niternosti*. Praha: H&H
- Čáp, J., Mareš, J. (2007). *Psychologie pro učitele*. Praha: Portál
- Drtilová, J., Koukolík, F. (1994). *Odlíšné dítě*. Praha: Vyšehrad
- Fink, E. (1978). *Grundfragen der systematischen Pädagogik*. Freiburg: Rombach
- Hábl, J. (2017). *Aby člověk neupadal v nadčlověka*. Červený Kostelec: Pavel Mervart
- Hartl, P., Hartlová, H. (2010). *Velký psychologický slovník*. Praha: Portál
- Horyna, B. et al. (1998). *Filosofický slovník*. Olomouc: Nakladatelství Olomouc
- Janata, M. (2022). *Voda a diamanty. Hodnoty – zlo – dobro*. Praha: Malvern
- Kroupová, K. (2016). *Slovník speciálněpedagogické terminologie: vybrané pojmy*. Praha: Grada
- Květoňová, L. et al. (2020). *Lze vychovávat k úctě a sebeúctě?* Praha: UK
- Lechta, V. (2016). *Inkluzivní pedagogika*. Praha: Portál
- Olšovský, J. (2018). *Slovník filosofických pojmů současnosti*. Praha: Vyšehrad
- Pelcová, N. (2001). *Vzorce lidství*. Praha: ISV nakladatelství
- Ricoueur, P. (1993). *Já hodné uznání a úcty*. Filosofický časopis 1/1993
- Thorén, F. (1942). *Z ohně a vzduchu jsem... (III.)*. Praha: Světový literární klub
- Weber, M. (1998). *Základní sociologické pojmy*. In: *Metodologie, sociologie a politika*. Praha: OIKOYMENH

Online resources

- Artiles, A.J., Kozleski, E.B., Dorn, S., Christensen, C.A. (2006). *Chapter 3: learning in inclusive education research: re-mediating theory and methods with a transformative agenda*. Review of Research in Education, 30(1), 65-108. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732x030001065>
- Braumová, Z. (2023). *Inkluze se odehrává v mysli. Esej o inkluzivních hodnotách odkazu Malého prince*. Gramotnost, pregramotnost a vzdělávání: Žáci se speciálními vzdělávacími potřebami v kontextu vzdělávání. 19,1(7), 87-97. <https://doi.org/10.14712/25337890.3143>
- Florian, L., Spratt, J. (2013). *Enacting inclusion: a framework for interrogating inclusive practice*. European Journal of Special Needs Education, 28(2), 119-135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2013.778111>
- Lever, R., Sénéchal, M. (2011). *Discussing stories: on how a dialogic reading intervention improves kindergartners' oral narrative construction*. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 108(1), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2010.07.002>
- Rieser, R. (2009). *Inclusion, empowerment and the vital role of disabled people and their thinking*. Inclusive Education Across Cultures: Crossing Boundaries, Sharing Ideas, 365-379. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9788132108320.n25>
- Simplican, S.C., Leader, G., Kosciulek, J.F., Leahy, M.J. (2015). *Defining social inclusion of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities: an ecological model of social networks and community participation*. Research in Developmental Disabilities, 38, 18-29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2014.10.008>