“To reach out for new life” (“Po życie sięgać nowe”) is the title of the 7th Pedagogical Congress that was held from 21st to 22nd September 2010 in Toruń. The Congress was organised by the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń and the Research Board was chaired by Prof. Aleksander Nalaskowski. The representatives of almost all fields of study and research within pedagogy had been invited to co-organise the Congress. The plenary session with the papers by Professors: Kwieciński, Kwiatkowski, Nalaskowski, Śliwerski, Witkowski and Męczkowska outlined the thematic area of the conference, and presented social diagnoses – a list of issues to solve, a collection of social expectations and tasks for pedagogy and pedagogues. The two-day conference was based on the workings of ten sessions. A brief thematic description of each of them shall follow.

Session one entitled Market and Education: Between Entrepreneurship and Exclusion posed questions on whether the market is not a trap for education, seen as an authotelic quality, in search for a direction towards cultural heritage and the quality of concern for the individual and the sense of community.

How to prevent the “new life”, which is worth reaching for, as the title of the Meeting suggests, from changing into a life that is worse and more futile, despite the sense of self-satisfaction due to being unaware of deficiencies, incapabilities and loss of chances for spiritual development?

Isn’t entrepreneurship becoming cynical and culture-deprived, almost accepting the exclusion from the high culture and educational aspirations, apart from the concern for superficial markers of status and education?
1. Does the rat race facilitate entrepreneurship or exclusion?

The questions referred to the following relations between market and education:

The market of educational offers and services, including the interests of educational institutions and the quality of their personnel's educational attitudes, and the policy of assessment of the institution's potential (rankings) and "personnel market value";

Labour market, including the demand for professions and employers' expectations, with its emphasis on profiles oriented towards economy, service and application, without the concern for solid foundations in literature, tradition and theory;

The market of consumer attitudes to education and the quality of intellectual competencies and preferences (expectations) of those competing for a degree, here it is the market that determines the quality of potential connected with absorption capacity;

The market of publishing and media offer in relation to its means, their content, forms and programmes to mediate the reference to symbolic culture and knowledge (textbooks, dictionaries, handbooks, classics, literature, films, television and its theme channels and the internet).

The stated questions were answered in several stages. The first one was an introduction to the presently dominant ideology of free market capitalism which means liberalism and its varieties. This issue was referred to in the speech by Prof. Eugenia Potulicka who presented a criticism of neoliberalism, proving that there is an alternative to what is called “the only right way” in the post-socialist societies. The demand for ethical liberalism seems exceptionally promising here. The second stage was a panel discussion with vice-chancellors of Polish state and private universities. The speeches were made by: the Rector of Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz – Prof. Józef Kubik, the Rector of the University of Lower Silesia in Wrocław – Prof. Robert Kwaśnica, the Rector of the Higher School of Pedagogy of the Society of Public Knowledge in Szczecin – Prof. Kazimierz Wenta, the Rector of the Higher School of Health Education and Social Sciences in Łódź – Prof. Zygfryd Juczyński.

In the panel discussion, what was especially interesting and valuable was the contrast between the opinions emphasizing the necessity of adjusting a university function to market requirements and expectations of the so called “clients”, and the attempt to critically analyse the legal foundations of the functioning of non-state universities which marginalize these educational institutions at the very beginning of their operation. Such criticism or even a truth-revealing bias characterised the speech by Prof. Robert Kwaśnica.
The second session was entitled *Democracy: Passiveness and Involvement*. Its organizers agreed on a hypothesis that democracy is neither a guaranteed ideal nor it is non-problematic. It is disappointing, unstable and still at risk of, on the one hand, impotence, on the other though, authoritarianism temptations; still in the state of recession and fired with criticism. Its connections with education are varied and multi-directional – education “to democracy” or “for democracy” is not the only perspective worth consideration. What is also problematic is the democracy in education (a democratic school?) and democracy for education (political conditions of the access to meaningful education). The following papers were presented:

- Piotr Błajet: *Foresight in Education – How the Future Determines the Present*;
- Mariola Gańko-Karwowska: *Between Strategic and Deliberative Understanding of Passiveness and Electoral Involvement*;
- Anna Kola-Rola: *The Role of Elite Education in the Process of Democratisation and Pluralisation of the Polish Society after 1989*;
- Michał Mielczarek: *Active Social Policy in the World of “Disappearing Employment” – Urging for Involvement or Placing in Passiveness*;
- Małgorzata Orłowska: *Social Assistance Recipient – is it Still a Citizen*;
- Piotr Stańczyk: *Silent Consent, Culture of Silence and Policy of Voice*;
- Karolina Starego: *Democracy – People’s Power or Managing the Masses? Contemporary Social and Political Reality as Viewed by the Polish Teachers*;
- Rafał Włodarczyk: *Involvement and Drawing Boundaries from the Perspective of the Pedagogy of Asylum*.

The discussion during the session proved that in Poland there exist circles who not only pose questions about the range and content of various social groups’ and entities’ participation in the public sphere, about access to education, citizens’ freedom and rights, but also show inequalities and barriers connected with them, as well as mechanisms of their emergence and fixation. Undoubtedly, the academic circle of the Gdańsk University, gathered around the moderator of the session, Prof. Tomasz Szkudlarek, has comprehensive knowledge on the issue.

The third session’s discussion topic was *Difference or Confusion – Imitation or Homeliness*? The organizers of the debate in this session assumed that there are two phenomena occurring in the contemporary culture and education: universalisation and particularisation. On the one hand, the invasiveness of globalisation processes leads both to the realisation of the idea of “global village” and “the elimination of differences” (Americanisation, McDonaldization, CocaColisation). On the other hand, one witnesses a growing importance of “difference” and “dissimilarity” – of a search for individual forms of identity. In this case, the absolutisation of a form
of difference sometimes becomes the source of fundamentalism. It is difficult not to mention the phenomenon of “difference faking”, typical of the contemporary society of consumerism (the mass culture’s typical idea of “you have to be the same” has been replaced with the idea of “you have to be different”; however, the sources of dissimilarity seem to be consumption choices and pop culture sphere only). The individual more and more often builds their sense of freedom by constructing their identity (including even their citizenship or gender) from a broad, the critics would say – faked, consumerism ideology or mass media offer. The session included the following list of papers:

**Part 1 – Global Citizenship or a New Tower of Babel?**
- Dr hab. Jadwiga Kosowska-Rataj: *Intercultural Awareness of University Students*;
- Dr Lidia Marek: *World Inhabitants or Citizens? – The Educational Perspective of Global Citizenship*;
- Mgr Łukasz Stankiewicz: *Imitational Transformation and Its Influence on the Ideology in the Discourse of the Polish Public Sphere*;
- Dr Monika Nęcka: *The Problem of Culture Identification of International Schools Students – A Diagnosis and an Educational Help Suggestion*;
- Mgr Telimena Ryta: *Homeliness and Foreignness as Constituent Principles of Social Organisation (Mass Culture as a Characteristic of a Modern Society)*;
- Dr Joanna Cukras-Stelągowska: *Post-modern Re(constructions) of Ethnic Identities*;

**Part 2 – Between Pluralism and Longing for Normative Solutions**
- Dr Tomasz Gmerek: *Education in Russia – from Socialism to Neoliberalism*;
- Dr Andrzej Jarosław Puliński: *Egalitarianism as a Factor in Educational Success of the Finnish School*;
- Dr Jarema Drozdowicz: *Mapping the Difference. Human Terrain System in Academic and Social Discourses of Authority*;
- Mgr Olga Mazurek-Lipka: *Social Constructions of Life Success in the USA. Between Aiming at a Degree and Television Show*;
- Mgr Joanna Nawój-Połóczanska: *Flexibility Versus Attachment: European Union Policy Within the Scope of Lifelong Life Counselling*;
- Mgr Maria Serafinowicz: *Fashion in Junior High School: Creating One’s Individual Image or Following Current Trends?*;
- Mgr Karolina Domagalska: *Mr Smith, Pop Culture and Immigrants’ Identity in Norway*.

**Part 3 – Academy – Homeliness or Confusion**
- Prof. dr hab. Zbigniew Kruszewski: *Intercultural Activities in Relations Between Universities from Different Countries*;
Dr Renata Wawrzyniak-Beszterda, Dr Sylwia Jaskulska, Mgr Mateusz Marciniak: Between School and Academic Field. Inspirations of P. Bourdieu in Studies on the Students of UAM (the University of Adam Mickiewicz) in Poznań;

Dr Sławomir Banaszak: Managers Education in Poland: Present State and Perspectives;

Dr Włodzimierz Olszewski: University’s Objectives for the Development of the local community;

Dr Katarzyna Kabacińska: The Czech Students on Life Success;

Dr Daria Hejwosz: Social Functions of Higher Education in the Republic of South Africa and Difference Constructing.

This session was extremely varied. Adequately to the listed topics of presentation, they were either of a universal dimension, discussed essential issues which the authors attempted to embed in a theoretical context, or referred to “details” which were considered locally, for example narrowly understanding the issue of ethnical identities. The variety of issues and their presentation methods can be both considered as an advantage of the session and its limitation. It becomes an advantage when we understand diversity as an asset, when we do not associate multitude with chaos, mess, superficial tumult. It is a limitation for those of us who expect some order form a scientific debate – content, presentation, form or method.

The fourth session was Postmodernism and Tradition. Its rich programme included the plenary part with the presentations by:

Prof. Dr hab. Roman Schulz: Does Pedagogy Have its Big Questions?

Dr hab. Romuald Grzybowski: Educational Heritage of the Past: Burden or a Treasury of Patterns?

The three sections were:

Section one
Pedagogy and Education in the Postmodernist Perspective

Section two
Pedagogical World Views and Projects – The Heritage of the Past

Section three
Educational Successes and Failures – Between Tradition and the Present

The variety of content and wide range of issues discussed in this session were not its only characteristics. For the first time during the Pedagogical Congress, historians could find such an interesting, current and interdisciplinary area. It was filled with both traditional, historical issues, and the most current, contemporary problems embedded in tradition, in a broad time perspective. Examples of the diversity of issues in session four are as follows: the question about the function and importance of education, its models in the past and present; the question about
a university’s mission; about upbringing and various environments where it takes place; the question about the importance of tradition and contrasting it with the concept of modernity.

The next, fifth session was entitled *Egoism or Autonomy. Or the End of Community?*

As the moderator and the person responsible for the debate in this session, the author of the present paper invited the participants with the following words:

The subject matter of the session lies within the issue of “passage”: from collectivism to individualism, from the pro-social orientation to egoism, from involvement to autonomy. The issue of passage becomes then one of the issues around which the debate is to focus. How is the experience of a passage, a threshold, a critical event understood and described in pedagogy today, what in the field of theory, concept of the contemporary humanities is this experience, once referred to as intuition, maturing, growing-up or development? What is the nature of this experience, its ontological characteristics? What competencies are needed today to face the experience of passage? It is a question about passage, its ontological status, importance, possible forms and consequences posed from the perspective of an individual. What is this experience from the social experience though? What knowledge about change, its phases, barriers and pathologies that accompany it, is provided by today’s social practice? How does pedagogy cope with this issue? How is passage, change, crisis described from the social perspective and in reference to it (to social institutions such as school, social environments like family, peer group, social phenomena like mass culture)? And the third perspective which is a theoretical reflection, or even scientific knowledge constituting our field. What can pedagogy, with its language of generalisation, say about methods, causes, mechanisms, sooner or later consequences of those verge experiences, passages or breakthroughs witnessed from the perspective of an individual, social group, culture? Are those issues present in the discourse of contemporary pedagogy and what is the nature of this presence? This is the first thematic block which I invite the participants to.

The second one is the question about the subject, how the humanities, and pedagogy among them, treat the ideal of a person as consciousness. How are the conditions for studying what is most irreducible in the subject – openness to dissimilarity, to the outside, to being the place for “going beyond oneself”, to transcendency – created? What is the concept of subjectivity open to today, what are the examples and signs of such openness? In this context, what is the understanding of the genesis of the contemporary individualism, the modern term, the passage from the traditional hierarchical society to the modern egalitarian one? What
is the role of tradition in thinking about the subject and what are the consequenc- 
es of the tradition for pedagogy? The further areas for research and discussion, 
which I invite this session participant to, are philosophy of the subject and peda- 
gogy, and the philosophy of the subject and education.

The third thematic block is the question about the identity of the individual, 
about the possible methods of describing, studying and understanding this cate-
gory. Is identity a construct possible to be created today by the individual, or a task 
to be completed, or is it a kind of narration, a still continued story of “I”? What 
problems are recognised in the contemporary reflection on this conceptual cate-
gory? What are the orientations of the contemporary person – the professional, 
educational, biographical ones? On the basis of what values are these being con-
structed, and what are the construction methods available today? What is the po-
sition and role of education processes and educational institutions for the forma-
ton of all those orientations and each of them separately? Where are the sources 
of the basic identity deficits, problems and disorders of the contemporary person? 
Are pedagogy and pedagogues able to recognize and describe them, are they able 
to respond to them and should they be? What is the autonomy of the individual? 
Is it a condition for effective functioning, a personality characteristic, a phase in 
moral development, or a quality within the crucial competencies, necessary for 
understanding and the comprehension of the present world, and which are one of 
the basic objectives of education?

The fourth thematic block is the consequence of the question: does the contem-
porary individualism mean the end of community? The community of values, 
aims, life orientations, and the community of practices and involvement. This issue 
can be exemplified by the question: is the university (as an idea and an institution) 
today this kind of community, or rather an interest group, a field of battle for he-
gemony of different discourses, legitimised and authorised by various, explicit and 
implicit ideologies? What ideology is present in education – in educational prac-
tices and institutions?

The last, fifth thematic block of the session is connected with the question about 
the community of researchers. Is the research, carried out within our discipline, of 
the common, involved nature; does it refer to the shared conventions, to the norms 
and traditions recognised in methodology, or are they rather a collection of indi-
vidual research practices, conducted in an “island-like” manner, which connect to 
form interests, lobby or fashion groups? Does the community of researchers still 
éxist, or has it also been affected by “revolution of subjects”? Is science an involved 
social practice today, or rather an individual choice, an individually constructed 
life orientation?
The sixteen papers presented in this session proved that, on the one hand, “there will not be a revolution of subjects” (the title of the paper by Dr Paweł Rudnicki from the University of Lower Silesia) since, as we are enslaved by consumption, we have today the only freedom… of the very consumption, on the other, though, they raised hopes for citizenship as a new kind of independence, and for subjectivity as a new model of development and personality.

Session six was entitled Searching for a New Paradigm: Polyphony or Cacophony?

During the session, questions about the dominant model of the validation of the humanities, its characteristics and basic qualities were posed; there were questions about the validity criteria of scientific cognition in the humanities. The presentation of methodological attitudes and perspectives used by particular schools and circles of researchers was also diverse. The less present perspectives (such as hermeneutics and phenomenology) were discussed, epistemological terms were defined: pictorial turn, practical turn. This area, as the previous ones, was also characterised by multitude and diversity of attitudes. Multitude understood as either the variety within the discipline, or chaos, superficial, general “humanistic review” which, on the one hand, justified the banality of analyses, on the other though, faked their transdisciplinarity.

Session seven was a great meeting of educational researchers, practitioners, decision-makers and the very students – experiencing their offers on an everyday basis. Its title was: Pretence in Education Invites to Consideration, Intrigues, Irritates. Undoubtedly, the distinct thesis included in the title did not allow any of the participants to remain indifferent. Another feature of the session was the way of conducting the debate by the two charismatic Professors: Prof. Maria Dudzikowa and Prof. Dariusz Kubinowski.

Session eight was dedicated to the analysis of course books and handbooks. The thematic area of the session was outlined by the two moderators – Prof. Mariola Chomczyńska-Rubacha and Prof. Lucyna Kopciewicz, as follows: The debate on course books and handbooks is a good starting point for the discussion about the education of the future. However, focusing on the concrete thing, which are course book and handbooks, has the advantage of disciplining the discussion, placing it both within the material world and in the world of ideas; both in the present and in the future. To construct the answer for the title question may require the process of analysing the status quo of the contemporary course books (their present) and the role which they are to play in the world of information technologies (their future). Carrying out the analysis, one's thinking about course books shall not be limited to their dictionary definitions which ignore the fact that, apart from knowledge, course books also contain heuristics that facilitate the learning process of the
readers. And this is what distinguishes them from the scientific and popular scientific texts, or handbooks.

2. The present of course books and handbooks

The shape of the contemporary course books and handbooks is a source of knowledge about the state of didactics, as well as a source of knowledge about the society. Subsequent generations of course books and handbooks illustrate and exemplify the contemporary standards of knowledge and ways of its transmission, and present the applied strategies of physical, behavioural and intellectual discipline of the addressees. The analysis of course books and handbooks can be conducted from various perspectives. Apart from factual, didactic and editorial criteria, one can indicate less obvious ones such as author’s preferences on world view, propaganda values, beliefs and norms. Besides the issues explicit in course books, that is the theory of school knowledge, the hypotheses about students of both genders, and learning, we – pedagogues are also interested in the implicit messages of the coursebooks (on races, religions, ethnic groups, gender, class, etc.). Thus, we invite you to join in the search for criteria due to which a teacher (but also a parent and every person interested) could make a choice of a coursebook which would be free from discrimination and prejudices, and guarantee effective learning.

3. The future of coursebooks and handbooks

Modern technologies have introduced a new dimension of learning and interaction between the participants of the education process, which has necessitated a review of teaching content, methods and measures. In spite of some signals of fears, the introduction of books, coursebooks and magazines in the electronic form (audiobooks, e-books, e-coursebooks, coursebooks via the Internet) into the educational practice creates new opportunities and challenges. Some doubts are raised due to: the quality of displays (causing tiredness and slower reading), high costs of technical devices, limited protection of copyright law, the quality of materials, etc. Among the advantages, the most important is the opportunity to quickly update the content, which in the face of fast ageing knowledge becomes an essential feature of electronic publications. There is a number of questions to answer, among them:

- What are the advantages and disadvantages of an electronic coursebook?
• Are electronic coursebooks a full alternative for their paper counterparts?
• What are the criteria of the assessment of electronic coursebooks?
• Is learning based on electronic coursebooks effective?
• Does the young generation possess the digital intelligence which predisposes them to use the electronic and multimedia educational materials?
• Is the access to electronic coursebooks and study aids going to contribute to or diminish the phenomenon of social exclusion?

The heated discussion which took place during the session, the disagreement on the ideology of the transfer of content, the kind of justifications which underlie the dominant or the dominant-to-be kind of justification, proved that the issue discussed was essential and current.

Session nine referred to the problems of the profession of the teacher, and the forms of performing this profession of “public trust”. The introduction to the session was the paper by Prof. Dorota Gołębniak who offered the description of broad socio-cultural contexts in considering the teacher and playing the role. A new approach, an attempt to update the questions about the teacher and an introduction into the area of research in action as a way of “being” the teacher inspired the participants to join an interesting discussion. An important and original voice in the discussion was also the paper by Mgr Iwona Hęcka on trust as the basic value for the teacher-student interaction.

The last, tenth session was supposed to be the meeting of Practitioners-Creators of alternative educational concepts, alternative schools. They had arrived hoping for experience exchange, to use the opportunity to learn from one another. Did they succeed? Were we all successful – the organisers and co-organisers of this exceptional meeting of the whole circle of academic pedagogues, which takes place once every three years?

A new life of pedagogy, a new life of pedagogues, a new life of school… was the announcement in the title of the 7th Pedagogical Congress. We arrived at the meeting, intrigued by a promise of breakthrough, moved by the atmosphere in our country, full of involvement and with a strong belief in the power and importance of education. What did we find, what did we agree on, what happened during the next Congress of the researchers of education and learning processes? Do we have any kind of picture of the Polish educational reality today? What picture is it and what are its consequences for all the participants of this reality? The present text shall attempt to offer the author of the present paper’s own, subjective answer to the question.
4. Firstly: pedagogy

Once more, during the next big conference, the pedagogues proved that the first and most important issue is the state of their discipline. I understand that this kind of professional meetings encourage such debates, the specific “self-examination”; it is my strong feeling, though, that we have already exceeded the limit of caring for ourselves in the situation when “reality bites” and demands descriptions, diagnoses, some attempts to solve the problems in the field of upbringing, education, learning. It is no use making repeated, at almost every conference, appeals for the consideration of pedagogues and pedagogy, for our influence on the course of events in the sphere of upbringing and education, if instead of these descriptions and diagnoses we complain about the marginal position of our discipline, our absence in the public debate, or about ignoring our findings by subsequent parties of decision-makers. In order to have an impact on the reality, one has to somehow respond to it, be familiar with it, speak about it using the language of their own discipline; has to precisely and often repeatedly name problems, suggest solutions, disclose threats and pathologies. Self-knowledge and self-reflection of a discipline and the community who practices it is one (certainly important) issue, however, the social importance of a science is manifested by how successful it is in explaining people their world in an adequate, comprehensible and useful way. The world or worlds of education which each of us experiences today require such descriptions – this is our, the pedagogues’ task. What do pedagogues say about pedagogy? What problems within their own discipline do they prioritise?

5. Secondly: school

Today, school as the basic educational institution demands a deeper and a bolder diagnosis, a comprehensive description of the processes which take place in it; a description of what functions it really has today in the life of each of us: the parent, the student, the teacher. The description and criticism of this institution, present in the debate during one of the thematic sessions entitled Pretence in Education – Diagnosis, Attempts of Solutions were examples and attempts of such diagnoses. An interesting idea successfully used by the two professors conducting the session – Prof. M. Dudzikowa from UAM in Poznań and Prof. D. Kubinowski from UMCS (Maria Curie Skłodowska University) in Lublin was to invite for a joint consideration on today’s school functioning, on the current pretence of researchers and practitioners among whom to find both the teachers, head teachers and the very students.
The idea of a joint, open and democratic debate over the Polish schools is especially close to me. For several years, as a part of the Lower Silesian Science Festival (Dolnośląski Festiwal Nauki), the author, together with a team of associates from the University of Lower Silesia, organises debates entitled What's the Matter with School? [Co z tą szkołą?].

The participants of the debates are parents and teachers, head-teachers and students of Wrocław’s schools, the representatives of educational authorities and academic circles, all having equal rights. The discussions have been inspired by the conviction that a lack of a real dialogue, inability to mutually respect persons co-creating school, or limited abilities to listen to the voice of others – all this generates problems which prevent an effective co-operation between the students, parents, teachers, school controlling authorities, or local government. The problems connected with communicative competencies at school translate into the overall picture of educational and upbringing problems. People who know they will not be listened to, remain silent or express their dissatisfaction with aggression. “The training of silence”, or “symbolic violence” emerge as pedagogical categories showing how much oppressive school can be for both students and teachers. The questions arising in this context refer to: How to talk and what about? How to go beyond the stereotypical roles of “the all-knowing teacher” and “the nothing-knowing student”? How to ensure that the dialogue becomes the space for education? The experiences gained from the previous meetings prove how difficult it is for us to learn to talk to each other, how hard it is to listen to each other when no role and position statuses are between us, and when we try to exchange our such different educational experiences. They also show that we will have to overcome numerous pretended activities, which fake development and mock dialogue; activities which are used by various participants of the educational process mostly as a means to secure their position and their own, often dissimilar interests. During the Pedagogical Meeting, in the debate over the school, the pretence was noticed, and it refers to:

6. Thirdly: the individual

The individual finds oneself in the conditions when they are forced to accept dissimilar, and even contradictory images of themselves which refer to the roles they perform. In the past, the traditional answer to the question “who are you?” was “I am my father’s son”. Today, the answer is “I am myself, I decide for myself by what I do and what I choose”. This change of self-identification is a sign of the present.
It is also a forecast of a serious crisis of individual’s identity. A stable personal identity which is continued throughout the whole life seems to be not only untypical, but what is more, it appears to be socially pathological and apparently out-of-date in the post-industrial society. Today, in the knowledge-based society, an increasing number of longer educated people take on the research-reflective orientation. The people understand themselves and their identities as objects which undergo intentional modifications, and they fully consciously and deliberately begin attempts of a psychological transformation and social reconstruction of themselves. For the generation who were born at the beginning of the 80s, change has become a form of socialisation. The individual’s identity, though, has become their problem since there are no matrixes, identity types which would ensure a safe socialisation. As many types of descriptions of the present times co-exist today, so there co-exist many various and contradictory identity models. The conviction “you have to be this”, so typical of the modern era, in the consumption society has been replaced with “you can be anyone”. Therefore, so important today becomes the issue of choice of: life orientation, values and aims, lifestyle and way of life, as well as of the kind of justification that motivates the choices, enables and legitimises them. It is good that during the 7th Pedagogical Congress there was a chance to discuss this issue.

However, is it possible today to say that we have reached out for “a new life”? For new ideas and problems, new ways and new opportunities of describing and understanding reality, for new theories used as instruments for such descriptions, and finally, has a new generation or even a group of researchers emerged? Has the quote from Adam Asnyk’s poem become a realised hope of meeting a community of pedagogues, or is it still our dream? An unrealised one, and thus, so inspiring? I think that each of us, the participants of the meeting, may have their own, often different (which does not mean – false or less correct) answer to this question.