

Sándor Karikó, 2017

Volume 3 Issue 2, pp. 899 - 913

Date of Publication: 19th September, 2017

DOI-<https://dx.doi.org/10.20319/pijss.2017.32.899913>

This paper can be cited as: Karikó, S. (2017). Education – What For? For the Philosophical Foundations of Education. PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences, 3(2), 899-913.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-commercial 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

EDUCATION – WHAT FOR? FOR THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

Sándor Karikó

University of Szeged, Hungary

bacon@jgypk.u-szeged.hu

Abstract

I feel it necessary on both theoretical and methodological levels to think over the meaning, the possibilities and the challenges of philosophy of education, as well as its usability for our educational activities. Philosophy of education is part of the so-called applied philosophy, which examines the interconnection of the world, mankind and education. It tries to grab the characteristics and the deepest relationships among these three elements. Therefore, the educators, sociologists, philosophers and professors of education should continue working out convincing and steady answers. What we should take into consideration is that the matter of education itself is not identical to the process of education and socialisation. It would be advisable to find a solution to this issue in everyday pedagogical practices. Finally, I hope and I would like to believe that forming the goodness is the most noble and the most important mission of education.

Keywords

Education, Socialization, Care, Goodness, Education of Philosophy

Motto: In honour of the unknown good man
Ágnes Heller

1. Introduction

It is obvious that first and foremost we must examine (and understand and interpret) the concept and philosophical aspects and implications of education as a unique/special human activity in order to lay the foundations of educational activities of all types. If you like, first, we have to and are required to think about the philosophy of education. Further examination of any other special topic can only follow after this. The present study aims to contribute to this task.

It is an unfortunate fact that the place and position of the philosophy of education have not been defined yet. Additionally, the clear-cut and homogenous recognition of its importance has not taken place either. This immature condition may be explained by several reasons. One underlying factor may be that an unacceptably small number of researchers study the possible and at the same time inevitable opportunities for linking the issues of philosophy and education. For me it is obvious that the philosophy of education is – we could say – still fighting for its civil rights *in a Hungarian context in Hungarian language*, and so far we can only report on modest results. Today we are still standing ahead of numerous untackled problems and far-reaching challenges. If we take a realistic perspective, we can hardly expect a quick and efficient solution to this problem or a positive turn. We certainly have a lot to do: first of all, the representatives of the philosophy of education need to carry out systematic and efficient research. Furthermore, a fine-tuned collaboration of researchers of education, sociology and education, practicing educators and – last but not least – educational policymakers is required. (This list already gives an impression of the multifaceted, complex and long-term nature of the task).

Unarguably, it is not possible to eliminate or reduce this undoubtedly present deficiency at one go. Of course, this is not the right place and time to initiate lengthy professional and objective analysis. We rather make a brief attempt to outline the *theoretical and methodological lessons and considerations* that the stakeholders involved in the process of education to any extent or on any level are advised to take into account.

The philosophy of education – as the words also imply – seeks to grab and deal with the common issues, themes of „education” and „philosophy”. We believe that the *philosophy of education* is concerned with examining the social objectives, circumstances, and principles, values and virtues of human coexistence and collaboration along which the process of the formation of personality development is shaped. This is not „pure”, the most abstract, traditional, „academic” philosophy but a *special discipline*, a contemplation about the moral

perfection of practice and in this respect, it is part of the so called *applied philosophy* (Fobel, 2002, p. 23)¹. It is a way of thinking in which the examination and cultivation of the most general content and deepest characteristics, features of education lie at the core. In what follows I only list some concrete examples with which a researcher in this domain deals with: what the concept of education means, especially in contrast with the meanings of *care*, *teaching/instruction*, and *socialization* (the public considers the aforementioned words synonymous), what is the driving force underlying the objectives of the process of education, what is the relationship between education (and educability) and autonomy, what ideas and virtues are exposed (or are to be exposed) in it or by means of it, what are the human resources and sociological-biological limits providing a framework for its functioning, etc.

There are numerous theoretical (and of course practical educational) questions awaiting to be answered. In what follows, we intend to and are able to highlight only three factors, or more precisely principles (the issues of the so-called „second nature”, socialization, and goodness). Here we obviously do *not* strive to discuss these issues *professionally* in details, but we make an attempt to illustrate what *methodological criteria* and *aspects* one is advised to take into consideration – when it comes to any (type) of education. First and foremost, we must see what particular ideas, deep recognition and firm belief shapes and organizes the educational activity itself. Furthermore, we must always keep in mind that a certain level of naivity, the commitment and belief in the possibilities of shaping one’s personality, a holy sense of mission, or at least hope for a better future, are essential and constant attributes of the educational activity.

2. The „second nature”

Everyone may acknowledge the – somewhat – classical definition of education, according to which it refers to the shaping of the (young) man and personality. However, we can witness great uncertainty, inaccuracy or even misunderstanding when it comes to the real meaning, importance and significance of education. These are the issues to which the philosophy of education can contribute by filling the different gaps in understanding. At least, it offers a clear and unambiguous educational ethos and a (more) differentiated approach.

If we want to shape human relationships, human coexistence and cooperation, we must (or rather need to) take into consideration at least three aspects (criteria).

A. Man has certain external and internal innate qualities and features. Simply because of the DNA inherited from his/her parents. This is the reason why one person grows tall, another one becomes short, one will tend to gain weight, while another one will remain slim,

one will have a round face, whereas the other one will have an oval face. Then again, there will be people who are happy, cheerful and have a good sense of humour, while others will have an introvert, quiet and passive personality etc. This is why we say that people come to this world having certain external and internal basic features – ones that are beyond individual choice –, which they will carry and live with throughout their whole life. These are non-arbitrary features existing independently from a person regardless of the fact that the person recognizes it and likes it or not. We call this unique entity man's so-called „*first nature*”, which are present until death. Everyone has a „*first nature*”. It is impossible to eliminate it and it is inappropriate to deny it or to be ashamed of it. We should rather learn to live with it, decrease its negative impact or to capitalize on its positive effects. It is easy to see that the concrete reality of „*first nature*” is a substantial and absolutely not indifferent factor in education. Here we would only mention one aspect of the rich relationship between „*first nature*” and education that we tend to forget. It is a highly interesting experience when we see syblings having the same parents, brought up along the same principles, become entirely different types of people although the principles and values of education and the socio-economic status of the family remain the same. Yet, the basic nature and behaviour of the two children having the same parents – in many cases – will apparently differ. So, in this case the outcome of education (considered as a transformational and shaping activity) will not be as planned². However, we should not jump into the conclusion that the educational activity failed. We do not claim that failure may not occur in pedagogy, we rather imply that it is more reasonable to talk about the limits of education. Limits and failure are not equivalent terms. If we make a distinction between the two concepts, we can understand what many people do not want to and/or cannot recognize and accept: *education is not omnipotent*. In other words, it is impossible to solve every single problem by means of education: we cannot eliminate man's „*first nature*” at all. Furthermore, endeavouring to substitute and replace it by means of education may be considered a particularly wrong approach. (That would really be doomed to failure!).

It is obvious that this is the point where another entity called education may come into the picture. We point it out instantly that education itself does not solely refer to caring (nevertheless caring is also part of it!) because it is also present in the animal kingdom. For example a female mammal feeds and protects its offsprings. Moreover, it teaches its cub how to protect itself and hunt for prey. As *Kant* puts it, „man can only become a man by education” (Kant, 2005, p. 498, p. 592). In other words, education *does not only mean or imply caring* but a dramatically different higher-order entity as well at least in comparison

with caring present among the animals (too)³. We are talking about a developmental process in which we can create or develop new features and internal-external qualities alike in other people. Not instead of the „first nature” but besides or in parallel to it. As *Democritus* recognised it a long time ago: education is fundamentally about a new nature being born, a new nature being artificially created. This will be man’s so-called „second nature”⁴. We cannot emphasise the idea of „second nature” enough because – in our view – *this provides the general purpose and philosophical importance of education*. In other words: we do not only educate because of caring – which is evident – and to provide children with skills that can be utilized in everyday life or to prepare children for everyday life but most importantly we primarily educate to create new external and internal qualities, features and high-order values in the young. To create the „second nature” in another man or at least to strive to do so and believe in it – this is every educators’ inner driving force, justification and final verification.

3. ”Are socialization and education contradictory?”

B. The above section shows that we would narrow down the definition of education if we considered it equivalent with mere care. However, there is also another simplification with which we must deal. People (even educational professionals) are inclined to assume that education refers to the process of preparation for life. It refers to the procedure by means of which we teach children and the young to acquire the basic societal norms and habits, to understand and accept the so-called adult roles. According to this approach, the fundamental function and point of education is to make the educated ones integrate into the world of adults, at the end of the day, to society. We call this socialization exactly. Socialization as an entrance ticket to society is an inevitable process, which takes place regardless from the concrete historical time and era. This is how the concepts of socialization and education are interrelated. Thus, from this perspective, the point and societal importance of education is the socializational content, matter.

However – according to our view – socialization can by no means become identical to education. We could instantly assume or feel insidiously that the latter term must imply more and deeper content. (We make an attempt to touch upon this in the third section). Nevertheless, first we discuss why it is not reasonable to treat the two concepts as completely identical.

Work and playful activities organized around teaching and learning get to the centre of the process of socialization: parents, kindergarten teachers, teachers have to teach their

children or students a whole bunch of knowledge, rules and „materials” – initially in a playful manner in large part. While growing up and developing, the young strives to acquire basic (and more and more complex higher-order) knowledge that they can capitalize on in their lives. It is obvious that education is a fundamental goal, interest and challenge from a societal point of view. However, we may have a reason to ask: is this activity education at the same time? In connection with this question – even if just momentarily – let us bring up the relationship between teaching and education.

There is no doubt that teaching and education are closely related activities. Both can have an influence on each other and it is more than welcome that these two phenomena progress hand in hand reinforcing one another. For example, it is easy to see that an educator who teaches by neglecting any educational criterion (and requirement) can only be a specialist in a narrow subject but not an educator. However, an educator who tries to educate without being able to follow and keep up with the modernisation of the curriculum and scientific development will inevitably become anachronistic, discredited and inefficient.

But we can also claim that education and instruction is not the same and not equivalent activities. There is a difference and sometimes a major contradiction between them. *Hannah Arendt* warns: „One cannot educate without at the same time teaching, an education without learning is empty (...) and may become rhetoric but one can easily teach without educating” (Arendt, 1995, p.203). In connection with this we may remember the unfortunate experience that a teacher can be an accomplished and a well-qualified professional, workforce and at the same time a very bad person, a dishonest educator. The latter condition may occur if, for example, the teacher evaluates his/her students based on his/her subjective emotional impressions instead of the students’ work and achievement. (Not to mention even more serious cases!) In such cases it is him/her, the teacher who fails not the student! If we want to define the general differences, we can say that *education*, teaching focuses on thinking, which is the only one, true and important area of the human being. In other words, education *aims at and serves to improve and refine man’s reasoning*. At the same time, *education* aims to affect the *whole* human spectrum and it wishes to shape man’s *every* aspect. (It tries to shape the heart and soul, the reasoning and moral, aesthetic and physical condition) Instruction is a short-term cooperation in general, which takes place in small portions and phases, which is relatively easy to follow, evaluate or control. However, it is easy to recognize that education is a long process (as we usually say: a long-term investment). It is an infinite complex world with several stakeholders, where the outcome is delayed and is

generally realised through big mediating factors. Thus, in many cases it is difficult to follow and experience it.

We bring another example – this time – from the world of pop music to illustrate the relative difference between socialization and education. *János Bródy*, a well-known figure of the Hungarian beat-movement wrote – among other pieces – his poem entitled „The bad children”, that we can also listen to on CD set to music. One of its verses is as follows: speaking of bad children, let’s ask, „Is it possible that they are bad / because they learn it from the adults / So, do not expect them to be good / as long as they see the adults / Being selfish, jealous and aggressive / and they lack / they are short of love.”⁵ In other words, the world of the adults is full of sins, caducity bad and good people. In that case why would we want our children to become adults *like this* during and as an outcome of education? Should the young adapt to *such* a world of adults? Should the next generation integrate into *such* society full of all kinds of bad things? Or should their aim be to prepare for a better adult life? If we accept the latter case – as having an evident and trivial objective –, we should immediately acknowledge that the young should not simply integrate into society and solely copy the world of adults (because it is both good and bad), but they should also advance it, go beyond it. Consequently, they should be ready and capable of creating a higher-order future. The young should not only reproduce and repeat the society of adults but they should create something different, something better and something more flawless. The young should preferably strive to realize such bold demand and noble value and education serves exactly this purpose. Or at least this would be the desired objective and mission of education.

Ottó Mihály, a Hungarian philosopher of education, makes a fruitful attempt for a differentiated interpretation of the relationship between socialization and education. In his book *Introduction to the philosophy of education*, which may also be considered as a classic piece of Hungarian philosophy of education, he writes that education works in the dynamics of two factors: namely necessity and possibility (Mihály, 1998, p.25). We can identify two different entities: the *socialization* and the so-called *personalization*. The former is the process of „being social”, that is, necessity prescribed by society, which sets the limits and forms of following norms and rule-violating and rule adhering behaviour. Socialization leads to collectivity, it is a tendency of unification and integration. The other „pillar”, the personalization, refers to the unique, the only one, the unrepeatable and the odd: it implies the inner active power by means of which man also creates itself. This way, man is not only a toy of „external” factors. In general: history is not solely an occurrence in man’s life, an

absolutely determined entity independent from him but it is „made and created” and in that „creation” personality takes an active role as well.⁶

Obviously, we could have an argument about the extent to which the introduction and such interpretation of personalization is reasonable. Others put forward different suggestions (let’s put their introduction aside here!). However, we could hardly contest the idea that – namely – it is not sufficient to solely mention or discuss socialization when it comes to education. If we thought socialization is the gist of education, we would totally simplify or we may even forge. Furthermore, it is right to claim that it is not only possible to educate for personalization but it is our duty to do so.

We both know and experience that reality, life and education are different. We can particularly become aware of the difference if we take into consideration the aspect that education entails a *unique* world of ideas and values (We should not be afraid of the word: idealism!). Regarding this we may want to recall a bright idea from a contemporary French philosopher of education *Éric Dubreueq*: education can never break free of the rule that it does not ‘describe’ and explain the present or the past but it determines what has to be, thus, it is inevitable that it leads to ideologies and speculation. Education derives from theory and moves towards things and not the other way round: from things towards theory. Education has to strive to break free of ideological concepts and illusions. However, it is very far from reaching this aim (Dubreueq, 2004). The author’s perception is valid as education must tackle the challenges of ‘there is’ and ‘there must be’: both theory and practice draws from the principle of ‘must be’, the particular reality is not sufficient does not suffice for the purpose because it always aims to create something new and something more perfect. Therefore, it includes a certain future orientation, a thought, an idea, an ideal about what it aims to achieve. The aim of the educator is to create a personality that is non-existent yet but it may exist in the future.

This objective of ‘there must be’ brings about a lot of complications regarding theory and practice alike. First and foremost, we must acknowledge that education, due to its future orientation, will become exposed and sort of defenceless. The daily politics and ideology often wishes to set the directions for organization and the concrete principles of this personality shaping activity. Additionally, it also expects the practicing teachers (and sometimes the research as well) to serve these kinds of artificial and mostly extraneous needs and demands. We must admit that professional resistance is an exceptionally huge challenge and surely, we do not always succeed in maintaining our firm professional belief or defend the educational (and school) autonomy. The educator (also) moves towards and chooses the

direction of lighter resistance, that is (thinking: it is better to be safe than sorry!) adheres to the ill-founded requirements or demands of the all-time government and power politics.

However, the profession itself also becomes uncertain when it comes to taking a stand on the inmost content, „holy” mission, or at least the gripping appeal of education, which, by the way, is the answer to the issue of „there must be”. The recognition is immensely simple but its acceptance, and even more, an adherence to its content framework is not self-evident. It is no other than the *pursuit of goodness*. We intend to claim that the final driving force, „soul”, ideal and function of all education is goodness. This goodness will be the concrete equivalent and content of the general principle of „there must be”. This seems obvious to us but some representatives of the profession – unfortunately – act as if they were ashamed of or at least they were not responsible for the idea and virtue of goodness. The reason for this may be that they are afraid of being accused of naivety and utopia as this quite often and unmistakably occurs in an educator’s life. But in the third section of the present study let us briefly review what this goodness really is!

4. Moral goodness = when paradise becomes reality

Although many of the classics of the history of education pointed out that there is an obvious and natural possibility for linking education and goodness, the issue itself often remains neglected in both the theory and practice of education.

We do not aim to initiate a deep and detailed discussion regarding this topic here, however, we mention that already *Kant* claims: education – at least its most noble aim – is in fact the terrain of universal improvement. According to him the freedom of education is a prerequisite for the *universal improvement* of man (Kant, 2005). Not long after Kant, this idea was broadened and generalized by *Herbart*: fundamentally and primarily education „must comprise every virtue.” (Herbart, 2003, p. 178) Educational activity is organized around and by the virtues among which goodness is the most valuable. To become a good man – do we need a more sublime and noble virtue than that? Then let’s pay attention to a statement of *Richard Pring*, a contemporary British philosopher of education, according to whom an educator continuously keeps seeking answers to the question how one can become a whole and good man and how one can be shaped to become a better man („more human”). (Pring, 2004, p. 24)

At this point we should return to the issue of differences between teaching and education. As we indicated before, it is highly imperative to grasp the difference between the expressions „being a qualified person’ and ’being a well-educated person’. When asking the

former question we intend to get to know whether s/he went to school but the latter implies much broader and special contents. Being a well-educated person is not identical to being a qualified person. Let us pay attention to Socrates' suggestion: education expresses that nurturing of the soul (Hodgson, 2010). For us it is an indisputable argument that it is a more complicated and at the same time a more sublime challenge to deal with the issue of soul, generally with the shaping of one's character than, let's say, to teach children the geometry rules for triangles, the biological parts of the human body or a country's orology and hydrography. The real „genuine” educator does not only teach but s/he also works to shape students' personality and this activity cannot be mistaken for anything else or substituted with anything. For a real educator this is not a hassle or mere errand but – with a slight exaggeration – for a genuine educator this is a „dear fever dream”.⁷ This must concern „a good education, one that will allow not for an enculturation into orders, but one that allows for failure and frustrations (Kalisha, 2014, p. 41).

The idea and principle of goodness is not merely an idea among the plethora of other ideas. It is an inner power that can manifest itself in reality, in our everyday life. Therefore, it is not something that can only occur in tales! At this point it may seem evident to make a short mention of some literary masterpieces. (Art can only enrich the views of science and philosophy, as it can touch upon and affect such depth of the soul that is out of reach for a scholar or philosopher.) First, three concrete examples may be provided instantly: we would cite works of *Gogol*, *Dostoyevsky* and *Milán Füst* (a 20th-century Hungarian novelist and dramatist).

We would quote the final, self-critical decision of the main character of Gogol's *Dead Souls*, Chichikov verbatim: „there is no real love for what is good, no real spark of that beautiful instinct for well-doing which becomes a second nature, a settled habit. Also, never do I yearn to strive for what is right (...but) I intend to (...) work hard, (...) and to engage only in honourable pursuits, and to influence my fellows in the same direction.” (Gogol, 1982, p. 531). It is not our task to talk about the plot of the novel in more details and we do not touch upon or seek to answer the question what causes the 'crooked' main character's unique volte-face. We would merely emphasise that with the above lines Gogol managed to frame the sine qua non of education: education in its essence aims to awake one's aspiration to outperform their peers in goodness. *To make ourselves and others good people* – and there is no objective more sublime and aspiration more noble than this! Gogol's recognition (which is at the same time an uplifting moral) could be followed and employed by all educators.

Let us continue the list of literary examples. We cannot cast away the existence and manifestation of the „good” by claiming that it only exists in theory and in reality we can only encounter the bad. Regarding this, it is worth paying attention to Bulgakov’s point of view. At the end of his novel, *The Master and Margarita*, the magician Woland and the holy Levi Matvei have an argument about the character of the world: whether it is good or bad. Levi Matvei’s choice is not surprising: of course, the world is good. Woland takes issue with his partner and his argument is not only appealing but convincing as well: „Think, now – calls Woland – : where would your good be if there were no evil and what would the world look like without shadow? Shadows are thrown by people and things. (...) Do you want to strip the whole globe by removing every tree and every creature to satisfy your fanatsy of a bare world?”(Bulgakov, 1969, p. 435). The author draws our attention to the obvious but hardly ever emphasized relationship that it is possible to eliminate neither the bad nor the good from our lives. Thus – considering our topic, we must admit that – the „good” does not only exist in tales or artistic pieces but it is also present in reality, in our concrete lives. In other words, there are good people living among us (besides the evil ones). And how nice this is!

Finally, I would like to talk about Milán Füst. The Hungarian writer already relates to Gogol when he discusses the fascinating nature and „holy” mission of education⁸ ecstatically. However, in his *Diary* we can read a short piece of text that we may call a „direct hit”. Unfortunately, Milán Füst’s deep recognition and compelling train of thought – quoted below – have remained unveiled in the Hungarian literary history and educational settings and regrettably the philosophy of education has not reacted to it to a great extent either. In order to somewhat bridge this gap, let us quote the particular text – which I recommend to every educational stakeholder wholeheartedly: professionals, researchers, students reading pedagogy at the university, parents and anyone being in touch with children and young people to any extent – exceptionally lengthily. „There’s no point in preaching to you at school, it is no use that the priest, your mother, your father keep telling you to be good, (...) it is no use to decide in childhood to be good, altruistic and clean... Life intervenes – and you (...) soon forget, - you cheat, steal and lead a lecherous life. (...) You are canny and faint-hearted. (...) The bringing-up that I received from my mother, I sucked in idealism remote from life with breast milk. ... But life is – unfortunately – not like this. (...) And you think, your mother did not know life? She did, - but still she wanted to give you her better self, (...) the faith/belief that her child can and may be clean – *must* be clean. (...) And as soon as you have a child: - you will also (...) steer clear of (...) unveil the horrible, ... and you will point at/to life like Moses showed the hopeful the Promised Land.” (Füst, 1976, pp. 178-179 - own translation)

The above lines clearly show that education is primarily a pursuit of good, cleanly and honest life. It always comprises humane values, virtues, powers and abilities by means of which man becomes more noble. Nevertheless, this inmost principle of education (i.e. goodness), as the writer puts it: „idealism” of course, often contradicts the „rigid” facts, horrible phenomena of reality and the abundance of feeble people. It is doubtless that the concrete life and practice often shows an entirely different world than the parent, the teacher, the priest (as the three classical „agents” of education) believe and preach. Reality resists and defies the noble ambition of the educator but s/he should never give up his/her faith. Although the educator may also fail many times, s/he would like to plant the hope and conviction that we can become a good man and the world – in spite of all the negative tendencies – may be shaped to be more humane, the man can be shaped to become more noble and better, which contributes to *the real acquisition of human substance* being no other than, as it is widely known, its *social existence*, social relevance. (Man is a social being)

The three above mentioned literary outlook leads us to the recognition or *conclusion in the philosophy of education* and at the same time outlines a *methodological lesson* penetrating the entire educational work, that it is impossible *to extinguish or erase* our longing for goodness and *our ability and skill to achieve good from the history of mankind*. This demand and ambition will not become extinct in the future either: as long as history exists *good men* will live among us (too).

Finally – in connection with the virtue of goodness – we would like to draw your attention to a study from the early life of *Georg Lukács*, a Hungarian 20th century philosopher well-known worldwide.⁹ In his essay *On Poverty of Spirit* he writes: „If goodness appears in us, paradise became reality. (...) Goodness is the abandonment of ethics, (...) because ethics is general and compulsory. (... but – S. K.) goodness is a miracle and leniency. (...) Goodness is 'obsession'. (...) In the souls of the good, all psychological content, every reason and consequence ceased to exist.” (Lukács, 1977, pp. 540-541, p. 543). We believe that Lukács is right: everyone must adhere to the written and unwritten rules of coexistence and cooperation. The basic moral norms bind everyone. However, not everyone is capable of and ready to become a good man. Goodness, as a virtue, is not a generally and universally „prescribed” moral requirement but a special, blessed condition, the phenomenal gift of fate, which, with its wondrous effect, captures the donator, the donated and their fellows alike. The ideal and virtue of 'the good man' is the most powerful drive, the life and soul of education, which at the same time means – let us not doubt it! – huge grit, an unconditional commitment towards humanity and a 'life program'. However, life often forces us to make difficult decisions when

the principle of goodness does not only interfere with the rigid facts of reality but with other virtues and ideals as well. And in such cases the judgement of the particular decision and the particular action is not obvious (A further discussion of this issue offers itself to be the focus of another study!)

5. Conclusion

Society rightfully expects the idea and virtue of goodness to have a more appreciative audience among educators than in other social groups, layers. The real educator knows that becoming a good man is itself an educational value and believes unconditionally that goodness is capable of soothing and reducing harmful effects even if it cannot put an end to human suffering and torment. And this is not little, indeed! We would like to hope that with such determination and firm belief, we can make and control the educational activity more efficiently. The final lesson and the next suggestion: *educational research and practical pedagogy should consider the joint issues of education and philosophy.*

Notes

1. Unlike in many developed western countries, in Hungary both the philosophy of education and applied philosophy strive to gain professional recognition. Other western countries have long-established research groups, departments and journals in this discipline. In this respect we mention that in Hungary, the Hungarian Applied Philosophy Association was founded in Budapest in 1998 in the Institute of Philosophy, Hungarian Academy of Sciences. For more information on its professional activities: <http://www.jgypk.hu/alkfil>
2. Attila Horváth's work Who educates whom? On the interactive nature of education [Ki nevel kit? A nevelés interaktív természetéről]. In: *Education as value [A nevelés mint érték]*. (ed. Karikó Sándor) Áron Kiadó, Brozsek Kiadó, Budapest, 2010. 72-73 refers to this. The author refers to Sándor Karikó's study: Education – what for? A starting point for the philosophy of education [A nevelés mibenlétéről. Nevelésfilozófiai kiindulópont című tanulmányára]. *Új Pedagógiai Szemle*, 2006. máj. 3-15.
3. Kant writes: it is a peculiar feature of mankind that it requires education. Without education man could never become a social being. In our opinion, this feature is one of the fundamental differences between humans and animals.
4. István Pais draws our attention to Democritus' thought. *The Greek philosophy [A görög filozófia]*. Gondolat Kiadó, Budapest, 1982, 190. It is a regrettable fact that Democritus' great idea have not reached the attention of educational researchers.
5. János Bródy: Bad children. In: *Still there are bad children*. CD. Sung by: Judit Halász. The lyrics of the well-known beat-musician portrays the gist of the relationship in question in an accurate and expressive manner.
6. From the scant literature on the philosophy of education in Hungarian see: Mihály Ottó: *Introduction to the philosophy of education [Bevezetés a nevelésfilozófiába]*. Okker Kiadó, Budapest, 1998. In our opinion, the profession did not react to this pioneering work to a sufficient extent. Furthermore Karikó Sándor: *A nevelésfilozófia alapjairól*. SZEK JGYF Kiadó, Szeged, 2009. Second edition: 2010. 65. Pintes Gábor – Fenyvesi Lívía: *The value*

transmitting role and pedagogical concept of the educator [A pedagógus érték közvetítő szerepe és pedagógiai koncepciója]. In: The educator in focus [Középpontban a pedagógus]. (ed. Karikó Sándor) Áron Kiadó, Budapest, 2012. 135-150. Finally Karikó Sándor – Pintes Gábor: The philosophical perspectives of education [A nevelés filozófiai vonatkozásai]. Szegedi Egyetemi Kiadó, Szeged, 2015.

7. The expression belongs to László Németh, a famous Hungarian drama and essay writer and influential educator in the 20th century. He was an educator who really governed human hearts and souls. In: *The last look around [Utolsó széttétekintés].* Magvető és Szépirodalmi Kiadó, Budapest, 1980. 768.
8. At first sight Milán Füst makes the seemingly dumfounding statement that an educator can learn more from Gogol than from multiple volumes of educational scientific research. Some researchers may not agree with Füst's statement but – in our view – it is worth taking it into consideration. *Contemplations and studies [Elmélkedések és tanulmányok].* Magvető Kiadó, Budapest, 1967. 800.
9. Tudománytörténeti kuriózum, that a contemporary south-korean philosopher of education draws our attention to the work of the Hungarian marxist philosopher Georg Lukács in – perhaps the most popular – journal of the philosophy of education published in English. The author highlights Lukács's thought „live with virtuousness!”. Kwak, Duck-Joo: Practising, Philosophy, the Practice of Education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education, 2010. vol. 44. No 1 74-75.*

References

- Arendt, H. (1995). *Between Past and Future [Múlt és Jövő között].* Budapest: Osiris – Riders International
- Bulgakov, M.(1969). *The Master and Margarita [Mester és Margaréta].* Budapest: Európa
- Dubreueq, É. (2004). *Une éducation républicaine. Philosophie de l'éducation.* VRIN
- Fobel, P. (2002). *Applied philosophy and ethics [Alkalmazott filozófia és etika].* In: Opportunities for applied philosophy [Az alkalmazott filozófia esélyei]. (ed. Sándor Karikó) Budapest: Áron
- Füst, M. (1967). *Contemplations and studies [Elmélkedések és tanulmányok].* Budapest: Európa
- Füst, M. (1976). *Diary I. [Napló. I.]* Budapest: Európa
- Gogol, N. V. (1982). *Dead Souls [Holt lelkek].* Budapest: Európa
- Herbart, J. F. (2003). *Pedagogical lectures [Pedagógiai előadások].* In: *History of education chrestomathy [Neveléstörténet. Szöveggyűjtemény].* (eds. István Mészáros István et al.) Budapest: Osiris.
- Hodgson, N. (2010). *What Does it Mean to Be an Educated Person? Journal of Philosophy of Education, 44(1)* <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9752.2010.00744.x>

- Kalisha, W. (2014). "What is education for? Or does it matter what it is for?" Exploring the meaning of education for refugee girls in Dadaab Refugee camp secondary schools. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, 2(4), 26–44.
- Kant, I. (2005). *Anthropological writings [Antropológiai írások]*. Budapest: Osiris/Gond - Cura
- Lukács, Gy.(1977). On poverty of spirit [A lelki szegénységről]. In: Early writings [Íjjúkori művek]. Budapest: Magvető
- Mihály, O. (1998).. *Introduction to the Philosophy of Education.[Bevezetés a nevelésfilozófiába]*. Budapest: Okker
- Pring, R. (2004). *Philosophy of Education*. London, New York: Continuum,