

Social Rehabilitation, where are you Heading?*

At the turn of the 60s and 70s of the 20th century, the harsh words of criticism appeared towards the functioning model of imprisonment, which was accused of ineffectiveness of social rehabilitation institutions (including Martinson's report in the USA). The financial expenditures incurred on the humanitarian and psychologically instrumented penitentiary and correctional social rehabilitation (used on minors) did not bring tangible social rehabilitation results measured by the so-called "coefficient of recidivism". In axiological concepts one would return to the enlightenment vision, thus the free will of the perpetrator and the related retributive justice.

A neoclassical trend appeared in criminology, which was represented by A. von Hirsch (1976, 1986) and E. van den Haag (1975), who referred directly to the work of C. Beccaria and Bentham, that is the leading representatives of the enlightenment theory of criminal justice, but not entirely abandoning deterministic concepts. At this time, it was also considered (like in the period of positivism) that criminal justice should not be directed against individual perpetrators, but against their acts.

Modern philosophers dealing with the issues of criminal punishment, including Michel Foucault (1993), Pierre Bourdieu (2005) and Loïc Wacquant

.....

* Fragment of the author's book *Pedagogika resocjalizacyjna*, Oficyna Wydawnicza "Impuls", Kraków 2014.

(2009), are of the opinion that social organisms, and more generally, modern civilization and modern states, form systems that enslave and subordinate people. This systemic enslavement and subordination serves to exercise power based on the manipulation of tangible and human emotions associated with it. Prisons are only a technology of exercising power, the essence of which is the enslavement of the body and soul of citizens (Foucault), and the penal system is a mechanism of neo-liberalism for controlling social emotions and stabilizing social classes and subclasses (Wacquant 2009).

Reflections arising from literature on contemporary philosophical concepts relating to the role of law in regulating interpersonal relationships, indicate a certain specific model of thinking for contemporary thinkers. It involves criticism of the state and its social control mechanisms, among others, of criminal justice, which identifies itself as a tool of absolute governance, often against the interests of citizens, their personal good and social interests.

A Neoliberal state associated with international corporations is seen as a “monster”, which is unscrupulous in using the attributes of power to carry out the interests of the ruling elite and their supporters. Citizens become victims of corporate economic systems, being hostage to both their work and the money they earn. Defectively functioning states are indeed somehow “producers” of deviant and pathological phenomena. Criminal behavior of citizens is on the one hand “forced” by defectively designed economic systems, on the other hand – they represent a defense mechanism for survival.

Therefore, it is no wonder that the penitentiary systems involved in governance are not interested in their social rehabilitation effectiveness, because it is not needed by anyone. The role of prisons and other isolation institutions comes down to the implementation of short-term political goals, which include effective social isolation of offenders, providing a sense of security for citizens and safety guarantee for prison staff.

The sad vision of reality described, which emerges from reading the works of contemporary philosophers, is unfortunately confirmed by scientific analyses of the functioning of penitentiary systems in the USA and in Europe. We can also see great similarities of the described vision to the Polish social rehabilitation institutional reality. Hence, perhaps published content on the visible crisis of the social rehabilitation space, which is conditioned not so much by the incompetence and ill will of policy-makers and contractor-officials at their disposal, as the planned and consistently implemented neo-liberal vision of the state, unscrupulous, lacking compassion and empathy towards the citizens subordinate to the administrative apparatus.

Pedagogical thinking, and so also involving social rehabilitation educators, is based on specific paradigms understood as a set of general premises in explaining the area of reality, adopted by representatives of the scientific discipline as the model of definitive thinking.

In the twentieth century, several social and pedagogical paradigms emerged, which had the greatest impact on the theoretical base of social rehabilitation pedagogy, and thus also on educational practice.

The structuralist paradigm stems from realism and determinism, thus scientific objectivity and assumes the existence of objective structures through which life progresses. Each individual is assigned to a specific structure and is subject to the impacts of objective forces determining his fate. It examines the assumed social conflicts from the point of view of social organizations (structures).

Similarly, the functional paradigm stemming from realism and determinism (scientific objectivity) defines the social world as objective existence with ready structure governing the life of the individual. A form of description of the world is the cultural system conforming the personalities of individuals to itself. In a sense, it is a paradigm of social homeostasis acknowledging social inequality as the price of social balance.

The humanistic paradigm, which has its roots in nominalism and voluntarism, and therefore scientific subjectivity, justifies the individual and subjective meaning of social life. It presents a critical position towards culture as a set of facts imposed on a person. According to this trend of thinking, a person has the right to make the rules and have a real impact on culture, as well as interpret social conflicts from the point of view of the protection of an individual's interests.

Similar assumptions are adopted by the interpretative paradigm, which also prefers scientific subjectivity, rejecting (like the humanistic paradigm) deterministic order, dealing with the development of awareness of individuals functioning within social structures. The subject of the interpretative paradigm is subjective understanding of the social experience by testing specific human collectivity.

On the basis of the paradigms two trends of building the pedagogical theory have emerged. The first of them is *pedocentrism*, the goal of which is unrestrained development of a child (humanistic paradigm), preferring conscious radical actions strengthening its development and removing social block of this development (*antipedagogy, pedagogy of postmodernism*), and conscious actions governing and strengthening in the child records of the subjective meanings provided by the surrounding reality (interpretative paradigm – *personalistic pedagogy, pedagogy of religion*).

In opposition to this trend is *didascalioctrism* located in the structuralistic and functional paradigm, and consisting in conscious and radical actions shaping the personality of a child able to act in the conditions of structural conflicts (*Herbert's pedagogy, positivist pedagogy*) and conscious actions that shape the personality of a child in accordance with the psychological-social standards in force in a given culture.

The effect of the mentioned visions of building pedagogical theory clashing, two fundamental trends of thinking about pedagogy as a theory and social practice are visible. The first is *neopositivist pedagogy*, the second – *pedagogy of culture*.

Neopositivist pedagogy dates back to Herbert's work (1806) of "*educational teaching*" based on psychological determinism (behaviorism) and sociological determinism (Comte, 1961), as well as the teachings of E. Durkheim (1968) (determination of theoretical and practical conditions of relations between an individual and society).

Pedagogy of culture on the other hand acknowledges and prefers developing and educating an individual through his contact with cultural goods. It is adjusted to hermeneutics, that is in-depth interpretations and understanding symbols by recognizing various educational effects (aesthetic, ethical, artistic education) as pedagogical stimulation of the impact of cultural values on the development of the human personality. In a sense it has become a defense of pedagogy against strictly scientific, naturalistic and materialistic orientations.

Undoubtedly these paradigms and pedagogical theories have had a decisive influence on the theoretical and application space of social rehabilitation pedagogy, both the "classic" one and new trends of searching for theoretical justifications of the social rehabilitation process.

It seems that the following lay at the heart of the emergence of *classical social rehabilitation pedagogy: structuralistic and functional paradigm with the theoretical concept of didascalio-centrism*, while the dominant broad theoretical and methodical base was neopositivist pedagogy.

Whereas *modern (new) social rehabilitation pedagogy* dates back to the *pedocentric vision based on the humanistic and interpretative paradigm*. This fundamental difference in the theoretical approach to the problem and resulting in new methodical solutions triggers live controversy and discussions in scientific environments, but especially arouses anxiety and many doubts in environments of educators-practitioners.

Professor Marek Konopczyński, PhD
Editor-in-chief