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Abstract: The article primarily deals with the issue of social exclusion and interpersonal relations. Education strategies play a crucial role in fighting social exclusion at national, European and global level, and a discussion is arising among the phenomena of social exclusion, school and its products. European learning society school with its investing in knowledge (human resources) supports the product of human capital which, however, appears to have an exclusive effect at the level of social inclusion. Interpersonal relations with a high degree of intolerance and egoism are a key problem of contemporary exclusive society. Thus European Union school can be seen a place of learning as well as a social place. Understanding school within the concept of social capital is necessary to understand a society's social structure. Social capital is a product of school which emphasises co-operative interpersonal relations; in the exclusive society it represents a potential which could support social inclusion.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Social exclusion, a burning issue in contemporary society and school, is here connected to the problem of interpersonal relations. This relation should be taken into consideration when making plans for future school, the latter being an important social area. UNESCO’s International Commission recommends, “Along with acceptance of our spiritual and cultural differences, the world should strive for the best possible mutual understanding, the greatest solidarity – and we should let this utopia lead us. In fulfilling this universal task the role of education, which should provide access to knowledge to everybody, is clearly defined: to help understand the world and other people.” (Delors, 1996, p. 46) School is a reflection of social events where all controversies and tensions take place so that “life in school is constantly influenced by our incessant important interactions” (Apple, 1992, p. 23). School culture significantly influences day-by-day social functioning of the school. Therefore we shall link
school as a social area with the concept of social capital. School can support social inclusion as well as social exclusion; we advocate the former. Social capital can be understood as a condition of social inclusion/exclusion. Different researchers (Cattell, Gamarnikow, Green, Hogan, Schmid, Warner, among others) state that societies with a high degree of social capital are inclusive while in societies with low degree of social capital social exclusion is manifested. They also relate social capital to the level of success in education, employment, quality of interpersonal relations within and without family, and health level.

The fundamental question of this article is: How it is possible to influence the contemporary problem of social exclusion with the principle of learning society in education policy, in the context of school and social inclusion? With regard to this issue, there is a parallel area of interpersonal relations which are being produced by school as a social area, and a related question is: What are school’s criteria for an individual’s social inclusion? When searching for answers, we shall rely on the idea of social capital which can be found in key documents and studies on education, albeit in related formulations, on the level of discourse, while it is missing in immediate school field. Close encounters with young people at school provoked a desire to point out social context of contemporary schools with emphasis on learning co-operative interpersonal relations, which haven’t been paid sufficient attention in practice. Back in the mid 1980s Beck in his renowned work Risk Society remarked that “it is not enough to finish a school; one is supposed to have “appearance”, “contacts”, “communication skills”, “loyalty” – therefore extrafunctional general criteria of belonging to “social circles” (Beck, 2001, p. 127), which could herald the arrival of the idea of social capital in education policy.

2. THE SOCIETY OF SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND EDUCATION

[Social exclusion is] a shorthand label for what can happen when individuals or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health and family breakdown. Different people will take the term to mean different things – many see it as another term for multiple deprivation, social disadvantage or poverty. Others prefer to talk about the need positively to promote social inclusion. In broad terms, however, social exclusion is taken to mean more than material lack of income.

(Scottish Office, 1998:2, in Pierson, 2002)
/.../ the terms poverty and social exclusion refer to when people are prevented from participating fully in economic, social and civil life and/or when their access to income and other resources (personal, family, social and cultural) is so inadequate as to exclude them from enjoying a standard of living and quality of the life that is regarded as acceptable by the society in which they live. In such situations people often are unable to fully access their fundamental rights.

(Joint report on social inclusion, 2002: 15)

The notion social exclusion has a subjective meaning for each individual or group concerned so there are different interpretations and discourses connected with the issue. The concept of social exclusion first appeared in France (Pierson, 2002), in the 1960s they began to label the poor “the excluded”, in the 1970s this expression was used for margin social groups, e.g. immigrants and the homeless. Later, social exclusion was defined in many ways, being related to inequality, delinquency, and unemployment. A relevant definition is hard to create. Besides the two mentioned, we add Pierson’s (2002) extended definition: Social exclusion is a process that deprives individuals and families, groups and neighbourhoods of the resources required for participation in the social, economic and political activity of society as a whole. This process is primarily a consequence of poverty and low income, but other factors such as discrimination, low educational attainment and depleted living environments also underpin it. Through this process people are cut off for a significant period in their lives from institutions and services, social networks and developmental opportunities that the great majority of a society enjoys (Pierson, 2002, p. 7).

Commins (1993, in Trbanc, 1995) mentions civil, economic, social and interpersonal dimensions1 of an individual’s social exclusion. Each of them includes numerous areas where an individual can be excluded. Social exclusion means that the individual is excluded in several dimensions or several areas within a dimension. According to Abrahamson, social exclusion is “a phenomenon of emerging post-industrial society connected with ascension of individualism, with social changes and with changing market society in which social subjects,

---

1 The dimensions are described in more detail (Trbanc, 1995, pp. 289-290) within the following systems:
- Democratic and legal system which enables civil inclusion (this means to be a citizen with equal rights in a democratic society),
- Labour force which enables economic inclusion (to have a job, to have a certain economic function in the society),
- The system of a welfare state which enables social inclusion in a narrower sense (to be allowed and to be able to use social services provided by the state),
- Family and a system of neighbour and friendly networks which enables interpersonal inclusion (it provides security, sociability, moral support).
even if they fight the dominant power structure, are separated from economic and political system” (Trbanc, 1995, pp. 292-293). In individualised life situations (Beck, 2001) collective fate became personal fate which affects individual “specifically of life phases” (Beck, 2001, p. 132). At the same time, individualised positions depend on institutions which means that “liberated individuals become dependent on labour market, therefore on education, consumption” (ibid, p. 192) etc. Undoubtedly today we speak of structured social exclusion and individual’s dependence on institutions which enable social inclusion.

Among systems in which individual is involved, school with all features of wider society seems to be of a special importance. Bourdieu (Grenfell, 1998) defines education as a field of interpersonal relations, as a part of culture, a part of the whole system, which enables connection with other fields in the network of social system. Futurologists (Rifkin, 2000) predict that in future individual will be above all preoccupied with the question how to restructure one’s most basic relations with others. The problem of interpersonal relations nowadays involves intolerance, alienation, lack of solidarity and dominance of egoistic competition over co-operation. Globalisation produces opposing results: on one hand, everybody and everything is more and more connected and interwoven, on the other, there are growing exclusion and distance in interpersonal relations. School as an area of interpersonal relations should be a part of and face the issue of re-structuring of interpersonal relations, since in school – just as in wider society – the relations which are created affect the climate and culture of school. Social exclusion hinders access to help and opportunity, and among individual’s resources for social inclusion social interaction, social networks and the community in which individual lives play the most important roles. To benefit social inclusion of individual, special tackling of interpersonal relations at school should be strongly recommended.

Social exclusion represents one of the youngest concepts, the use of which was in late 1980s strongly encouraged by European Union; in its documents it is emphasised as one of the crucial contemporary problems. The European Council Report, adopted in 1998, in which the policies regarding health service, employment, social security, education and housing were dealt with in detail, is based on the premise that “social exclusion does not only mean lack of income and material goods but inadequate and non-equal participation of individuals and individual groups of population in social life. The problem of social exclusion being complex and multi-dimensional, it requires integrated approach combining policies of different fields
among which an appropriate degree of synergy is expected. The report, in which Slovenia also participated, establishes a growing tendency that those people who are not equally included in different systems are becoming an endemic part of the “society of possibilities”, or, to put it more drastically, they are turning into lost souls. /.../ Concerned about the consequences of globalisation and being aware of the fact that it is impossible to solve problems within individual countries or continents, European politics has set a goal of globalisation without poverty and marginalisation” (Program, 2000, p.13). Slovenia has joined the efforts of European Community. The European Council Report states that significant indicators of exclusion are connected with education field. The latter is very important for the program\(^2\) of reducing social exclusion, “since it enables better inclusion in labour market and, consequently, social inclusion. In this regard, lifelong education is of an utmost importance” (ibid, p. 78). There is no doubt about the fact that social issues and involvement of politics in other social areas influence the formation of education policy. Strategic goals of the programme for fighting poverty and social exclusion in education were integrated in the changes of system and contents in the education area. Within its renovation of school system and considering European recommendations, Slovenia brought in education certain mechanisms to make programmes more accessible, to reduce drop-out rate, to increase quality of acquired knowledge and to provide various forms of education. Education is understood as prevention from social exclusion and support of social inclusion of the most vulnerable groups (Joint, 2002).

In this respect, the interpersonal relation factor of a community seems to be crucial. By notion of community we mean “people who live on a certain territory, establish interpersonal relations and have a sense of belonging” (Jeri_ek, 2003, p. 207). A community is essential for building a social network which ‘protects individual, defends him, satisfies his needs of keeping company, belonging, affection, and represents a “psychological home” for him’ (Bishop, ibid), and individual is supposed to identify with it. A community by itself does not exist: it has to be built. Europe as a community has all possibilities to create an environment for direct learning how to live with others. Only such environment enables people to learn how to co-operate and be tolerant in interpersonal relations. European Community school as its social area represents a learning environment which could tackle the problem of interpersonal relations. If we are aware of the issue of interpersonal relations and if we do care what our society will be like tomorrow, then we will have to start re-structuring our

\(^2\) In 2000, Slovenia adopted a national program to fight poverty and social exclusion.
fundamental relations with others, as futurologists predict. And school seems to be the most suitable area for this process. Individuals learn at school, and it is the only system in which entire generations are included.

School as individual’s immediate social environment is significantly related to the problem of social exclusion. Two important questions are: What kind of school can we create in regard to social context and which is the role school plays in particular social contexts, since school is (Apple, 1992) part of economy, politics, and culture, and it is impossible to plan school systems in isolation from them. Adopted education strategies should be in accordance with social conditions of the time. In education documents this article relates to social traits and time changes are the first which education recommendations and guidelines refer to. The recommendations of the White Paper from 1995, undoubtedly the key document on education of European Commission, are based on social traits, changes and problems, and are especially focused on intolerance to social exclusion which is a negative product of globalisation. The focus of the White Paper is defined in its very title: Teaching and Learning – Towards the Learning Society. Education strategies suggested by the White Paper for education in a social exclusion society tend to increase human capital by developing human resources. Education strategies and standards influence both school as a social area and school as a learning area. They influence interpersonal relations among pupils, between pupils and teachers, and between teachers and parents, as well as principles of learning which are favoured by school product in a form of “capital”3. If we compare emphasising the development of human resources, which are manifested in the form of human capital, there’s an interesting Carneir's definition of educational systems. He says that the latter are “the resource of human capital (Becker), cultural capital (Bourdieu) and social capital (Putnam). Instead of 'Homo homini

3 The use of the concept of capital within human relations requires an explanation. Capital is used to describe (Schmid, 2000) machines and factories by which products are made. Capital supports production. It is an object of investment. It is typical of capital that it decreases even if not used. We speak of human capital because human skills are an important investment in acquiring assets. If we describe human relations with social capital, they “are like a factory which produces goods, transfers, and utility (and bads)” (Schmid, 2000, p. 170). Like other forms of capital (Coleman, in Putnam, 1995) social capital is productive and brings achievements. It is, however, important to point at the difference (Morgan, 2000) between the resources of human and social capital and capital as a commodity. In the theory of economy capital as a commodity is a reproduction factor of gaining basic products and final goods. The resources of human and social capital, on the other hand, are a stock of non-specific but potentially fertile factors which with the first accumulate into knowledge, and with the second in affinity ties among the members of community and social distance between the members of community and individuals outside of the community. Hirschman (Putnam, 1995) states that social capital is a moral resource the stock of which increases with use and decreases when not used. The same relation is probably valid for human capital. In comparison with conventional (and also human) capital social capital is “public good” (Putnam, 1995, p. 3) and not private property of its user who benefits from it; he is only his foster parent.
languages connecting the 1995). Education about the type of society. The recommendation of UNESCO documents we follow the recommendation and guidelines for education which are based on awareness of the problem of interpersonal relations in a social exclusion society; to support the topic of this article, we shall refer to their understanding of school.

In its document from 1972, UNESCO International Commission led by Faure devoted a whole chapter to the relation between school and society. They put a special emphasis on lifelong learning and introduced a new principle of learning, learning to be, which shows a different relation between individual and society. "Learning to live, learning to learn, so as to be able to absorb new knowledge all through life; learning to think freely and critically; learning to love the world and make it more humans learning to develop in and through creative work” (Faure, 1972, p. 69). Learning how to survive as far as social inclusion is concerned of crucial importance for individual in exclusive society. School can greatly support him, and on the other hand, it can be exclusive, just as a wider society. Some twenty years later, in 1996, UNESCO International Commission led by Delors in their recommendations wanted to make an appeal to education institutions “to be able to listen to the needs of society and to implement more dynamism within school” (Delors, 1996, p. 150); since education is common good, it can not be dictated solely by market principles (ibid). The document also emphasises that the decision about the type of education means a decision about the type of society.

3. SCHOOL AND LEARNING SOCIETY

Education policy of European Union strives to direct Europe towards learning society. With increased level of learning society Europe would reach goal – the knowledge-based society or the so called society of knowledge for which it strives in the area of education (White, 1995). In the White Paper of education, the European Commission defined the path towards the society of knowledge with five general goals which refer to acquiring new knowledge, connecting schools and business, combat exclusion, proficiency foreign (Community) languages and enhancing investments in education and learning. A strong emphasis is given
to investment in knowledge and skills suitable for quick adjustment to social changes which will serve individual throughout his years of service, and to so called investment in human resources and lifelong learning, since according to the White Paper individual’s area will be, among others, defined by his capacity of learning and basic knowledge (ibid). Interpersonal relations in the context of knowledge and skills will be of a deciding factor for individual. The so called “learning relationships” (ibid, p. 17) will become a predominant feature of social structure. When building a firm society, the principle of lifelong learning, which is “parallel” to the direction towards the society of knowledge, can not replace the possibilities which are typical of formal types of education, as several critics of this kind of learning warn. The principle of lifelong education is connected with “a frequently mentioned principle – the principle of learning society in which everything can enhance learning and holistic development of individual’s talents” (Delors, 1996, p. 103), as the UNESCO International Commission recommends. According to the Commission, lifelong learning is important for economy as well as for individual since it enables the latter to control his destiny, which has become, as Beck (2001) states, a personal fate of individual. With introducing the idea of learning society, we try to include learning in the concept of social development (Ivan_i_, 1995). But is the society of knowledge with prevailing “learning relationships” really going to support social inclusion? Some authors say that the society of knowledge is supposed to encourage social inclusion, but a closer look at school field arouses certain doubts. Individuals and groups with lower learning capacity and poorer basic knowledge will always live among us, and if this will be a condition for their relations with others, their social exclusion can not be eliminated by any principle of lifelong learning. These groups will always be behind. Even if a path to equality is created and opened, this equality seems to remain evasive. On the other hand, there is incessant fight and competition for knowledge. Not long ago, people competed to have more material goods; the society of knowledge heralds competition for human capital, or you are out of the game. Special attention should be paid to individuals and groups the behaviour of which does not conform to the standards of the society. These groups are treated especially exclusively and intolerantly by school system. In comparison with other categories of the so called disturbances, their behaviour is unacceptable and if they have any advantages because of that at all, these are fewer, narrower and less tolerant. Their everyday competition

---

4 People with learning difficulties have lower cognitive abilities, therefore they reach a lower level of human capital and consequently get marginal positions in economic and social areas of life (Riddell, Baron, Wilson, 2000, in Field, Schuller, Baron, 2000).

5 Slovene Law of directing children with special needs (2000) does acknowledge all such children equal possibilities and priorities but practical experiences show that children with behavioural and personality
is not about knowledge but for recognition and friendship. In comparison with other groups their focus is somewhere else. The result of this is the highest drop-out rate in this very group.

We do live in a learning society based on knowledge, but this is exactly why it is exclusive. And school works according to the same principle. Individual’s attention shouldn’t be paid only to increasing human capital. We should ask ourselves what makes individual’s life in society really easier. Historically, this has been relations with other people and living in tolerance and solidarity; today, however, these values are entirely neglected. To re-learn how to live with others - this principle will ease individual’s way to society and overcome egoism. Investment in learning society and human capital excludes the groups which are treated as marginal in school system. Another question to be asked is: How do schools understand social inclusion regarding the fact that human resources are a key category they are focused on, and human capital is the main product of education. Researchers claim that social capital is a product of a community with co-operative interpersonal relations. Since school is understood as an area of interpersonal relations, we believe that one of school’s products can be social capital, too. Carnier’s definition of the sources of education, which is quoted at the beginning of this article, even states cultural capital as a source of education system, but here we will not go into details about this form of capital.

Coleman, who has dealt with the concept of social capital in connection with education, linked the achievements in education with the level of social capital (Schuller, Baron, Field, 2000). He also emphasised the relation between social and human capital which is especially interesting for the purpose of this article; he states that social capital is fundamental to form human capital (Field, Schuller, Baron, 2000).

It is crucial to explain how we define human and social capital. Human capital is understood as individual source, it is about investment in individual’s health, education, skills and values. Social capital is understood as a social source, it is about investment in interpersonal relations, social exchange, community development and degree of trust and security. Social capital

---

disturbances are in a worse position compared with other groups of children with special needs among which the law includes mentally retarded children, blind and weak-sighted children, deaf and partially deaf children, children with speech impediments, physically handicapped children, children with protracted illnesses and children with learning difficulties.

6 It is necessary to emphasise that there are different definitions of human and social capital. Understanding of concepts in this particle is a result of studying various literature dealing with the concept.
enables social inclusion of individual in community. Typical of the high level of social capital are dense social networks which help individual in the process of social inclusion.

The following matrix of the components of human and social capital is quoted from MacGillivray and Walker (2000, p. 203).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of capital</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Social (Informal)</th>
<th>Social (formal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of trust</td>
<td>Trust in ourselves</td>
<td>Trust in each other</td>
<td>Trust in organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Components</td>
<td>Self-esteem,</td>
<td>Level of trust</td>
<td>Number of organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-respect,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>Services provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Networks and</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Connections</td>
<td>involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Networks and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>partnerships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we take Coleman’s presumption as a thesis, then school in learning society in which the degree of human capital is a condition for social inclusion could surpass social exclusion of behaviourally maladjusted groups by investing in interpersonal relations. Thus it could reach two goals: it would prevent drop-out by which the threatened group would be given the opportunity of social inclusion in the society of knowledge with a higher level of human capital; and the consequence of the higher level of social capital would be lesser delinquency and therefore a safer society in general.

»A good society depends not just on the economic success of the individual, but on the 'social capital' of the community. Investment in social institutions, including good quality public services, is as important as investment in economic infrastructure. Communities do not become strong because they are rich; they become rich because they are strong.«

Researchers have worked on the school: society relation for a long time. Social capital is used in this context in order to integrate and understand social structure of society (Munn, 2000). Therefore the concept of social capital is a product of further research and understanding connections between school and social, economic, and political structure of society (ibid).

4. SCHOOL AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

[The] principle that we live by entering into relations with one another, provides the basic structure which all human experience and activity falls, whether individual or social. For this reason the first priority in education... is learning to live in personal relation to other people. Let us call it learning to live in community.

I call this first priority because failure in this is a fundamental failure that cannot be compensated for by success in other fields; because our ability to enter into fully personal relations with others is the measure of our humanity. For inhumanity is precisely the perversion of human relations.


While White Paper emphasises the knowledge-based society in which human capital has the highest value, UNESCO International Commission pays close attention to interpersonal relations within education; we shall present them because their findings support our issue. In the introduction of the Report it is said that “education is a permanent process of enriching knowledge and skills and at the same time – maybe even in the first place – also an exceptional means to form personalities and relations among individuals, groups and nations” (Delors, 1996, p. 14). Of course the Commission doesn’t want to overshadow the basics of knowledge-based society and is aware of the influence of education on economic and social development. But it is also aware that “changes of traditional ways of life require better understanding of other people and the whole world. And for this we need mutual understanding, peaceful exchanges and of course harmony” (ibid, p. 20) and it puts a special emphasis on one of the four pillars of education, “learning to live together” (ibid), which is often ignored although we should be aware of the growing co-dependence. The Commission does expose education in the spirit of co-operation but it does not neglect the other three pillars of education or learning principles, i.e. learning to know, learning to know how to work
and learning to be. “Education should be a holistic life-long experience which comprises both understanding and use of knowledge and focuses of individual and his place within society” (Delors, 1996, p. 78). It understands learning society as the one which would “be based on acquiring, renewal and use of knowledge” (ibid, p. 21), which seems an utopian idea to the Commission, too.

As far as the issue of social exclusion, the Commission states that “education can function as an integrative factor provided that it strives to respect differences among individuals and groups and tries not to contribute to social exclusion itself” (ibid, p. 50) since it is of utmost importance that the school system is not exclusive in itself. The most problematic today is competitiveness, a result of limiting one’s development to intellectual progress. If we want that education policy really plays the central role in fighting social exclusion then its activities should oppose all forms of social exclusion. Although education activities alone can not solve the contemporary problem of interpersonal relations, education “can be expected to encourage the desire to live in a community, which is a basic element of connectedness” (ibid, p. 60), the Commission recommends. Education should primarily answer the question “How to live, why to live in community” (ibid, p. 55), and school should encourage social abilities and group work of participants. Among basic knowledge and skills there are also “enhancing creativity, group work, mutual support and complementing” (ibid, p. 73) which should be included in future education systems.

In new social circumstances in which interpersonal relations are totally sapped living together is a true art which we have to learn from scratch. To renew the human community is going to be our challenge in future, and “learning society, based on the rules of distribution of knowledge and learning experience created by unlimited personal relations enabled by globalisation /.../ should initiate creating of post-materialist values” (Carneiro, in Delors, 1996, p. 194).

Learning society school, emphasising strengthening of human capital, which wants to contribute to social inclusion, should take a critical stance to exclusive education strategies because of all those individuals and groups which don’t succeed in running marathon to the society of knowledge.
5. CONCLUSION

Working directly with the youth in the school field, when thinking about exposed problems and reading key documents on education by European and International Commission as well as Slovenian national documents, I am led (and hindered) by the insight of the so called “black box” (Apple, 1992) of school. Close observing of the school “interior” shows different colours than its exterior, furnished solely with theoretical discourses. When planning education strategies and discourses it is important to bear in mind their co-dependence. Because of the reader’s immediate involvement in school field, reading the documents which represent education strategies of learning society can be above all a critical analysis which can hardly avoid subjective experiences and feelings in the school field. We believe in high value of personal experience; following the example of Apple who, starting from practical school field, deeply influenced education policy, we do not want to hide a personal note which has formed during practical work in education and thinking about it. As Apple would put it, we presented reflections about school and education “at first hand”. What was presented in a form of discourse and maybe seems just one more idea about education actually grew from real school experience; we are thankful for that and due to it, our belief in exposed issues is even stronger. Everyday encounters with the youth at school resulted in long hours of reflection about school which forms individual and his knowledge, about school as a social area of interpersonal relations, about the youth who will, after they finish school, begin the difficult way of social inclusion in wider society. The question arises to which extent a teacher-social pedagogue with my immediate activity at school in certain education system can influence the development of individual and knowledge which enhances social inclusion. We think about knowledge which is produced within the education system in which we participate, about the exposed human capital on which the society of knowledge (for which contemporary education systems strive) is based, and we ask ourselves how to adequately point out (or ignore) negative impact of nowadays school priorities which are manifested in practice. Is it possible to make any difference about the issue by such discourses as well as with direct participation at school? “On one hand, education system is a guardian of standards: standards of academic excellence, scientific truth, and technological adequacy. Such system tends towards exclusion and is only focused on students who show abilities and attitudes in accordance with the rules of excellence. It tends to push the rest into an inferior process of preparations for life, which is part of the process of exclusion from the best that a society can offer” (Manley, in Delors, 1996, p. 213). The phenomenon of social exclusion has
grown to unimagined dimensions and the task of education is to face it (Geremek, in Delors, 1996). And our duty is to warn against it. If we constantly encounter the excluded and realise that social exclusion is also a school problem, it would be unfair to turn a blind eye to it.

“The world is our village: if one house catches fire, all roofs above our heads are threatened. If one of us tries to start renovation, his or her effort will only remain symbolic. Solidarity has to become the main principle: each of us should take his or her part of general responsibility”
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