

Mária Potočárová¹  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6608-3449>

Comenius University in Bratislava

CONSERVATIVE IDEAS IN PEDAGOGICAL THINKING OF PHENOMENOLOGIST JÁN PATOČKA AND PERSONALIST LADISLAV HANUS²

S u m m a r y: In this paper we focus on the reflection of conservative ideas reflected in pedagogical thinking. The conservative trend in the philosophy of education is presented in a selection of two representatives from the environment of the former Czechoslovakia, who lived and were active in the period of totalitarian real socialism. We present the philosopher and phenomenologist Ján Patočka and the personalist and theologian Ladislav Hanus. Both of them are united by the fact that their works are based on the common philosophical direction of phenomenology and existentialism. In addition, both representatives, above all, through their personal life stories, have been committed to humanistic and conservative values, for which they had to endure persecution during the totalitarian period. They tried to pass on their convictions through the formation, upbringing and education of the younger generation. This common purpose also linked them to pedagogy, to the development of philosophical pedagogical thinking. This article will compare the philosophical views of both, as well as the personalistic and anthropological conceptions of society that were rooted in phenomenology as well as in the tradition of Christian humanism. The contribution of the life and work of J. Patočka and L. Hanus remains significant for contemporary pedagogy and philosophy of education. The paper has also attempted to add some of the basic knowledge of philosophy of education needed in the education of future teachers.

Ke y w o r d s: conservatism, pedagogical thought, Ján Patočka, Ladislav Hanus

¹ Prof. PhDr. Mária Potočárová, Ph.D. – Professor of Pedagogy at the Department of Pedagogy, Faculty of Education, Comenius University, Moskovská 3, 813 34 Bratislava, Slovak Republic; e-mail: maria.potocarova@uniba.sk.

² The paper is an output of the KEGA grant project – Project No. 046UK-4/2021: Supporting the implementation of moral education in primary school: applied research and methodological material for teachers.

Introduction

The ideas of different philosophical, cultural, religious as well as social systems and political regimes have inspired not only the conditions of ordinary human life, but also the direction of science, including pedagogical knowledge. The influence of concepts of pedagogical thought, its currents, and ideas is evident in both pedagogical theories and pedagogical research.³ Tracing the development of pedagogical thinking and the transmission of the cultural values of civilization across historical periods is a key starting point for understanding the current state of pedagogy and the overall future direction of education. It should be emphasized that students majoring in pedagogy or teaching academic subjects are the ones who are preparing themselves most for the direct realities of school education and practice. In addition to well-mastered didactic training, and methodologies, students need to know the roots and ideological background of various pedagogical concepts. They need to be familiar with the development of pedagogical thinking in different historical periods, at least in the European area. The influence of these concepts is also concretised in the content of courses that prepare teachers and educators for direct educational situations and the practice of their further pedagogical activity. Therefore, pedagogical action understood as an art, or as a way of formation through education and training, is not only a methodological, content and didactic or organizational issue but also a philosophical one.

Today, we live in a free, democratic, but often antagonistic age of pluralistic opinions. The vast diversity brings enormous difficulties in understanding and respecting each other. It is particularly challenging to conduct a balanced and cultivated dialogue on philosophical and axiological questions of life, which are also automatically reflected in school practice. Despite the diversity of value worlds of individuals and society at large, finding consensus is not easy, especially when trying to establish a kind of “neutrality” of opinion.

The paper focuses on the reflection of conservative ideas reflected in pedagogical thinking in Slovakia and the Czech Republic. This is demonstrated in

³ Here is an example of a multi-year continuous research project, mapping the development of European pedagogical thinking in a historical-philosophical context, which was carried out at the University of Trnava, Faculty of Education in Trnava.

This is presented by the research publication outputs: Blanka Kudláčová, *Európske pedagogické myslenie od antiky po modernu* (Trnava: Trnavská univerzita / VEDA, 2010); Blanka Kudláčová, Andrej Rajský, *Európske pedagogické myslenie (od moderny k postmoderne po súčasnosť)* (Trnava: Trnavská univerzita / VEDA, 2012); Blanka Kudláčová, *Pedagogické myslenie a školstvo na Slovensku v medzivojnovom období* (Trnava: Trnavská univerzita, 2015); eadem, *Pedagogické myslenie a školstvo na Slovensku od konca 2. svetovej vojny po obdobie normalizácie* (Trnava: Trnavská univerzita, 2017); eadem, *Pedagogické myslenie, školstvo a vzdelávanie na Slovensku v rokoch 1945–1989* (Trnava: Trnavská univerzita, 2019).

a selection of two representatives who, in their works, through the philosophical outlook of phenomenology and personalism, but mainly through their personal lives, also subscribed to conservative and humanistic values. The Czech philosopher Ján Patočka and the Slovak theologian and philosopher Ladislav Hanus will be introduced.

It will be shown how they conveyed their philosophical ideas without ideologizing, with a sense of the human person understood through the lens of phenomenology, personalism and Christian anthropology. They used a dialogical form open to pluralism to disseminate their ideas. In doing so, they planted deep roots for a conservative current in thought that was naturally antagonistic to communism, anti-communist, and critical of liberalism, but at the same time rejecting nationalism and any kind of authoritarianism or totalitarianism. It can be said that Ladislav Hanus was a representative of an intelligent cultural conservatism that engaged in a principled dialogue with pluralism, but which was fundamentally different from fundamentalist traditionalism.⁴

Both leaders significantly inspired not only philosophical and theological, but also pedagogical thought with their views and especially with the example of their own lives. In the philosophy of education, they pointed out the importance of education to universal human values. They educated their pupils, found followers and also used their own forms of disseminating knowledge and education in this spirit. This is evidenced by their academic work at the university, which was interrupted by the repression of the totalitarian communist system, imprisonment and persecution. Their values, their determined testimony of perseverance in life, their fidelity in spite of persecution were evidence not only of firm faith but also of rational philosophical knowledge as the basis of cognitive convictions. The sense of inspiration in the life of Ladislav Hanus is confirmed by the existence of the institution that bears his name – the Ladislav Hanus Society (*Spoločnosť Ladislava Hanusa*). It was founded in 2001 and has operated since. Its primary mission is pedagogical, and the SLH Society's focus is academic, scientific and formative.⁵

The presented personalities – professor and philosopher Patočka and theologian Hanus – have contributed with their work and life to the understanding of possible ways to solve various contemporary social and cultural-ethical problems that arise in today's education but also in society itself.

⁴ Ladislav Hanus, *Princíp pluralizmu* (Bratislava: Lúč, 1997).

⁵ Monika Kekeliaková (ed.), *Ladislav Hanus v mozaike reflexií, interpretačných dotykov a postojov* (Ružomberok: Katolícka univerzita v Ružomberku, 2010).

The Importance of Studying Pedagogical Thinking History in Teacher Education

Today's widespread situation of the modern man crisis can also be understood as a state of conservative values crisis. This crisis is translated into the insecurity of the individual, but also of social life. In most cases, it also means a crisis of culture and religion or a state of marginalisation of traditional (especially Christian) values. It is a time in which humanity has encountered the crossroads of two worlds, which have changed the anthropological basis of social functioning that has been clearly determined so far, with predominant effects also on the education and training direction.

The current ideological development of thought is no longer merely in some fixed way pre-determined or prescribed by someone or in some determined or even feared "dogmatic" way. These opposing "two worlds" bring new themes that confront each other at different levels, for instance, as antitheses: conservatism vs. liberalism, secularism vs. progressivism, right vs. left, religious beliefs vs. atheism, democracy vs. totalitarianism, freedom of thought vs. ideology, multiculturalism vs. pluralism, and so on.⁶ This fact of the tension of opinion worlds is also pointed out by researchers from the Pedagogical Institute of the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, who are investigating the role of conservative values in the development of Polish pedagogical thinking.⁷

Ideological currents in social development are present in various fields and are strongly related to pedagogical thinking. They affect every school system, influencing education and training at every level, from the university environment to all types and grades of schools. This is why there is a great need for a cultivated and vast open dialogue in the academic environment on issues in the philosophy

⁶ "Dva svety." *Verbum – časopis pre kresťanskú kultúru* 33 (1) (2022).

⁷ At the expert seminar of the scientific seminar in October 2022, Professor Kostkiewicz commented on the topic as follows: "The state of Polish education shows that in recent decades it has lacked the influence of pedagogy that preserves traditions and creates paths for the evolutionary improvement of education. Among the "deposed" (seemingly) elites of the system of socialist pedagogy officially closed in 1989, it had too many enemies. After three decades of soft political and scientific games, the university elites of the discipline colonized pedagogy with critical (neo-Marxist) pedagogy. As a result, the educator who associates his or her practice with another (right-wing, Catholic religion-related) educational ideology experiences (depending on the environment) various kinds of marginalization to oppression: from pseudo-scientific arguments to reasons (again!) for the "only correct" educational ideology. In this situation, conservative educators are left with the role of a vanguard practicing conservative pedagogy as extremely unpopular, uncreative and non-innovative at the same time; a vanguard able to bear the resentment, contempt and marginalisation of the academic (neo-Marxist) majority, which, as a result of colonisation, has taken control of the structures of science and its nearer and more distant contexts. In light of the above, the following question becomes legitimate: are we left with only avant-garde conservatism?" Janina Kostkiewicz, "Edukacja, która ocala i tworzy. Pozostał już tylko awangardowy konserwatyzm?" [Vzdelanie, ktoré zachraňuje a tvorí: zostáva len avantgardný konzervativizmus?]. *Polska Myśl Pedagogiczna* 8 (2022): 61–78.

of education, on the knowledge of the historical as well as the contemporary development of pedagogical thinking. Dialogue should also be a stronger part of university and college education, more than it is today. This urgent need is particularly relevant to teacher education in undergraduate teacher training. In fact, we believe that the phase of qualification for the teaching profession is the most appropriate time to address these issues and acquire theoretical knowledge. However, experience has shown that the focus in the preparation for the teaching profession is more on the mastery of practical teaching skills, the development of competencies and the direct methodological and didactic training of future teachers. Subjects focused on more in-depth knowledge of the history of pedagogy, the development of pedagogical thinking and the philosophy of education are perhaps the most neglected part of teacher education. Notwithstanding, it is not enough to improve the education and training process by modernising didactic procedures and methods or by capturing the most effective trends in innovations in educational approaches, the education and training goals always derive from the values that present the particular ideological basis of the current time and the direction of the philosophy of education. Didactics itself is understood as knowledge about creating conditions for children and young people to learn. It can be axiologically neutral only to the extent that it does not concern the education and training goals, including the means to be used for their realization. The aims and content of education and training are determined by the current values and the direction of the development of pedagogical thinking.

Why is this important? Mainly because the universities and colleges' mission is to develop wisdom and education. University education should provide a broad outlook and a general (universal) education that develops not only the narrow personal goals of a person's life. In the variety of paths, in the search for philosophical truth, values, meaning and life goals is ultimately found the achievement of good for the whole society. At the same time, university education should be value-rich and truly "universal," in the freedom to choose from a menu of values for everyone. Communication in dialogue, sharing both conservative and liberal values, and democratic openness even to the differing views of others, are prerequisites for the fulfilment of this goal. So, what should also today's university education pass on to the next generation? In line with modern progress, academic education should also preserve the renewal of the spirit of the "old university," where the liberal arts are genuinely combined with honest scientific knowledge to create a new quality – by combining knowledge of the humanities and social sciences with a natural approach to the world and to the evaluation of its problems. However, it is at this point, in understanding the themes that emerge from the contemporary philosophical approach to knowledge that conservative and liberal-progressivist views seem to clash most in the academic university environment in general and in higher teacher education in particular.

What does conservatism actually preach and respond to, and what does liberalism, progressivism as a broad current of modern secularism, promote? Conservatism is based on the defence of the social order while reinforcing traditional values such as religion, nation, state, family, authority and hierarchy, the dignity of the human person as the anthropological basis of education... and other themes. Conservatives seek to defend their views by way of evolutionary cultural change. They are convinced of the thesis that the task of education, among others, is to form (in future and present) educators a sense of their own cultural identity and to preserve pluralism also in pedagogical thinking.⁸

Liberalism, on the other hand, can be said to be the sum of total freethinking views and efforts that want to get rid of traditions, rigid customs, dogmas, etc. and stand on their own feet in free independent thinking. Liberal doctrine focuses primarily on the needs and interests of the individual and not on the needs and interests of the collective. As a political movement, liberalism stands in reaction against conservatism; as an economic doctrine, it advocates free competition (liberal economic policy); worldview-wise, it advocates cosmopolitanism, tolerance, and humanity; in the field of religion, it stands unequivocally opposed to orthodoxy. Philosophically, liberalism is close to individualism: it stresses the value of the personality (but not as a human person, as understood, for example, by personalism) as opposed to the values of the community. Both liberalism and Marxism – both ideologies and systems – are very much related because they are built on the same principle of materialism. The materialistic understanding of phenomena, of man, the development of society without God, these systems have always sought to achieve by purely economic, material means. Conservative views (often identical with religious ones), on the other hand, in turn argue that a materialistic and purely pragmatic view is not only insufficient, but that without God it becomes dehumanizing and counterproductive. They stress that if we remove the moral principle and reduce economics to the profit principle and its functioning to a market mechanism, it will eventually become a destructive instrument hostile to man, incapable of ensuring the integral material-spiritual development of man as an individual, but also the common good of the nation or the state. How to overcome ideological inequality, even antagonism, and how to choose a language in which we can reflect together on our different beliefs and values and enter into a meaningful conversation even in a school (university) environment? How to prevent an opinion from becoming an ideology, an abuse of power or even a totalitarian view of the way things work (it doesn't matter whether it is "right" or "left")?

Despite the fact that in our Slovak (resp. Czechoslovak) social system after the Velvet Revolution in 1989 we got rid of the pressure of the direct totalitarianism of the communist and socialist regimes and we live in free democratic conditions,

⁸ Ladislav Hanus, *Človek a kultúra: filozofická esej* (Bratislava: Lúč, 1997).

yet today there is again an apparent one-sidedness in the direction of opinion. This change of orientation in social and philosophical thinking also applies to the university environment, where the ideas of liberalism, neoliberalism and progressivism are currently strongly preferred. Conservative views and values remain neglected, are identified with reactionism, medieval “non-modernity,” are not heard in equal argumentation and are not recognised as a starting point and a pointer for further development. The changing face of the contemporary university under the influence of neoliberalism has also been highlighted in Kaščák and Pupala’s recent publication, *The Golden Collar School – Škola zlatých golierov*.⁹ In the book, the authors point out that under the influence of neoliberal ideology, there is now a general distrust of the universities role and function in society, which is losing its identity and sense of its mission.¹⁰

And yet, above all, we wish that the university academic environment would be an independent and free space for the development of critical thinking, for the search for truth and the meaning of existence. University and higher education should therefore, in addition to the acquisition of qualified expertise, teach young people above all to think correctly, to think critically, to orient themselves in their own values, to distinguish and take into account the different value preferences of others, to accept them, to respect and honour both oneself and others, to learn to live together – to “coexist” (as one word) in tolerance, to remain in mutual dialogue as an authentic, free but responsible human being at all times.

The core mission of universities is therefore to provide quality education. However, this is only the external side of things. Universities today should be an environment that morally and humanly shapes young people, the future intelligentsia. It should be a community of educators and students from which new impulses for society emerge. The mission of universities derives from the pillars of European civilisation and the structures of the European Union, which are: ancient philosophy and science, Roman law and discipline, Christian morality and ethics and universal solidarity.

For the education of future teachers, it is again essentially a question of choosing from a menu of values. Everyone has to decide in his or her own value orientation which values he or she will prefer, because this will also determine the whole of society. Young learners, and future teachers in particular, need to be supported by a true interpretation of values in order to be able to make the right choice. We therefore call for the need for quality university education, which is designed especially for the teaching profession. The famous Cardinal John Henry Newman saw the university as *a community of thinkers*. Thus, its basic direction in mission

⁹ Branislav Pupala, Ondrej Kaščák. *Škola zlatých golierov. Vzdelávanie v ére neoliberalizmu* (Praha: Sociologické nakladateľství SLON, 2012).

¹⁰ Pupala, Kaščák, *Škola zlatých golierov*, 128–146.

is given – to develop intellectual themes without ideological, geographical or temporal boundaries, with the result of leaving an indelible mark on the minds of its graduates throughout their lives.

It is also the duty of universities to search together for the truth, which is mediated by much knowledge and science. However, to seek the truth is to convey the ideas that it is right to think truthfully, but then to live according to the truth that we have learnt. Universities are not just supposed to be a repository of knowledge and skills. They are social institutions that cultivate wisdom in students, but it is important that they also foster the ability not to drown wisdom in knowledge and not to let knowledge dissolve into information. Wise teachers, by their own example in life, by the hierarchy of values, together with the education provided, create a creative environment in universities today. And it is only in this way that conservative ideas and values can take hold in shaping the next generation.

From Phenomenology to the Ideas of Conservative Pedagogical Thought

Education in philosophical reflection subscribes to conservative values primarily in the form of personalism. It is a philosophical direction or stance that emphasizes the unique significance of each human person and at the same time his or her relationship to society. Based on humanism (especially Christian humanism), personalism opposes individualism as well as various forms of collectivism and totalitarianism. The roots and origins of personalism can be found throughout the history of Western thought in philosophers, artists, dramatists and educators. However, especially in the late 19th century personalism follows the teachings of some important thinkers such as – Schleiermacher, Franz von Baader, John Henry Newman, Borden Parker Bowne, in France – Maurice Blondel, Emanuel Mounier, Jean Lacroix, Gabriel Marcel, Jacques Maritain and others.

Among the prominent proponents of personalism we consider the representatives of phenomenology and especially some disciples of Edmund Husserl in Germany such as – Max Scheler, Edith Stein, Roman Ingarden and others. To some extent, we can also include the Czech phenomenologist Jan Patočka as a representative of this current in the line of philosophers – phenomenologists, but he was not directly a personalist or a supporter of the conservative current of thought. Nevertheless, this common link with phenomenology was the reason why this paper associates his name with representatives of conservative philosophical and pedagogical thought.

Ján Patočka (1907–1977) was one of the most important Czech thinkers and philosophers of world importance. From 1925 to 1931 he studied Slavonic studies and philosophy at Charles University in Prague. In 1928 he took up a study stay

in Paris, where he met Edmund Husserl and became his pupil in Freiburg. He gained extraordinary recognition from Husserl, who described him as the most penetrating of his pupils. He also studied phenomenology in Freiburg with Martin Heidegger and other eminent philosophers, and here he also struck up a lifelong friendship with Husserl's assistant Eugen Fink. He was instrumental in founding the Cercle philosophique de Prague (the Czech-German Prague Philosophical Circle at Charles University) and later became its secretary. In 1936 he habilitated with his thesis *The Natural World as a Philosophical Problem*. After the closure of the Czech universities in 1939, he taught at a grammar school and published several books to prepare future university students. After the end of World War II he returned to Charles University, lecturing on the history of ancient philosophy. However, in 1948, shortly after the Communists seized power, he was expelled from the university. He refused to accept the totalitarian ideology of Marxism-Leninism and was therefore banned from the university and from teaching for twenty years. From 1950 he worked at the T. G. Masaryk Institute, and later at the Pedagogical Research Institute, where he prepared the first edition of J. A. Komenský – *Všennáprava věcí lidských*. He participated in the translation of philosophical works, for example in 1960 he translated Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* and *Aesthetics*.

At the time of the relaxation of conditions in 1968, he became an editor at the Institute of Philosophy of the Czech Academy of Sciences. He attended lectureships in France and Germany and in that year became a full professor of philosophy at Charles University in Prague. A collection of his works from 1968-1969, *On the Meaning of Today*, was published during this period. Unfortunately, the circumstances of the political regime changed again. After the occupation of the Czechoslovakia by the Soviet army in 1968, Patočka was one of the protagonists of the so-called Prague Spring resistance at Charles University. Shortly afterwards, following the re-normalisation of the socialist political regime in Czechoslovakia after 1970, his name was no longer allowed to be quoted publicly, his works were not allowed to be published and they were liquidated. Even the extended edition of his habilitation dossier was scrapped. Patočka was allowed to publish only abroad. Finally, in 1972, at the age of 55, he was prematurely retired and sent into retirement. However, he continued to develop his work illegally "underground" in residential seminars and private lectures amidst a circle of his disciples and followers. His studies and analyses were published as typewritten and copied samizdat, which could only be distributed clandestinely.¹¹

The theoretical definition of the phenomenological pedagogy of the Czech philosopher Ján Patočka focused on the nature and meaning of education and the

¹¹ Andrej Rajský, "Prípád paralelnej vedy v „podzemí“. Osvetový program Ladislava Hanusa." In: *Pedagogické myslenie a školstvo na Slovensku od obdobia normalizácie po pád komunizmu*, ed. Blanka Kudláčová (Trnava: Typi Univeritatis Tyrnaviensis, 2018), 205–207.

philosophy of education. The starting point of Patočka's philosophy of education is characterized by realization through dialogue. The communist dictatorial regime established in Czechoslovakia after 1948 sought to completely push this European thinker and philosopher out of the public sphere and to remove his influence from any influence. Ján Patočka's pupils and the circle of "flat lectures" included, among others, perhaps the most important representative of conservative thought in Czechoslovakia, the Catholic philosopher Stanislav Sousedík (1931). Sousedík was also cruelly persecuted for his faith and philosophical and theological orientation during the totalitarian regime. He was primarily devoted to scholasticism, the history of medieval and early modern philosophy, and natural-law theories in philosophy. It is significant to note that he "grew up" into a conservative philosopher and humanist "in the school" of the philosopher-phenomenologist Ján Patočka. It is significant to note that he "grew up" as a conservative philosopher and humanist "in the school" of the philosopher-phenomenologist Ján Patočka. The overview of studies by the conservative philosopher S. Sousedík devoted to important figures and themes of Czech cultural history are, among others, about Ján Patočka. The common feature of all the texts is the distinct motivation and thinking of Sousedík, for whom philosophy in its various forms has always been a tool of criticism but also of rational clarification, which he considers to be a prerequisite of his professed Christian faith.¹²

In January 1977, Ján Patočka, together with Václav Havel and Jiří Hájek, became the spokesman for Charter 77. For this political involvement in Charter 77, he was subjected to a series of interrogations and cruel torture. After one of them, Patočka died of a stroke on 13 March 1977. His funeral became a symbol and a significant event of anti-communist resistance.¹³

Ján Patočka did not explicitly oppose the communist totalitarian regime, but his works penetrated deeply to the sources of European culture, and he figured in them in a strictly philosophical way. He evaluated all the events around him as a philosopher. The culmination of Patočka's reflections on the situation and role of man in history is his collection *Heretical Essays on the Philosophy of History* (1975). In addition to being a rigorous philosopher, Patočka also earned his position as an extraordinary moral authority. Through his life and death he testified that the free investigation of truth is a moral category. He spoke out against totalitarian domination, and his "heretical philosophy" (against all dogmatisms) is a philosophy of struggle – a philosophy of the experience of wandering in the wilderness of the senselessness of war that was the 20th century. Patočka considered the only, intrinsically binding and practical truth to be the **truth of morality!** His philosophical views also proclaimed that without a moral foundation, without convictions that are not a matter of opportunism, circumstance, and expected benefits, no society,

¹² Stanislav Sousedík, *O co šlo?* (Praha: Vyšehrad, 2012).

¹³ Rajský, "Případ paralelní vedy," 73.

even the most technically equipped, can function. Morality, however, is not there to ensure the functioning of society, but simply to help man to be man. The truth of morality is not defined by man at the will of his needs, wants and desires, but it is morality itself that defines man. The point is that the motives for action lie not mainly in the realm of fear and favoritism, but in reverence for what is higher in man, in an understanding of duty, of the common good, of the necessity of taking on discomfort, incomprehension, and a certain risk in this regard. (Adapted from the ideas of *Heretical Essays*...¹⁴)

With his philosophical work, his deep conviction in the primacy of truth and morality, or true respect for man and his freedom, Ján Patočka confirmed the unquestionable conservative values, which are not lost even in times of the most cruel repression, but also in times of their frivolous liberalization. He tried to pass on these ideas and convictions in the academic environment of the university, thus making a significant contribution to the formation of the next generation of teachers and intellectuals.¹⁵

The current of the developmental stage of Slovak personalism (of which Ladislav Hanus later became a representative) was formed in Slovakia in the spiritual-intellectual centre concentrated at the Theological Institute in Spišská Kapitula in the interwar period between 1930 and 1945. Ladislav Hanus (1907–1994) made a significant contribution to the development of a personalistic anthropology based on Slovak cultural philosophy, and thus subscribed to the more narrowly understood so-called cultural personalism. The thinkers of this group of Christian philosophers and theologians were personalistically oriented on the basis of Neo-Thomism and Christian anthropology and actively took their cues from the Austrian and German dialogical personalists. Among them we include in particular Romano Guardini, and Ferdinand Ebner, and among the French Emanuel Mounier, Jacques Maritain. They were also inspired by the works of the religious writers of Catholic modernism – P. Lippert, T. Haecker, R.M. Rilke, G. Papini.¹⁶

As stated in his work on Slovak Christian philosophy of the 20th century,¹⁷ Hanus held that a true, personalistically oriented anthropology can only be created and applied in life on the basis of Christian universalism, which, according to him, encompasses all that is progressive from the cultural tradition of the West and from the traditions of other cultures.

He understood Christian humanism in a broader sense as “catholic” or “all-embracing” thus expressing the view that Catholic universalism is not mutually

¹⁴ Rajský, “Prípad paralelnej vedy,” 74.

¹⁵ Jan Patočka, *Úvod do Husserlovy fenomenologie* (Praha: SPN, 1969); idem, *Kacířské eseje o filosofii dějin* (Praha: Academia, 1990).

¹⁶ Ladislav Hanus, *Romano Guardini. Myslitel' a pedagóg storočia* (Bratislava: Lúč, 1997).

¹⁷ Ján Letz, *Slovenská kresťanská filozofia 20. storočia a jej perspektívy* (Trnava: Filozofická fakulta Trnavskej univerzity a Spolok Slovákov v Poľsku, 2010), 218–219.

exclusive with Catholic pluralism. Ladislav Hanus argued that the construction of a true and fruitful universalism can only be pluralistic and integralist, uniting. Also, he understands culturality as only connected with the added attribute of a natural basis of religiosity and goodness.¹⁸

In his cultural anthropology, he was inspired by other philosophers besides those already mentioned – Max Scheler, Gabriel Marcel and P. Teilhard de Chardin. He started from the thesis that man is a person by his very being, by the very fact of being human, by being the bearer of human nature. Man is always on a journey in his development – from himself to himself to the fullness of his personality. The development of the personality is possible, and this is made possible especially by becoming a spiritual and moral personality. To be a person is an ontological given, but to be a personality is an achievement. Thus, according to Hanus, man is a complex ontological entity with the primacy of the spiritual principle. Man is a rational being, a free being, a “personal-personal” being, and last but not least, a historical being. History, historical time, is indispensably necessary for man in order to fulfil the content and meaning of his humanity. He concentrated and presented these views in his work – *Man and Culture*, which was published after his death in 1997.¹⁹

Ladislav Hanus’s views on the understanding of pluralism are also remarkable, highlighting the importance of dialogue as a means of communicating values. In his opinion, the theses of cultural personalism and pluralism should become part of the theoretical basis of pedagogical anthropology as well. He defended them according to the slogan – “**dialogue for pluralism!**” He was in favour of pluralism, which he recommended to develop through dialogue. One could say that he was, as it were, directly “touching” the conservative values of life. Again, this is an important stimulus for pedagogy, for theoretical starting points in the direction of philosophy of education, dialogical pedagogy, because Hanus understands dialogue as a means of education and education and cultivates the formation of the human person²⁰. Ladislav Hanus became an inspiration and a role model for young Christians also in the deep experience of faith in God, an example of realization in spiritual life and in social engagement in favor of Christian culture. The vision of Ladislav Hanus’s philosophical and theological ideas was specifically inspired by the community of educated and committed Christians who founded the Ladislav Hanus Society (SLH) in 2001. This Society is still creatively active today and enriches cultural and public life in Slovakia. The mission of SLH is primarily the spiritual and intellectual formation of young people, academic study, commitment to the common good according to the natural law and the values of the Gospel, and

¹⁸ Ladislav Hanus, *O kultúre a kultúrnosti* (Bratislava: Lúč, 2003).

¹⁹ Soňa Gabzdilová, *Školský systém na Slovensku v medzivojnovej Československej republike (1918–1938)* (Košice: CFF UPJŠ v Košiciach, 2014).

²⁰ Hanus, *Princíp pluralizmu*.

building a creative community of educated and committed Christians. The Ladislav Hanus Society itself is committed to the legacy of the so-called “Kolakovič family” (Kolakovič – was a prominent religious dissident in the era of totalitarianism), which belongs to the tradition and activity of the underground church in Slovakia during the era of socialism and communism in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic (Czechoslovak Socialist Republic). Currently, SLH has more than 500 members and organizes in Bratislava and Košice, where we conduct our formation and academic programs and an international social and academic festival called Hanus Days.

From the brief biography of Hanus we select the basic facts. He was a Slovak Catholic priest who in his pastoral ministry and later as a professor of theology in Spišská Kapitula tried to raise the faith and cultural life of the Slovak nation. His desire was that priests and the faithful should not live their religion only in a habitual, thoughtless and comfortable way, but that they should be spiritually and ideologically rooted and able to shape the life of society. He wrote several books on cultural and religious themes, and also published many articles and essays in the magazines *Kultúra*, *Verbum* and *Obroda*. During the persecution of Christians by the Communist regime, he was arrested in 1952 and subsequently sentenced to 16 years in prison. After his release in 1965, he first worked as a clerk, and was later allowed to return to pastoral work. Secretly during the totalitarian regime, he wrote several books and recorded his life memoirs on cassette tapes. After the fall of the communist regime in 1989, the work of Ladislav Hanus was again made available to the general public. For his faithful service to the Church, Pope John Paul II awarded Ladislav Hanus the honorary title of Apostolic Protonotary.²¹

In conclusion, we can only state that both selected representatives – Ján Patočka and Ladislav Hanus – can fruitfully inspire each of us personally, as well as the directions of contemporary pedagogical thought, with their fidelity to conservative ideas. Both of them decided to serve the truth, made their lives a proof of what they believed in and passed this example on to the following generations.

Idee konserwatywne w myśleniu pedagogicznym fenomenologa Jána Patočki i personalisty Ladislava Hanusa

Streszczenie: W niniejszym artykule koncentruję się na refleksji nad ideami konserwatywnymi odzwierciedlonymi w myśleniu pedagogicznym. Nurt konserwatywny w filozofii wychowania prezentuję na przykładzie dwóch przedstawicieli ze środowiska byłej Czechosłowacji, którzy żyli i działali w okresie realnego socjalizmu. Przedstawiam filozofa i fenomenologa Jána Patočkę oraz personalistę i teologa Ladislava Hanusa. Obu łączy to, że ich prace opierają się na wspólnym kierunku filozoficznym fenomenologii i egzystencjalizmu. Ponadto obaj przedstawiciele, przede wszystkim poprzez swoje osobiste życiorysy, oddali się humanistycznym i konserwatywnym wartościom, za które musieli znosić prześladowania w okresie totalitarnym. Swoje przekonania

²¹ Mária Olejníková, *Mária Olejníková o Ladislavovi Hanusovi* (Bratislava: Ústav pamäti národa, 2019).

starali się przekazywać poprzez formację, wychowanie i edukację młodego pokolenia. Ten wspólny cel łączył ich również z pedagogiką, z rozwojem filozoficznej myśli pedagogicznej. W niniejszym artykule porównuję poglądy filozoficzne obu, a także personalistyczne i antropologiczne koncepcje społeczeństwa, które były zakorzenione w fenomenologii oraz w tradycji humanizmu chrześcijańskiego. Wkład życia i twórczości J. Patočki i L. Hanusa pozostaje istotny dla współczesnej pedagogiki i filozofii wychowania. W artykule podjmuję również próbę uzupełnienia podstawowej wiedzy z zakresu filozofii edukacji, potrzebnej w kształceniu przyszłych nauczycieli.

S ł o w a k l u c z o w e: konserwatyzm, myśl pedagogiczna, Ján Patočka, Ladislav Hanus

References

- Dancák, Pavol. *Personalistický rozmer vo filozofii 20. storočia*. Prešov: GBF, 2009.
- “Dva svety.” *Verbum – časopis pre kresťanskú kultúru* 33 (1) (2022).
- Gabzdilová, Soňa. *Školský systém na Slovensku v medzivojnovnej Československej republike (1918–1938)*. Košice: CFF UPJŠ v Košiciach, 2014.
- Guardini, Romano. *Konec novověku: pokus o orientac*, transl. Otakar Veselý. Praha: Vyšehrad, 1992.
- Hanus, Ladislav. *Človek a kultúra: filozofická esej*. Bratislava: Lúč, 1997.
- Hanus, Ladislav. *O kultúre a kultúrnosti*. Bratislava: Lúč, 2003.
- Hanus, Ladislav. *Princíp pluralizmu*. Bratislava: Lúč, 1997.
- Hanus, Ladislav. *Romano Guardini. Mysliteľ a pedagóg storočia*. Bratislava: Lúč, 1997.
- Kekeliaková, Monika (ed.). *Ladislav Hanus v mozaíke reflexií, interpretačných dotykov a postojov*. Ružomberok: Katolícka univerzita v Ružomberku, 2010.
- Kostkiewicz, Janina. “Edukacja, która ocala i tworzy. Pozostał już tylko awangardowy konserwatyzm?” [Vzdelanie, ktoré zachraňuje a tvorí: zostáva len avantgardný konzervativizmus?]. *Polska Myśl Pedagogiczna* 8 (2022): 61–78. <https://doi.org/10.4467/24504564PMP.22.004.16057>.
- Kudláčová, Blanka. *Európske pedagogické myslenie od antiky po modernu*. Trnava: Trnavská univerzita VEDA, 2010.
- Kudláčová, Blanka (ed.). *Pedagogické myslenie, školstvo a vzdelávanie na Slovensku v rokoch 1945–1989*. Trnava: Typi Universitatis Tyrnaviensis vydavateľstvo VEDA pri SAV, 2019.
- Kudláčová, Blanka. *Pedagogické myslenie a školstvo na Slovensku v medzivojnovnom období*. Trnava: Trnavská univerzita, 2015.
- Kudláčová, Blanka. *Pedagogické myslenie a školstvo na Slovensku od konca 2. svetovej vojny po obdobie normalizácie*. Trnava: Trnavská univerzita, 2017.
- Kudláčová, Blanka, Rajský Andrej. *Európske pedagogické myslenie (od moderny k postmoderne po súčasnosť)*. Trnava: Trnavská univerzita / VEDA, 2012.
- Letz, Ján. *Chápanie osoby v kresťanskej filozofii*. Trnava: FH TU, 1997.
- Letz, Ján. *Personalistické metafyziky*. Trnava: Typi Universitas Tyrnaviensis, VEDA, 2006.
- Letz, Ján. *Slovenská kresťanská filozofia 20. storočia a jej perspektívy*. Trnava: Filozofická fakulta Trnavskej univerzity a Spolok Slovákov v Poľsku, 2010.
- Maritain, Jacques. *Kresťanský humanizmus*, transl. V. Gaja. Řím: Kresťanská akadémia, 1967.
- Olejníková, Mária. *Mária Olejníková o Ladislavovi Hanusovi*. Bratislava: Ústav pamäti národa, 2019.
- Palouš, Radim. *K filozofii výchovy*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 1991.
- Palouš, Radim. “Kresťanská výchova.” *Teologické texty* 6 (2) (1991): 204–206.
- Palouš, Radim. *Čas výchovy*. Praha: SPN, 1992.

- Palouš, Radim. *Totalismus a holismus*. Praha: Karolinum, 1996.
- Patočka, Jan. *Aristotelés, jeho předchůdci a dědicové*. Praha: Nakladatelství ČSAV, 1964.
- Patočka, Jan. *Kacířské eseje o filosofii dějin*. Praha: Academia, 1990.
- Patočka, Jan. *Max Scheler. Pokus celkové charakteristiky*. Praha: Academia, 1968.
- Patočka, Jan. *Péče o duši, Vol. 1: Stati z let 1929–1952*. Praha: Oikoymenh, 1996.
- Patočka, Jan. *Úvod do Husserlovy fenomenologie*. Praha: SPN, 1969.
- Pelcová, Naděžda. *Filozofická a pedagogická antropologie*. Praha: Karolinum, 2000.
- Pelcová, Naděžda a kol. *Evropské myšlenkové tradice k hodnotám evropské civilizace*. Praha: PedFUK, 1998.
- Pelcová, Naděžda a kol. *Výchova k humanismu*. Praha: PedFUK, 1999.
- Plašienková, Zlatica. *Niektoré súčasné kresťanské etické koncepcie*. In: *Súčasná etická teória: Etika II: diel 2*, eds. Vasil Gluchman, Miloš Dokuli. Prešov: PVT, 1998.
- Pupala, Branislav, Kaščák, Ondrej. *Škola zlatých golierov. Vzdelávanie v ére neoliberalizmu*. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství SLON, 2012.
- Rajský, Andrej. "Prípád paralelnej vedy v „podzemí“." Osvetový program Ladislava Hanusa." In: *Pedagogické myslenie a školstvo na Slovensku od obdobia normalizácie po pád komunizmu*, ed. Blanka Kudláčová, 204–218. Trnava: Typi Univeritatis Tyrnaviensis, 2018.
- Rembierz, Marek. *Refleksja moralna nad odpowiedzialnością i etosem filozofa w XX wieku*. In: *Społeczność, kultura, moralność*, eds. Zlatica Plašienková, Marek Rembierz, 265–282. Bielsko-Biała: Wydawnictwo Akademii Techniczno-Humanistycznej, 2008.
- Sousedík, Stanislav. *O co šlo?* Praha: Vyšehrad, 2012.