

The Relation between Education and Freedom.

Conceptual Parts

Associate Professor Ioana Axentii, PhD

*Stat University „Bogdan Petriceicu Hasdeu”from Cahul, Republic of Moldova
iaxentii@mail.ru*

Assistant Professor Natalia Chiriac

*Stat University „Bogdan Petriceicu Hasdeu”from Cahul, Republic of Moldova
chiriac.natalia@gmail.com*

Teacher Natalia Roşcovanu

*Industrial-Pedagogical College from Cahul, Republic of Moldova
natalia08031985@list.ru*

Abstract: Redesigning and rebuilding education pedagogy as a subject were not, are not and shall never be inappropriate. Quality of education is emerging as the basis for individual's freedom and development. The problem of freedom in education has been a constant concern of Romanian interwar pedagogical thinking. Significant concepts concerning the relationship between individual freedom and education have developed: GG Antonescu, I. Gavanescul IC Petrescu, II, and especially C. Gabrea Narly, which strongly mentioned indicated that education as "intentional influence, it cannot take away individual's freedom. In the Romanian pedagogical concept was mentioned asked to meet Ro → highlighted the idea that education, freedom, discipline makes it organic. There can be no freedom unless, through education, to succeed, in the end, the realization of individual self-imposed discipline. Freedom means effort. All that the world has, valuable life was obtained with effort, prolonged in conditions of freedom. This is the say which focuses our interwar pedagogical idea also is still viable.

Keywords: education; freedom; individual; discipline; pedagogical concept

Reengineering and reconstruction of education as a subject of pedagogy weren't, aren't and will never be inappropriate. In the expose of following ideas we tried to conceive education, placing freedom as the basis concept. If we accept that man is and can be man only in freedom, than we understand that the foundation of human in freedom is, as natural, as currently that he needs to be directed to acquire,

manifest, maintain and defend freedom (Albu, 1998, p. 8). We know that the problem of freedom in education and the concern of such problems aren't new. It was a constant concern of pedagogical thought especially in the interwar period. The concepts developed in this period deserves to be known and promoted, being viable and for contemporary education.

Under the influence of universal pedagogy, resonating with the new currents which emerge and develop literature for education, teachers have always reported to them, specifying the limits and how they could be applied at that time in Romanian schools. C. Narly, G. G. Antonescu, I. Găvănescul, I.C. Petrescu, I. I. Gabrea etc. have developed: significant concepts about the relationship between individual freedom and education. Thus C. Narly mentioned that education as "intentional influence" cannot take away freedom from individual. Moreover, Narly claimed, when education means "the introduction of individuals in culture and civilization," culture and civilization means "just the product of human freedom". Assuming the spontaneity in action, initiative, freedom is opposed to passivity it requires actions appropriate to direction of the individual's inner force (apud Albu, 1998, p. 43). In this context, the vision of Narly presents interest about the freedom and specific originality of the individual. He mentions that "there is with man something that appears as a gift", to which we cannot do only to receive and capitalize it. We can become someone through the effect of the contact between this specific originality and the environment. Here the spirit is very important. And if the individual will follow the path, will be free, but if will turn wrong he will be handcuffed.

Specific originality is our great dignity, the property most valuable of each of us. If man wants to be free he will be only if we will manifest himself according to his specific originality and any manifestation will be successful such as any obstacle will be unsuccessfully. C. Narly says that freedom and originality reflects the same reality and depend on each other. Originality is the base of appropriate deployment while freedom is the possibility of deployment. We can infer that human freedom means manifestation toward its own laws, its own specific originality which grows in contact with the environment, becomes vocation (Narly, 1938, p. 145). There is freedom only in self-assertion. However, by self-assertion we can understand the human manifestation toward his vocation. C Narly says that vocation is the convergence of all the human powers to certain events, through which he realize himself, has his own feeling of freedom, of affirmation (Narly, 1938, p. 239).

At the same time there can be no absolute freedom because human lives in community. The meaning of education cannot be only that to ensure maximum development of human specific originality, but also to ensure the harmonization of individual freedom. In this situation, education has the role to guide each person to develop their individuality according to hereditary endowment, on the one hand, and to oversee the harmonization of existing individual freedoms, on the other. There cannot be freedom where is no harmony, where harmony doesn't exist freedom also disappears, therefore, only by keeping harmony can be maintained or recovered individual freedom. Because of that "for this harmonization which coincides with the manifestation of the true freedom, education has the right to intervene actively by supporting and stifling some manifestations" said Narly (apud Albu, 1998, p. 44). So being organized, education can offer and respect personal freedom only if is concerned with assurance and maintain social harmony, simultaneously. According this, education imposes as priority directions: the encouragement of child aspiration to be an unmistakable being, unique, sincere; child's release of unanimously mode accepted to see things; release of a common opinion; encouragement of critical approach to the conformism or social and cultural pressures in order to determine the degree of legitimacy, challenge, encouragement and request (maintain) of an active attitude, of openness and child's receptivity, removal of fear and of intellectual distrust etc. All these directions aims the formation through education of a man who, as J.J. Rousseau said, can be cached in social abundance, not being disappointed nor passion, neither people's opinion, seeing with his eyes, feeling with his heart and which rules his own mind (apud, Albu, 1998, p. 148).

The interwar national pedagogy, individual freedom means, at least, the following components: to live and act freely means to live and act according to individual wishes; to live and work as some reasons coming from reflection, judgment, from combination of representations or ideas. Individual freedom is the domination of natural being by spiritual being; it is life lived according to reason, rather than "pulses of changing moment" empire (Găvănescul, 1929, p. 147). In fact, emphasizes our interwar pedagogues including Găvănescul, Narly, Antonescu, man can suspend the decision and proceedings until will be sure about circumstances of his movements, effectiveness of the means used before, etc. It follows that spiritual being is the most important component in the analysis and expression, therefore, of freedom. Freedom and its manifestation authentic presuppose as essential element of deep analysis, prudence, self-control, respectively, the power to evade from the

influence of the present time to work and live for an ideal life by a calculation for the future (Găvănescul, 1929, p. 14). It is a concept that fits and with the formation and development of human of our days. However, this is confirmed and by prof. dr. VI. Pîslaru which says "you can become a free man whoever you are and whatever you do, if your actions follow your soul harmony with himself and with the world where he lives" (Pâslaru, 2010, p. 6).

Individual freedom cannot be separated from moral freedom. Guidance of freedom may be elaborated, either by immediate context of life either by "sovereign rule of moral law" which opens the opportunity to achieve human personality. If we say that moral law can be as a fundamental part of human freedom, it may look like: "Work in that way as your activity principle may become an activity rule of all people for the common good" (Găvănescul, 1929, pp. 125-129). What would mean your actions to be such that if any man would do in the same circumstances as you, resulting an increase of goodness and happiness for all, or behave, so you can contribute to minimize pain in the world and to increase overall well-being or look for your happiness according to others, etc. (Găvănescul, 1929, p. 178). To this VI Pîslaru mentions: The accumulation of material riches isn't a bad thing if it serves the public good and the multiplication of beauty. I do not mind the billions of B. Gates as long as I know that it provide an advanced computer and more professional freedom. It isn't bad that peasants are racing to make beautiful houses, fences and gates because the beauty of soul is expressed not only through ideas and feelings but also through ennobled matter. The people that have power aren't bad and because of that they are limited in their freedom, if the power they hold serves the most part of truth, goodness, beauty and justice of those which are under their power (Pâslaru, 2010, p. 6). Freedom means self-governed, knowing how to behave towards the appearance of pain and the enticements of pleasure.

I. Găvănescul said toward the danger of losing our freedom, that what suggested our duty to defend it (Găvănescul, 1929, p. 39). Referring to the same problem, C. Narly mentioned in his work *Ideal and Education* in 1927, that were kidnapped and continues to be kidnapped a lot of freedoms. Therefore, the author's opinion, "our duty is to ensure our inner freedom in its general human nature, regardless of place and time, to keep it untouched" (Narly, 1938, p. 160). From where we can deduce that our center, the stranger and more intimate, is inner freedom "because human life is nothing more than complication path through this". Everyone wants to be free, more freely than it is, and if it's possible completely free ... Loss of inner freedom (ie, abolishing it) means the total cancellation of self, a fatal crash

(Pâslaru, 2010, p. 6). However, inner freedom can be lost if we do not defend it - and so, if not conquer it - wherever it is threatened.

Being an expert of pedagogical history, G.G. Antonescu mentioned that the problem of the relation between education and freedom, have faced two trends: optimistic and pessimistic trends. These currents were presented by G.G. Antonescu as it appeared in his vision. The main representatives of optimistic current were: J.J. Rousseau, E. Key, O. Decroly, etc. Man - supports this trend - is born naturally good, and should therefore be sufficient natural development of his support, without any resistance of free individual development, which is developing towards the good. Pessimistic current (or rigorist) whose theoretical core is in German culture, based on the premise that evil is innate in human nature, therefore, the most justified opinion would be a serious education. The true character cannot form only by a severe education, based on obedience and self-control. Therefore, G. G. Antonescu, then, when he talks about moral education in school, consistently condemned the use of repression by educators in their current practice. He considered inappropriate the method of making from removal of evil an important fact for children / students behavior, rather than encouraging goodness. The student had be convinced that he can become a free being only if he assumes a given subject of his life and work (Antonescu, 1943, p. 51).

I.I. Gabrea plead for a school requires and validates an able school capable to stimulate deep uptake activity and assimilation of knowledge, able to strengthen the student to pursue a distant ideal, and to a focus his energy to accomplish it. Such a school form vigorous people with debt awareness and responsibility (Gabrea, 1937, pp. 67 – 68). From where we deduce that such a school does not mean that violate students individuality, on the contrary, it gives a sense to the development reinforces it. "Spontaneous activity, chosen by the student, not one imposed from outside, should be valued in face of highly teacher" (Gabrea, 1937, p. 162).

Therefore to be encouraged student autonomy tendency, creating the conditions manifestation of this autonomy. In the context of the need for expression of individual autonomy G. G. Antonescu developed concepts that are viable and today. He mentioned that "man cannot say than taking the basic autonomy of each individual and the all autonomy together. This autonomy is the freedom to manifest in your own direction to achieve those spiritual goods, and so those values that correspond to your vocation. A humanity that would tolerate such an attitude

would work on its own state, and thus to its own decline. If humanity went so slowly on the way to his own achievements, it is because he has put only gates (Antonescu, 1943, p. 237).

In conclusion, we mentioned that the relationship between education and freedom has been a constant concern of Romanian interwar pedagogical thinking, many of the presented concepts can be taken, and adapted to conditions in our days. In the Romanian educational concept was evidenced the idea that education, freedom, discipline is an organic condition. Freedom does not mean cancellation of effort. Everything more valuable that people have in their life is obtained with the effort in conditions of freedom. Effort, in his turn, gives depth to freedom. Value that dominates and guides humanity today is Freedom that evolves significantly from the human-social value to the human-individual value. The spirit of time gives more and more appropriation to each positive context encouraging and supporting free development of each individual. According to its power of propagation social, professional, cultural, political, economic education is considered more natural, such a context, perhaps the most important. Major international and continental forums such as United Nations, UNESCO, Council of Europe, European Community, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, provide for their programmatic documents the idea of freedom in education as a right of every man.

Bibliography

Antonescu, G.G. (1943). *Pedagogia contemporană. Probleme și curente/Contemporary pedagogy. Problems and directions*. Second Edition. Bucharest: Casa Școalelor.

Albu, G. (1998). *Introducere într-o pedagogie a libertății/Introduction in pedagogy of freedom*. Iasi: Polirom.

Găvănescul, I. (1929). *Manual de instrucție și educație morală - pentru școlile secundare/Manual training and moral education - for secondary schools*. Third Edition. Bucharest: Librăriei „Universala”.

Gabrea, I. I. (1937). *Din problemele pedagogiei românești/From the Romanian-pedagogy problems*. Bucharest: Cultura Românească, S.A.R.

Narly, C. (1938). *Pedagogia generala/General pedagogy*. Bucharest: Cultura Românească, S.A.R.

Pâslaru, VI. (2010). Libertatea – ipostaza desăvârșirii/Freedom- the hypothesis of perfection. *Ziarul Timpul/The Newspaper Time*, 15 October. Chisinau.