

Agnieszka Lena Licznarska*

THE OTHER – A TRUE INDIVIDUAL¹

This paper describes how a common European may perceive *the Other* and analyses the question how a common European teacher can build better dialogue and connectivity between diverse students in situations where opportunities for dialogue are being challenged because *the Other* is frequently experienced as a threat rather than a source of solidarity, learning and enrichment. The strategy I adopt here to answer the above question refers to my own experience. I had been working as a regular teacher for 15 years when I decided to write a PhD on inclusive education, which in Poland is primarily understood as education for disabled children. In my fieldwork I met the whole range of other children: poor, disabled, Roma, ill, who were not offered equitable education. In such cases, solidarity entails social praxis including reflection and calling for political action (Freire 2000, p. 52).

On the classroom level, a common teacher is unable to become radical and engage in political action. However, the teacher can work on themselves to eliminate the conflict between human solidarity and alienation, between being silent and the desire to speak out to oneself and others (Freire 2000, p. 48). In Freire's opinion (2000, p. 49), helping is demanding, as it requires us to enter the situation of the others, and I believe the skill of going out of oneself in order to look at oneself is one of the basic tools in ethnography.

Literature on ethnography and anthropology in education include texts by George and Luise Spindler (1982a; 1982b) who describe how they change the teacher's way of thinking with cultural therapy for culturally diverse schools. Though the text may be perceived as now dated, I believe it has not lost any of its strengths and is still actual. I have partly performed it on myself to the point where it was relevant for my research studies and followed the Spindlers' recommendation to become an ethnographer. The text's procedure is as follows: in the first stage the teacher works on her/his awareness, focusing on the topics of relationships and communication. The second stage performed within the class is to work with *the Other* and regular students in the area of relationships and communication to convince both parties that they can be prospective

* Agnieszka Lena Licznarska, M.A. – PhD student, University of Lower Silesia, Faculty of Education, Doctoral Studies of Pedagogy in English Language, Wrocław, Poland; e-mail: olibanum@wp.pl.

¹ The paper is part of a project that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie-Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement number 676452.

interlocutors for each other. Then, in the moment which Goffman calls mixed contacts (Goffman 1963, p. 137), when *the Other*/the stigmatized and the normals are in the same social situation, as in a classroom, their problems with communication are vital (Goffman 1963, p. 12).

On the whole, in a long and painstaking process, education teaches how to make contacts effectively. The teacher as the agent is responsible for starting a dialogue and he/she sometimes fails. My overarching paradigm here is the belief that everybody has the right to equitable education and at the intersection of relationships, communication and education, this article focuses on three topics which may help better dialogue: the teacher's cultural therapy, *the Other*, and communication and language.

Teacher development or cultural therapy

We live at the time of mixed contacts (Goffman 1963, p. 137) and classrooms are full of *Other* children: poor, disabled, mixed nationalities, ill. As teachers say in my informal meetings, each student has the right to equitable education and most educators claim to be willing to work with *the Other* by initiating a dialogue on an everyday basis. They believe that education is enough to change a person's life. However, teacher-educators and researchers in education seem to wonder.

Can education change society to offer education which really brings enrichment and not subjugation, asks Apple in his book title (2012) and during a lecture given at Ljubljana University (CEPS Ljubljana 2016). At the lecture, he argues that people on the Right share his faith in education but use it for their own purposes. For Apple, this means to bring up students to become elements of a system by using an official and hidden curriculum which teaches norms and values. People on the Left have numerous doubts about faith in education, says Apple, while education has a leading role in radical social transformation. Freire even embodies education with political power (Freire 2000, p. 54). However, the Spindlers' (1982a, p. 208) "assimilationist, racist, and mainstream" classroom environment of the 1950s, when they did their first field studies, in 1982 seem not to have been transformed at all. The founders of anthropology in education, similarly to neo-liberal voices, present education as a process transmitting culture and values, where school is "a mandated cultural process and the teacher a cultural agent" (Spindler 1982b, p. 365). They do not use words like agents of cultural imperialism, cultural hegemony or cultural struggle, but they present the teacher as a person who helps put children in caste roles. In my opinion, with society's margins changing and more subtly defined, *the Other* becomes the Foucauldian (1995) construct of the society.

The Spindlers (1982a) argue that the discrepancy between the teachers' attitude and outsiders' opinions can be attributed to teachers' upbringing. In my view, as a child the

teacher is brought up to norms created by the dominant group's experience and culture, with its model of a normal, average man developed in the 19th century and propagated by literature. The paradox is that though the teacher subconsciously defines *the Other* according to established norms, a common European tends to believe that teachers are impartial. Bureaucrats and experts cannot, however, be impartial and exercise their decision-making power in an impartial manner (Young 2011, p. 114). According to Spindler (1982b, p. 365) teachers are cultural agents of the society and yet I would argue that they simultaneously believe in a contradictory equitable education, though admitting not being prepared to work with *the Other*.

The Spindlers suggest to prepare the teacher by turning her/him into an ethnographer, because if the teacher remembers to treat herself, other colleagues and students as foreigners or anthropological natives “engaging in rituals, interaction, role-playing, selective perception, cultural conflict” (Spindler 1982a, p. 202), this person may discover a foreign land. In the first stage of the cultural therapy the teacher works on her/his awareness, focusing on the topics of relationships and communication important for starting a dialogue with *the Other*. The second stage performed within the class is to work with regular students and *the Other* in the area of relationships and communication to convince both parties that they can be prospective interlocutors for each other. Sometimes, the teacher has no choice and does both stages at once. Still, the advantages of a teacher-ethnographer may be appreciated in the following simile: “if a fish were to become an anthropologist, the last thing it would discover would be water” (Mead cited by Spindler 1982a, p. 202).

In the area of relationships, I believe the teacher may take a course in cultural anthropology and learn about, e.g. the noble savage, the brute savage, the idea of progress. Regardless of their age, these notions do exist in everyday conversations and need some theoretical development. In practice, the Spindlers' basic premise is that culture is not simply a factor, as it is an influence. This appears in everything the teacher does, says, or thinks: assumptions, goals, values, beliefs and communicative modes (Spindler 1982b, p. 367). When I think about ethnographic methods, I see the teacher turning herself into an ethnographer performing participant observation, which means being immersed into a classroom, being vigilant, looking around and observing everything to gather information about human behaviour. With self-examination, the teacher brings herself to the level of awareness and sees how assumptions, goals or values affect her/his behaviour or become obstacles. I believe anthropological methodology forces us, teachers, to analyse ourselves and the surrounding world.

In their texts (1982a, 1982b) the Spindlers claim that ethnography is good for education because it helps to fight resistance to change. This is hard and requires time, as the body and mind refuse to collaborate. The Spindlers successfully use cultural therapy

and gradually transform Roger Harker's hostile attitude into a reluctant, disbelieving attitude and he is finally surprised at his previous discriminating ways of behaviour. They help him to go out of himself to look at himself and to explore his self-identity. This paradox, that to find their characteristic features, someone has to go out of themselves to look for differences, was picked up, scattered over various Rousseau papers, by Levi-Strauss (Burszta 1992, p. 27) and has never lost its strength. Anthropology in education enriches the teacher who, through the lens of an ethnographer, learns about themselves and their own ways of communication.

When the teacher starts reflecting, she/he is certain to ask, as the first question, about the aim of education of *the Other*. I believe the teacher is almost certain to be able to juxtapose norms and values propagated by the normals (Goffman 1963, p. 5) with norms and values characteristic for *the Other*. And the teacher is very unlikely to be able to choose a better solution, as the task for her/him is to feel solidarity with *the Other* and simultaneously teach the student critical thinking.

The Other

Who is *the Other*? This is the person with a stigma, and a person with a stigma is not quite human, so is not treated as a human being (Goffman 1963, p. 5). Such a definition makes it difficult for *the Other* to become the point of interest for regular social sciences. *The Other* has become a research topic for studies dealing with marginality: disability studies, multicultural studies, feminism, critical race studies, queer studies (Gabel, Connor 2009, p. 382). As Gabel says, their researchers explore how to build a dialogue between mainstream thinking and actors from the margins, so I believe we can see this as applicable to a non-speaking disabled child. According to Gabel, in their quest, researchers refer to the paradigm of normalcy which dominates mainstream thinking and thus pushes all other differences into the margins. The above studies intersect in their fields because, says Gabel (2009, p. 382), they are founded on the quest for equity and social justice.

It seems clear that references to the notion of *the Other* have always existed as they are based, says Burszta (1992, p. 15), on the conviction typical for all cultures that man is at the centre and *the Others* are outside at margins. Burszta calls this Ethnocentrism which means that man considers his group and its values as especially valuable. Since the beginning of the historical geographical explorations, says Burszta, European travellers were trying to interpret people living outside Europe, following an ethnocentric model. Early historical accounts included two opposite notions: of the noble savage and of the brute savage. Both of them were connected with the discussion about nature, its influence and the otherness of natural life.

Before the Enlightenment, nature was seen as a source of threat and man could only adapt himself. Since the Enlightenment nature has, however, become dominated by reason interested in its means and goals. Learned people, such as Rousseau (Burszta 1992, p. 28), looked for ways to harmonise human life with nature and philosophers used the word harmony, but grand exploitation of nature had started. Man is a part of nature and “the history of man’s efforts to subjugate nature is also the history of man’s subjugation by man” (Horkheimer 2004, p. 72). The first interpretation of the noble savage supported harmony, while the second one of the brute savage supported subjugation, but both of them finally led to the conclusion that savages are people different from the Europeans. As this conclusion does not sound conclusive, so these two plots have been constantly present in European discourse.

In the 19th century the idea of the noble savage – the epitome of the ideal world – was suppressed by the theory of evolution and classical evolutionism, which underlined the notion of human progress from savagery through barbarism to civilisation. Claude Levi Strauss, who explored the rousseauian noble savage, says that by looking for relations between nature and man, Rousseau anticipated the reflection on European self-identity (Burszta 1992, p. 27). To explore it, man has to look at himself by going out of himself: to find characteristic features, man has to look for differences. This paradox is the problem for any anthropologist and research studies of otherness.

After constructing *the Other* people, the society constructed their features like their otherness, disability, and the race to differentiate the normals from *the Other* and help them to create their own group identity began (Goffman 1963, p. 112). Otherness, defined as cultural diversity, started to be seen only in the 20th century (Cervinkova 1996, p. 56). Its modern ideas juxtaposed with normalcy (Davis 1995, p. 23) are intersected with various disciplines and permeate everyday life with their discourses. The disabled *Other* is quite a new notion, as an ideal human body used to exist in mythologies only (Davis 1995, p. 25). All people were at the same level. Even people who were different were accepted because everyone was different from God. Everybody was assumed to have some flaws and other/different people (like the mentally ill) were sometimes even more accepted, as people believed in them having been sent by God. As Bakhtin shows, the opposite of the ideal was the grotesque, like gargoyles in cathedrals (Davis 1995, p. 25). The grotesque was not disabled, as disability was invented later and the disabled are subverts of the American Ideal (Murphy cited in Cervinkova 1996, p. 58). And who is the American ideal? – I wonder if it is Barbie.

The notion that a person with a stigma is not quite human is the prevailing way of thinking. This is either supported or fought against, yet the choice is not so simple. The problem, it can be argued, lies in the mixture of notions taken from two fields of science: neuropsychology and anthropology. Humans live in an ever-changing envi-

ronment which requires being on the alert all the time. If anything different appears, the individual knows about it at once due to their brain activity. This phenomenon is called the orienting/what-is-it reflex (Pavlov as cited in Łuria 1976, p. 103) and comes from the region of activation close to the regions of the brain responsible for emotions, decision-making and memory. It is the basis for any learning activity. Seeing differences, otherness, *the Other* is so natural, that the question rather is what people, including teachers, do with it. Cultural anthropology describes notions prevailing in different periods, which have not disappeared and are somehow present, often contradicting each other.

The 19th century left us still the legacy of an average individual, leading to the middle-ness of life, and the hegemony of normalcy. This has ever since been abusing people by changing the natural tendency to compare in order to process the results and construct something new (Davis 1995, p. 44). In this process, individuals have been given the notion of the native, the colonized, *the Other*, the disabled. The 19th century literature often depicts these characters by underlining the conflict: nature versus nurture, with nature always winning. There is no longer the noble savage of Jean Rousseau, living in natural, exotic places, but an evolutionary character at the lower level of savagery or barbarism with some limitation of morals, ethics and language. And this literary heritage has been constantly influencing the European Everyman (Conrad's *The Secret Agent*; Steinbeck's *Of Mice and Men*).

Through literature and culture, the society establishes norms to categorize people (Goffman 1963, p. 2). Norms become routines and the individual subconsciously follows them when meeting someone new. If there is anything different, the individual looks for signs of stigma, which might be connected with physical deformities, with the character flawed by passions, homosexuality, mental disorders, or with race, nation, religion (Goffman 1963, p. 4). Humans have the whole collection of labels which common people, including teachers, use. Each label is followed by normative expectations accompanied by positive or negative punishments depending on whether a person conforms or not. Being for the first time in a classroom, the self of *the Other* has to choose how to manage a stigma, balancing two elements: how the normals see the stigmatized person and how the stigmatized sees themselves. For the teacher, this is the crucial moment to start a dialogue. And yet this depends on the teacher's preparation and experience of how to deal with *the Other*.

The Other has two disputable solutions: either to assimilate or retreat (Goffman 1963, p. 129). The first one means that *the Other* keeps apart and still assimilates. The normals think they accept *the Other* unless *the Other* is far away and pretends to accept and like this situation. This person is expected to be brave, not to feel bad at being stigmatized, and to be patient, while the normals reserve for themselves the right not to be

patient. In the second pattern, *the Other* rejects assimilation strategies and consolidates with the similar group. The group supports fighters and suggests segregation from the normals by the explicit underlining of some features connected with their otherness.

I argue that the mixture of cultural, bodily and psychological problems might still be more complicated. Based on their experience in anthropological fieldwork, the Spindlers (1982b, p. 375) define the problems of *the Other's* self-identity connected with time and space. They mention its three facets. Romanticized and idealized, the first *enduring self* refers to its past experiences defining its own social identity. The second *situated self* is more pragmatic and deals with everyday present life. The third *endangered self* appears when the enduring self is threatened by the situated self and the question arises how to keep someone's identity. And even the Spindlers, with their experience of over-crossing their selves, felt marginalized in their own society, as if they were *the Others* though they were empowered by their social position.

Teachers' cultural therapy will help accommodate the intervention in time and space. Studies in anthropology will draw the teacher's attention to the problem with nature expressed through the notion of the noble savage, brute savage and progress. Modern insensitive pragmatic reason considers itself the master of nature and nature its servant, forgetting about Horkheimer's paradox that though man is part of nature by dominating it, he dominates himself too (Horkheimer 2004, p. 73). Cultural heritage, or cultural imperialism, after all, help analyse society. Society is historically constructed following how the normals and *the Others* perceive themselves, with the normals always considering themselves full members of the society. In Goffman's total institution, like the society (Spindler 1982b, p. 365) *the Other* accepting or fighting against the society has no chance to become the normal. Being always stigmatized, underlined by a psychologically natural tendency to experience them as a threat, *the Others* after some time discover that whatever they are taught, they are different. How is one to live with a stigma? Assimilate? Fight against the normals? The stigmatized look for solutions but they slowly discover that there might not be a true solution (Tokarska-Bakir 2007, p. 25).

In a classroom the situations with rejected or falsely accepted *Others* might become topics for critical analysis performed with students. We teachers know the fighting *Others*, sometime these are simply not popular students, constantly looking for any hint suggesting their acceptance is false. They are at once eager to present this falsification to the world. In the case of false acceptance, the normals never want to explore the borders of their tolerance and they would probably avoid talking about nature and the noble or brute savage, for example, while at the same time they think highly of themselves, arguing about less controversial topics like stealing. The problem is that no matter what *the Other* does, people cannot change the colour of their skin, people cannot stop being disabled, or people cannot learn something no matter how hard they

try, and the student may always find him/herself in a place where he/she is different. However, the classroom is a small microcosm in which the teacher can intervene if she/he has been prepared theoretically and practically.

The teacher will be able to organise and conduct discussions about models of stigma management (Goffman 1963, p. 51) within the school environment and culture. These will help the student to understand their situation. By talking about three facets of the self situated in the past, in the future and in the present, the teacher helps to identify and to describe boundaries nagging *the Other*, which are not “irrational and destructive”, as an outsider might think (Spindler 1982b, p. 387). These boundaries are absolutely necessary to preserve one’s self-esteem and combine the situated self which refers to past experiences with the enduring self which refers to present life. If they are shared within the class, I suggest, the boundaries, usually connected with other habits and cultures, will enrich the whole class community. The selves of all students will be built by understanding which is elaborated in dialogues conducted with teachers and colleagues at school. It is, however, necessary to say that stigma management does not help eliminate stigma, but it helps to organise someone’s life better.

In some circumstances, discussions on stigma management may introduce the topic of the savage. Based on some very informal observations, the author notices that the normals refer to the notion of the brute savage with its negative connotations and presumed limitations of ethics and language. In discussions they are certain to mention normalcy, juxtaposed with otherness as an element of nature, as the point of finite reference. I believe the teachers’ task is not to avoid such topics but to do what modern pragmatic reason likes and values, i.e. to refer to data and facts. Thus, the teacher will help *the Other* to critically analyse, ponder over the stigma, and imprint her/his own sign of individuality on their own personality.

Scientific disciplines (anthropology, neuropsychology, literature) at their intersections become ways to manage stigma and show that it is not possible (in fact would be fatal for learning) to eliminate natural brain activity that differentiates between people. People can, however, overcome their and society’s natural inclinations with critical analysis. As Bauman says: “Whatever *the Other* do, he or she is doomed to lose and the best solution for *the Other* is to colonize the society” (Bauman cited in Tokarska-Bakir 2007, p. 25). With critical analysis, an individual with stigma, though unwillingly, becomes somebody truly significant and not just like a commoner who cannot be differentiated from the background. *The Other* has a chance to become a true individual.

Communication and language

The skill to critically analyse is the final goal in language education and it is a long and painstaking process. Education teaches how to effectively make contacts and the ideal model of lesson communication is that teachers ask questions and children answer or vice versa. The meaning of the lesson (both the curriculum and way of teaching) is enacted by the teacher. Students are to leave a classroom with this meaning in their heads and be able to perform and talk about it. Semiotics relates how meaning is made through linguistic and non-linguistic ways with the use of signs, symbols, their surroundings, environment, all creating heterogeneous settings. Similarly, special education underlines the usage of different forms like sign language, facial expressions, gestures. These are sometimes named as important for special education only, though, in fact, they are elements of everyday life. In the field of applied linguistics, language is treated as a tool to mostly teach the curriculum in the process of learning. There has, however, been a centuries-long discussion as to what is the relation between thought and the word.

In Plato's *Cratylus*, it is the mythical maker of language who brings the words/labels (Harris 1990, p. 8), while according to Vygotsky, their meaning is the unity of a word and a thought (Vygotsky 1989, p. 320). It was, however, Saussure and Wittgenstein who pushed aside the references to the object, and out-of-language reality, and drew attention to the very language, becoming thus most nearly responsible for the linguistic turn (Rasiński 2009, p. 10). Saussure compares language to a piece of paper with *recto* being the thought and *verso* being the sound, thus making them indivisible (Rasiński 2009, p. 12). Combined, these are defined by Bakhtin as a "human act" and "a potential text" which "can be only understood in the dialogic context of its time" (Koczanowicz 2015, p. 50).

Each text is an unmediated reality of thought and experience, but Bakhtin, mostly interested in verbal texts, focuses on an utterance with its socio-ideological functions and defines it as a fundamental unit. As the basic unit of language, the utterance has a double nature, being simultaneously an expression of a human's mind and "a socially constructed means of communication" (Koczanowicz 2015, p. 45). The utterance is "a bridge between mental states, social institutions" and an "immediate or mediated *Other*" (Koczanowicz 2015, p. 45). All these three elements: mental states, social institutions and *the Other* constitute the whole, which is oriented toward the next *Other* and this orientation is an important step as there must be responsive understanding. *The Other* becomes part of the utterance and in his concept Bakhtin suggests the unity in opposition. If there is no opposition (no *Other*), there is no dialogue. This dialogical character is at the lowest possible level of language-in-action/use, the level of utterance, and individuals need *the Other* to develop their language. The usage of a dialogue in

language emerges out of social life, therefore there is not only one language. There are concurrent languages and voices of mental states, social institutions and *the Other*.

The idea of inclusive education deals with widely understood presence of *the Other* in a classroom, common room, cafeteria or participating in extra-curricular activities. Most problematic is the presence in a classroom and this draws most attention: the process of education needs mutual participation and a dialogue has to be meaningful. Educators, participants and parents signal problems with communication understood as the process in which one person “sends a message to another person, who receives and decodes the message” (Kumin 1994, p. 1). In general, *the Other* does not communicate easily, feeling stigmatized. Disabled children often speak poorly, so they rarely ask or answer any questions.

In general, lessons do not have dialogical character, the teacher asks questions and children are to raise their hands and answer. Any non-linguistic signs are usually treated as disruptions in the smooth flow of a lesson. The lesson rarely is the full exchange of meanings, in which students are not treated as “containers/receptacles” (Freire 2000, p. 72), and the aim is not “banking education” (Freire 2000, p. 73). Arguably, the teacher tends to forget that in their learning, regardless of age, students always use social institutions known to them: their funds of knowledge (Gonzalez and Moll 1995, p. 446) and add them to the meaning enacted by the teacher in a cultural and heterogeneous setting. Students’ human acts express their desires to communicate but how these possibilities are used depends on a communication style created by the teacher. The teacher as a lesson agent is responsible for starting a dialogue and its first moments, but very often she/he does not change her/his habits of verbal interactions to accommodate any other forms of communication like non-verbal behaviour and patterns of action or non-action. And unless the teacher is vigilant, like an ethnographer, reads facial expressions and gestures, there will be no context for a meaningful dialogue. Consequently teachers in general do not start the dialogue with *the Other* and do not communicate with other/disabled children in these moments of “mixed contacts” (Goffman 1963, p. 137).

The Spindlers’ cultural therapy expects the teacher to focus on the second element, i.e. communication. The text has points crucial for successful communication as it draws attention to problems later defined as power relations (Foucault 1995, p. 27). The teacher learns about her/his power, by being in charge and controlling the process of education in a classroom. If the teacher enters the class with not thought-out and not verbalised cultural assumptions (Spindler 1982b, p. 374), difficulties are bound to happen. Regular students and *the Others* also come with their assumptions and funds of knowledge (Gonzalez and Moll 1995, p. 446). At the beginning of any course, the teacher is expected to set the tone and start exchanging meanings with everybody,

including *the Other*. Later, the position of power might change, but essentially the teacher teaches to empower students with meaning of a class culture.

It is certain that meaning is the basic goal of each lesson and this meaning will be created by the teacher to include the whole range of topics: curriculum, teacher's transformed assumptions, the normals' and *the Other's* funds of knowledge (Gonzalez and Moll 1995, p. 446). The aim of education is to develop in students the skill of critical thinking and make students see that race, disability, *the Other* are human inventions constructed to differentiate themselves from the rest. This differentiation is natural but the society interprets this phenomenon and students need cultural and social knowledge to manage their *Other* in their group. I believe they also need language skills and knowledge about how various non-linguistic elements convey meaning.

Students' funds of knowledge (Gonzalez and Moll 1995, p. 446) include different forms of communication: both linguistic and non-linguistic. In a given context, any human act can be the beginning of a conversation. This context might be enacted by facial expressions, gestures, signs (Kumin 1994, p. 40) and a human act becomes the text, which the teacher might interpret as an indicator of communication. A human act, an unmediated text at the beginning, might become a conversation as an element of a linguistic process in a community of practice (Wenger 2010, p. 179). It is useless to wonder what is the first verso or recto, though teachers tend to assume that *verso* is knowledge and if there is no *verso*, there are no potentialities and a dialogue is impossible. However, it often happens that there is no dialogue because of its three elements: mental states, social institutions and *the Other*. There is no orientation towards *the Other* as an important step in responsive understanding.

Conclusions

The aim of this paper has been to discuss how a common European may perceive *the Other* and analyse how a common teacher may build better dialogue, by not seeing the *Other* as a threat, but instead as source of solidarity, learning and enrichment. The author claims that starting the process of self-reflection with the aim to learn and share this knowledge with *the Other* and students is the thing which a common teacher may do on an everyday basis as a sign of solidarity, learning and enrichment.

This paper focuses on cultural therapy as a solution for ongoing teacher development. The author sees the notion of the *Other* in a historical context underlined by culture and draws attention to the problem of dialogue and language. The therapy helps the teacher to understand her/his cultural position, widens horizons, and teaches how to appreciate different lifestyles. The teacher becomes sensitized to *the Other* and other cultures and through reflexive analysis based on anthropological knowledge learns to

see the own culture as the third person and to estimate how it influences her/his actions and perceptions (Spindler 1982b, p. 367). Students' funds of knowledge (Gonzalez and Moll 1995, p. 446) enrich the lesson and combined with the teachers' own produce a new fund of knowledge; elementary forms of sociality which trigger gradual development of understanding to "sophisticated institutions" (Mead cited in Koczanowicz 2015, p. 8).

It should be noted, however, that this article has explored only a few notions used on an everyday basis and even so only in outline. The author wants to underline the importance of the rousseauian paradox that to find their characteristic feature individuals have to go out of themselves, as this basic tool seems to be too often forgotten in the search for more elaborate techniques. The individual focuses their basic efforts on survival in the surrounding world and their orienting reflex is the heritage of living close to nature. For Europeans, nature was a threat, but since the Enlightenment it has long been subjugated with the help of reason. It is not possible to make nature a servant without doing harm to humans themselves as a part of nature. *The Other* has been always perceived as an element of nature and thus has become a philosophical problem for Europeans who both dominate and are dominated by nature.

References

- Apple M.W. (2012), *Can education change society?*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Burszta W. (1992), *Wymiary antropologicznego poznania kultury*, "Etnografia", No 15, Poznań.
- CEPS Ljubljana (Producer) (2016, December 9), *Can education change society?* [Audio podcast] Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OdiqHCXwJHc> [2.04.2017].
- Cervinkova H. (1996), *Disability and the other in cultural anthropology*, "Human Mosaic", 30(1-2), pp. 56-63.
- Davis L.J. (1995), *Enforcing normalcy: Disability, deafness, and the body*, Verso, New York.
- Deliège R. (2011), *Historia antropologii: szkoły, autorzy, teorie*, trans. K. Marczevska, Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa.
- Foucault M. (1995), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of Prison*, Vintage Books, New York.
- Freire P. (2000), *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Bloomsbury Publishing, New York.
- Gabel S.L. & Connor D.J. (2009), *Theorizing disability: Implications and applications for social justice in education. Handbook of social justice in education*, Routledge, New York.
- Goffman E. (1961), *Asylums. Essays on the social situations of mental patients and other inmates*, Anchor Books, New York.
- Goffman E. (1963), *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York.
- Gonzalez N., Moll L.C., Tenery M.F., Rivera A., Rendon P., Gonzales R. & Amanti C. (1995), *Funds of knowledge for teaching in Latino households*, "Urban Education", 29(4), pp. 443-470. doi:10.1177/0042085995029004005.
- Harris R. (1990), *Language, Saussure and Wittgenstein: How to play games with words*, Routledge, London.
- Horkheimer M. (2004), *Eclipse of Reason*, The Continuum Publishing Company, London.

- Koczanowicz L. (2015), *Politics of Dialogue: Non-consensual Democracy and Critical Community*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Krause A. (2010), *Współczesne paradygmaty pedagogiki specjalnej*, Impuls, Kraków.
- Kumin L. (1994), *Communication skills in children with Down syndrome: a guide for parents*, Woodbine House, Bethesda.
- Łuria A.R. (1976), *Podstawy neuropsychologii*, trans. D. Kądziaława, Państwowy Zakład Wydawnictw Lekarskich, Warszawa.
- Rasiński L. (2009), *Wstęp*, [in:] *Język, dyskurs, społeczeństwo*, L. Rasiński (ed.), Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa, pp. 7-27.
- Rzeźnicka-Krupa J. (2007), *Komunikacja – Edukacja – Społeczeństwo. O dyskursie dzieci z niepełnosprawnością intelektualną*, Impuls, Kraków.
- Spindler G. & Spindler L. (1982a), *Roger Harker and Schönhausen: From familiar to strange and back again*, [in:] *Fifty years of anthropology and education 1950-2000*, G. Spindler (ed.), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Mahwah, pp. 201-247.
- Spindler G. & Spindler L. (1982b), *The process of culture and person: Cultural therapy and culturally diverse schools. Renegotiating cultural diversity in American schools*, [in:] *Fifty years of anthropology and education 1950-2000*, G. Spindler (ed.), Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Mahwah, pp. 367-388.
- Tokarska-Bakir J. (2007), *Wstęp*, [in:] *Piętno: rozważania o zranionej tożsamości*, trans. A. Dzierżyńska & J. Tokarska-Bakir, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne, Gdańsk.
- Vygotsky L.S. (1989), *Myślenie i mowa*, trans. E. Flesznerowa & J. Fleszner, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa.
- Wenger E. (2010), *Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems: the Career of a Concept*, [in:] *Social Learning Systems and Communities of Practice*, C. Blackmore (ed.), Springer, London.
- Young I.M. (2011), *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

THE OTHER – A TRUE INDIVIDUAL

SUMMARY: This paper deals with a common perception of *the Other* as a threat for a dialogue expressed by students and teachers in a general education inclusive classroom. This assumption is however governed by natural brain reflexes interpreted by culture and society. This reason has been deeply covered with modern discussions about normalcy because nature as philosophical problem has been eliminated by pragmatic mind. This study explores modern discussions about *the Other*, nature and language. The article posits an argument that *the Other* is a natural element to develop any meaningful dialogue.

KEYWORDS: the Other, language, cultural therapy, nature.

INNY – PRAWDZIWIY INDYWIDUALISTA

STRESZCZENIE: Artykuł jest teoretycznym studium nad INNYM w perspektywie edukacyjnej i codziennego życia szkoły. Treść artykułu dowodzi, że edukacyjne badania społeczne skoncentrowane na INNYM muszą mieć charakter interdyscyplinarny i opierać się na osiągnięciach współczesnej neuropsychologii, andragogiki, pedagogiki specjalnej, etnografii i filozofii (por. Rzeźnicka-Krupa 2007; Krause 2010). Terenem prowadzonych rozważań jest szkoła powszechna oraz uczniowie i nauczyciele klas włączających. Autorka dowodzi, że INNY w tym środowisku jest odbierany jako zagrożenie, a argumentacja filozoficzna wskazuje, że sensowny dialog z INNYM jest możliwy tylko przy jego pełnym udziale w procesie inkluzji. Autorka przedstawia argumenty odkrywające genezę tego poczucia zagrożenia zarówno u INNEGO, nauczycieli, jak i uczniów. Zdaniem Autorki wynika ono

z wielowiekowej dominacji rozumu pragmatycznego i techniki jako narzędzia wykorzystywanego do panowania nad naturą/przyrodą, a w konsekwencji wyłączenia z dyskursu publicznego i naukowego emocji, takich jak strach, niepewność, lęk, które traktowane są jako wychodzące poza normalność. Poczucie zagrożenia odczuwane przez uczestników życia szkolnego uwarunkowane jest odruchem orientacyjnym, a reakcja na niego jest zinterpretowana przez kulturę danego społeczeństwa.

Jednocześnie, jak dowodzi Autorka, w klasie szkolnej potrzeby „zrozumienia” dotyczą tylko zrozumienia na poziomie umysłu, a wykazują tendencje do niezrozumienia mowy ciała (jak np.: gestów, mimiki twarzy, sposobu poruszania się). Autorka proponuje wykorzystanie metod badań etnograficznych pozwalających na uwzględnienie i interpretację mowy ciała, wypowiedzianych słów, odczytywanie niedomówień i za pomocą terapii kulturowej pomaga uczestnikom badań nawiązać wspólny dialog. Artykuł nawiązuje do rozważań na temat Innego, przyrody, roli nauczyciela oraz języka i jest zaproszeniem do interdyscyplinarnych dyskusji.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: Inny, język, terapia kulturowa, natura.