

DOI: 10.31866/2616-745X.17.2026.360719

UDC 94:37:[355.01+314.15]:008(438:477)

**HISTORY EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT  
OF WAR AND MIGRATION: TOWARD A DIALOGICAL  
MEMORY CULTURE IN POLISH–UKRAINIAN RELATIONS**

---

**Norbert Morawiec**

*Phd in Historical Sciences,*

*Assistant Professor at the Institute of History,*

*ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5025-5528>*

*e-mail: [n.morawiec@ujd.edu.pl](mailto:n.morawiec@ujd.edu.pl)*

*Jan Długosz University in Częstochowa*

**For citation:**

Morawiec, N. 2026. History Education in the Context of war and Migration: Toward a Dialogical Memory Culture in Polish–Ukrainian Relations. *International Relations: Theory and Practical Aspects*, 17, pp.127-142. doi: <https://doi.org/10.31866/2616-745X.17.2026.360719>.

**Abstract:** This article examines the role of history education in the context of war and migration, focusing on Polish–Ukrainian relations after 2022. It starts from the premise that the influx of students with direct or indirect war experience has exposed the limitations of the transmissive model of history teaching, based on a homogeneous national narrative, and has revealed the need for its critical revision. The coexistence of divergent mnemonic frameworks in the classroom generates tensions that challenge established didactic practices and call for more reflexive and adaptive interpretive strategies. The article aims to conceptualise history education as a space of mediation between competing memories, within the framework of rescue history and a glocal approach that links global dynamics with local educational contexts. The analysis adopts a multi-level perspective, encompassing didactic, political, international, legislative, and institutional dimensions. It engages with a reinterpretation of selected Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda in relation to education in contexts of conflict and displacement. The article demonstrates that the confrontation of divergent historical narratives in school settings necessitates a shift from an assimilationist model toward a dialogical and inclusive approach, enabling the negotiation of meanings, the recognition of difference, and the development of

critical competencies. It also highlights the importance of fostering reflexivity, empathy, and openness to multiple perspectives in the educational process. It argues that history education should be understood as a mediatory practice and as a tool for fostering a dialogical culture of memory, which constitutes a key condition for social cohesion and peaceful coexistence.

**Keywords:** history; memory; education; peace; Agenda 2030.

### **Introduction**

The outbreak of the Russian-Ukrainian war in 2022 fundamentally reconfigured the social, political, and educational contexts of European states, including Poland<sup>1</sup>. One of its most visible consequences has been the presence of children – war refugees from Ukraine – in Polish schools. This situation has revealed both the potential of the education system and its limitations, particularly in the field of history education, which had previously been based on a relatively homogeneous national narrative. The problem became especially evident in relation to “difficult topics” in Polish-Ukrainian relations. The teaching of history has thus ceased to function as a neutral transmission of knowledge and has instead become a practice of high social and political sensitivity. Moreover, the contemporary experience of conflict has rendered categories such as “education,” “war,” and “migration” no longer abstract, but integral to reflection on the security and future of societies. To grasp the deeper dimension of this issue, it is useful to invoke the concept of a culture of conflict, understood as a culturally conditioned way of perceiving, conducting, and resolving disputes. It encompasses orientations toward confrontation as well as toward cooperation or compromise, and typically includes a set of narratives and interpretive mechanisms through which societies experience tensions (LeBaron 2003). In this sense, history is not a neutral record of facts, but a process of meaning-making that can both reinforce conflicts and contribute to their transformation.

### **Analysis of Recent Research and Publications**

Wars, conflicts, and migration have intensified the search for new didactic models (Dill and Hunter 2010), and the works of Lynn Davies and Tony Gallagher have identified those capable of moving beyond the traditional transmissive paradigm (Davies 2004). Researchers have examined the pedagogical conditions of migrant and post-migrant societies (Geschichten im Wandel 2022), while also

---

<sup>1</sup> The article was inspired by a podcast I delivered titled “Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions as a Goal of the 2030 Agenda in the Context of the Culture of Conflict: A Historical Perspective,” presented as part of the NAWA Centre for International Academic Cooperation project Support for European Universities. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EvEpS5BCK5Q&t=287s>

emphasizing that although education is an important tool for peacebuilding, it may likewise reproduce inequalities and fuel conflicts (Tomlinson and Benefield 2005; Pherali 2016). Concepts of multicultural, intercultural, and transcultural pedagogy have gained particular significance, framing the educational process as a space of encounter between different “cultural codes.” The student is no longer understood as a *tabula rasa*, but as a subject shaped by a specific cultural matrix, historical memory, and social experience. Similarly, the teacher, and even the curriculum itself, are constructs embedded in particular axiological and socio-cultural contexts (Ullrich and Lücke 2014). Increasingly, scholars draw on glocal pedagogy – grounded in the local–global nexus and supported by critical pedagogy and digital technologies – and advocate for models of developing glocal competences. These models emphasize a holistic, student-centered approach that integrates cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of learning (Smaoui et al 2025). At the same time, there is an effort to embed pedagogical reflection within recent scientific turns (performative, visual, sensual, affective, immersive) and to enrich it with new post-constructivist attributes. Within this perspective, particular importance is attached to Ewa Domańska’s concept of rescue history, situated within prefigurative humanities. This approach moves away from fatalism and emphasizes the interventionist and ethical dimension of reflecting on the past in order to safeguard the future. In the context of education, this implies a shift from a unified narrative toward the creation of a space for dialogue and empathy, where diverse experiences and identities can be articulated and negotiated, critical thinking fostered, and protection against dogmatism ensured (Domańska 2014).

### **Formulation of the Objectives of the Article**

In this context, the present article seeks to conceptualise the history of education within the framework of *rescue history* or, more broadly, *rescue cultural studies*, positioning it as a mediating space between competing mnemonic narratives in Polish–Ukrainian relations (Huzarski, 2020). This orientation also reflects a wider intellectual shift, whereby contemporary scholarship engages in the critical deconstruction of categories such as “education,” “war,” and “migration,” while simultaneously re-inscribing them within evolving discourses of memory and historiography. Against this backdrop, the article foregrounds the need to refine current understandings of the Sustainable Development Goals within the 2030 Agenda. Although Goal 4, centred on education, has been extensively examined, often in relation to other goals, this study instead directs attention to Goal 16, which emphasises peace, justice, and strong institutions (Shulla et al., 2020). These categories are approached not solely in institutional terms but as elements of a broader cultural project, closely intertwined with the interpretation of the past and the governance of collective memory. The analysis adopts a multi-level

perspective, integrating didactic, mnemonic, political, legislative, and institutional dimensions. Such an approach enables a more nuanced account of history education as a critical mechanism in the formation of a dialogical memory culture.

### **Presentation of the main material of the study**

**Didactic Dimension:** Following the outbreak of the full-scale war in Ukraine in 2022, Poland became a primary destination for refugees, including hundreds of thousands of school-age children and adolescents. They were rapidly incorporated into the education system, revealing the unprecedented scale and pace of the adaptations required. The challenges were multidimensional. They encompassed not only organizational issues, such as the establishment of preparatory classes, curriculum modifications, and the development of language competences, but also psychological and social problems (Schmid 2022). Schools thus became spaces of encounter between students with markedly different experiences: those living in relative stability and those affected by the trauma of war and migration. In this context, key questions emerged regarding the model of integration, assimilationist or inclusive, and the ways of minimizing tensions in a multicultural environment (Kühberger 2025). The most complex issues became evident in history education. The teaching of history, grounded in a Polish national narrative, proved difficult for some Ukrainian students to accept. In the classroom, divergent interpretations of the past came into confrontation, reflected in differing values, hierarchies of heroes, and evaluations of historical events. A prominent example is the figure of Stepan Bandera, assessed differently in Polish and Ukrainian memory cultures. These situations exposed the limitations of a didactic model based on a unified narrative. Questions thus emerged: should education aim to incorporate students into the Polish canon of memory, or rather avoid doing so? Is it possible to create a dialogical space in which Polish and Ukrainian narratives enter into relation rather than compete? A response to these challenges has been found in didactic projects rooted in multicultural, intercultural, and transcultural pedagogy (Kryvosheia and Morawiec). Their aim is not to homogenise diverse experiences, but rather to establish conditions that enable their coexistence, thereby facilitating the negotiation of meaning, fostering openness to polyphonic perspectives, encouraging critical reflection on one's own narrative, and recognising the right of communities to sustain and articulate their distinct memories (Varner, et al 2021). Migrants intending to establish a lasting connection with Poland, and thus requiring civic integration into Polish culture and language, must be approached differently from war refugees, who exist in a condition of temporariness. In the latter case, history education should ensure a sense of security and protect identi-

ty, rather than impose a “foreign” vision of the past. In response to these challenges, it is necessary to develop didactic models that move beyond the transmissive paradigm and situate both student and teacher within their individual perspectives. Such an approach enables the individual to be understood simultaneously within the dynamics of global cultural processes and the specificity of local contexts. Within this “glocal” framework, both students and teachers are positioned as subjects embedded in distinct yet overlapping axiological orders, where global and local value systems intersect. Consequently, history education is reconceptualised as a process of negotiating meaning across these domains. This perspective foregrounds the subjectivity of participants in the educational process and shifts the emphasis away from transmitting a singular, authoritative narrative towards the creation of a dialogical discursive space. Such a space is co-constructed by individuals with diverse identity positions and facilitates the articulation of multiple narratives, their critical engagement, and their reflective interpretation. At stake, therefore, is not merely the coexistence of global and local orders, but their subjectively constituted synthesis, which becomes manifest in individual interpretative practices. This may be conceptualised as “(glo)culturality” (glo – globality/glocality), understood as a process through which cultural content is individually processed and recontextualised, such that global and local determinants become intertwined within a single cognitive and axiological framework. A key element of this (glo)cultural perspective is the explicit engagement of students with the mechanisms through which historical narratives are constructed, including the influence of cultural determinants such as nationality, religion, ideology, tradition, gender, and sexuality (Morawiec and Zabolotna, 2019). Such an approach enables a more nuanced understanding of the sources of interpretative divergence. At the same time, it is essential to foreground the mnemohistorical character of these narratives and their embeddedness in educational, media, and propagandistic processes. In contexts shaped by war and intensified informational pressures, this perspective assumes particular importance, as it helps to mitigate the reproduction of memory conflicts while strengthening critical capacities and fostering resilience against the instrumentalisation of the past.

### **Mnemonic Dimension**

Historical policy constitutes a central mechanism through which collective memory is shaped, and the past is socially interpreted. While the reconstruction of historical processes remains the domain of academic historiography, their societal impact is largely mediated by state-level decisions. Public institutions, through education systems, museum practices, and commemorative activities, select, reinforce, and legitimise mnemonic frameworks and historical narratives (Yarosh and Kalishchuk, 2020, 155–158). In this sense, historical or memory policy extends

beyond the mere transmission of scholarly knowledge; it represents an active process of meaning-making in which representations of the past are aligned with contemporary social and political priorities. Such policy may adopt either an open, dialogical orientation or a more closed form, shaped by the immediate interests of political authority. Under conditions of international tension, the significance of historical policy intensifies, functioning both as an instrument of mobilisation and as a potential catalyst for conflict escalation. This dynamic is particularly evident in Polish Ukrainian relations, where a shared yet contested past may be framed either as a foundation for mutual understanding or as a source of enduring antagonism. These complexities are further exacerbated by the propagandistic strategies of the Russian Federation, which instrumentalise contentious historical narratives to destabilise interregional relations. In this context, unilateral approaches to memory policy risk inadvertently reinforcing imperial or exclusionary narratives. At the same time, the state is not the sole actor involved in constructing interpretations of the past. Alongside academic historians, a wide range of stakeholders, including educators, media practitioners, civil society actors, local authorities, cultural institutions, religious communities, and business organisations, contribute to the production and circulation of historical meaning. Each brings distinct interpretive lenses and memory sensitivity. This underscores the need to move beyond centralized models and toward more pluralistic approaches. Such a shift does not imply relativism, but rather a commitment to dialogical engagement. Within this framework, discourse becomes the primary space for negotiating meaning, enabling diverse interpretations to be articulated, contested, and critically reflected upon (Meyer, 2008). This orientation fosters a more mature and reflexive relationship with the past, grounded not in exclusion but in mutual understanding. In contexts marked by historical conflict, such dialogical engagement assumes a stabilising function. Multilateral dialogue can mitigate the instrumentalisation of memory and counteract the radicalisation of social attitudes. While it does not eliminate differences, it facilitates their accommodation within a shared interpretative framework. Accordingly, the role of historical and memory policy should be to safeguard the autonomy of scholarly inquiry, promote the plurality of mnemonic discourse, and, crucially, resist the influence of propaganda and disinformation.

### **Political Science Dimension**

Reflection on the concept of “peace” has generated an extensive and diverse body of scholarship. It is often, however, defined in relatively narrow terms, as the absence of war and direct physical violence (*pax*). Political science offers a more expansive and process-oriented understanding. From this perspective, peace is

**NORBERT MORAWIEC**

**HISTORY EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF WAR AND MIGRATION:  
TOWARD A DIALOGICAL MEMORY CULTURE IN POLISH-UKRAINIAN RELATIONS**

---

neither a natural nor a stable condition; it does not arise spontaneously, nor can it be maintained without sustained effort. Rather, it is best understood as an ongoing process shaped by the negotiation of memory, the interpretation of the past, and the narratives through which communities construct a sense of collective identity. Accordingly, peace does not imply the absence of conflict, but rather a society's capacity to manage conflict without recourse to violence, whether physical or symbolic. This insight can be traced back to classical historiography, which recognised that conflicts often emerge from accumulated grievances and unresolved mnemonic tensions, and that the absence of overt confrontation does not necessarily equate to genuine stability. In the works of Livy, for instance, civil wars are attributed not merely to political disruption but to a deeper moral and civic crisis, marked by the erosion of shared values. The restoration of peace, in this account, was contingent upon negotiated settlements among social groups that retained vivid memories of prior violence. In this sense, societies "learn" peace through engagement with the memory of wars, rebellions, and crises, while institutions and practices of memory mediation become essential to the long-term stabilisation of the political community (Hoyos, 2019). In the medieval period, this narrative underwent a process of sacralisation. Historiography, largely produced by the clergy, framed peace as an expression of divine will and an integral component of a universal moral order. In the writings of Otto of Freising, drawing on the theology of Augustine of Hippo, world history is depicted as a continuous struggle between two orders: the City of God and the earthly city, associated with sin and self-interest. Within this framework, wars and conflicts were interpreted as elements of a providential plan of salvation, while institutions such as the Church and the Empire assumed the role of custodians of peace. The early modern period introduced a significant transformation in thinking about war and peace, giving rise to two dominant intellectual currents. On the one hand, realist perspectives conceptualised war as an inherent feature of human relations, with peace understood as a provisional and fragile condition. On the other hand, idealist traditions advanced the possibility of establishing durable peace through law, institutional frameworks, and civic education. Thinkers such as Niccolò Machiavelli and Jean-Jacques Rousseau grappled with the enduring tension between the preservation of moral virtue and the pragmatic demands of political survival (Amoroso, 2016; Nikolakakis, 2024). Contemporary scholarship increasingly emphasises that peace does not emerge spontaneously but is actively constructed through mediating institutions and practices of memory. Education systems, public discourse, and institutions responsible for interpreting the past play a central role in this process. The durability of social order depends fundamentally on the capacity to generate trust, which develops through shared experiences and communicative

engagement. Twentieth-century experiences indicate that peace can be fostered through the critical engagement with historical trauma, particularly when grounded in the acknowledgement of responsibility, the restitution of victims' memory, and the mediation of competing narratives. This is reflected in initiatives such as the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo in Argentina and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (South Africa), which exemplify dialogical, socially embedded processes of compromise (McCormack, 2014). In such contexts, peace emerges not as an imposed condition but as an outcome of sustained social negotiation. However, these processes are increasingly subject to contemporary pressures. Information warfare, the dynamics of global media, and the instrumentalisation of history have transformed collective memory into a site of competition. Where a single narrative dominates, conflict is not resolved but rather suppressed and deferred. Consequently, the durability of peace must be understood in relation to the quality of memory culture: it is more stable where memory remains open and where institutions can mediate disagreement. Dialogical engagement thus becomes essential, requiring a willingness to acknowledge diverse experiences and to interpret them collaboratively. Within this context, the commitment to peace and cooperation articulated in the 2030 Agenda should be approached not as an abstract ideal, but as a comprehensive cultural, legislative, and institutional project. Its realisation demands sustained effort across the domains of education, historical policy, and international relations, particularly in regions marked by complex historical legacies, where peace depends on the conscious governance of memory and the cultivation of dialogue.

**Legislative Dimension:** In public discourse, justice is most commonly articulated in normative terms, as both an ethical principle and a legal construct. While this perspective remains indispensable, it is insufficient when examined through the lens of conflict culture and memory studies. Justice does not originate at the moment of juridical resolution; rather, it emerges through the ways in which societies remember the past, interpret experiences, and define harm. In this respect, historiography plays a constitutive role, as it co-produces collective memory and thereby shapes the conditions under which justice can be recognised and enacted. This relationship is evident across a range of historical contexts. Within imperial narratives, memory is often subordinated to the logic of triumph, suppressing reflection on one's own violence and marginalising the experiences of others. Under such conditions, justice becomes conflated with power, while law is stripped of its mediating capacity and instead functions as an instrument for legitimising dominant interpretations. By contrast, a markedly different model emerges in Holocaust

**NORBERT MORAWIEC**

**HISTORY EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF WAR AND MIGRATION:  
TOWARD A DIALOGICAL MEMORY CULTURE IN POLISH-UKRAINIAN RELATIONS**

---

historiography. The work of Raul Hilberg and Saul Friedländer reoriented understandings of justice by shifting attention from legal adjudication to the centrality of victim memory. In this framework, justice extends beyond the prosecution of perpetrators to encompass the recognition and preservation of victims' experiences as foundational to collective remembrance. This mnemohistorical privileging of the victim's perspective contributed to the formation of a new moral consensus, in which the relativisation of evil became untenable, and memory education assumed the status of a public responsibility. Justice, therefore, became grounded in memory as much as in legal sanction (Friedländer, 2000, 9–10). A comparable dynamic can be observed in reflections on twentieth-century totalitarian regimes. Historiographical analysis demonstrates that justice in post-authoritarian societies cannot be reduced to a straightforward process of retrospective accountability. Where the memory of victims competes with that of former power holders, justice is readily politicised and risks being transformed into an instrument of mnemonic retaliation. Lustration and decommunization processes thus become not only legal procedures but also performances of memory. This tension is further illuminated in the historiography of colonialism. The work of Dipesh Chakrabarty highlights how, for decades, European historiography sustained a form of colonial amnesia, in which violence and domination were obscured by narratives of a "civilising mission." In such contexts, the absence of justice did not stem from a lack of legal frameworks, but from the erasure or marginalisation of memory itself. It is only through the decolonisation of memory, marked by the recognition of colonial harm, that meaningful discussions of responsibility, reparation, and symbolic justice become possible (Chakrabarty, 2007). The conclusion is that law does not constitute the primary source of justice, but rather its secondary legitimation. Its effectiveness depends upon the prior social recognition of harm and the emergence of a shared understanding of its significance. From the standpoint of the 2030 Agenda, this implies the need to move beyond a narrowly institutional conception of justice and to engage more substantively with the domains of education and memory policy as sites for working through difficult historical legacies. Only under such conditions can a normative order be established in which law does not merely impose justice but reflects and sustains it.

**Institutional Dimension:** The notion of "strong institutions," as articulated in the 2030 Agenda, is frequently framed in technocratic terms, emphasising administrative efficiency and the effective enforcement of law. From the perspective of conflict culture and memory studies, however, such a view remains reductive. Institutional strength does not derive solely from coercive capacity, but from social legitimacy grounded in cultural memory. The durability of institutions depends less on the continuity of authority than on the continuity of trust.

It possesses a narrative character, emerging through shared understandings of the origins, purposes, and meanings of institutional arrangements. In this regard, historiography not only documents institutions but actively participates in their construction, situating them within the social order and shaping their perceived role in the regulation of conflict. Institutions are invariably products of specific cultures of conflict. Where conflict is construed as a threat to be eliminated, institutions tend to assume a repressive character. Conversely, where conflict is recognised as an inherent feature of social life, institutions perform a mediating function, organising rather than suppressing disagreement. This distinction is reflected in classical historiography, which presents two contrasting models of state formation. The first, embodied in the myth of Romulus, portrays the state as emerging through violence, specifically fratricide, where law is aligned with victory and institutions function to sustain an order imposed by force (Livius 2014, 144-150). By contrast, the republican narrative depicts Rome as developing through structured conflict between patricians and plebeians, leading to the institutionalisation of mechanisms such as the tribune of the plebs, codified law, and collegial governance. In this latter account, institutions do not eliminate conflict but instead channel it into stable forms of political organisation (Gabrielli, 2023, 143-145). The medieval period offers a different configuration, in which institutional authority derived from sacral continuity rather than social negotiation. Law, ecclesiastical power, and political authority were legitimised through divine order, producing institutions that were symbolically robust yet limited in their capacity for mediation. Conflict is not resolved but rather delegitimised as heresy or rebellion. A significant shift occurs in modern revolutionary historiography. In accounts of the American and French Revolutions, from Alexis de Tocqueville to Georges Lefebvre, institutions are not understood as the product of a singular founding moment, but as responses to experiences of violence, instability, and systemic rupture (Cox, 1993, 290). From a mnemohistorical perspective, this marks a critical transformation: institutions derive their strength from embodying the memory of past failures. The constitution, courts, and parliament do not embody perfection, but rather limitation. Historiography that foregrounds terror and the necessity of constraining power serves to reinforce procedural institutions. A strong institution is one that retains an awareness of the conditions that necessitated its establishment. By contrast, imperial Russian historiography, from Nikolay Karamzin to Vladimir Putin, consistently portrays the state and its institutions as instruments for safeguarding historical unity. Internal conflict is framed as an existential threat rather than a constitutive element of political life,

**NORBERT MORAWIEC**

**HISTORY EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF WAR AND MIGRATION:  
TOWARD A DIALOGICAL MEMORY CULTURE IN POLISH-UKRAINIAN RELATIONS**

---

and institutional strength is equated with the capacity to sustain a singular, unified narrative. In this framework, law, religious authority, and governance structures do not mediate conflict but neutralise it, rendering institutional strength synonymous with narrative monopoly (Mogilner 2014). An opposite model can be found in postwar German historiography. The government of the Federal Republic of Germany, under Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, consciously pursued a policy of memory. Its primary objective was to prevent the resurgence of Nazism in postwar Germany. In practice, this entailed an effort to cultivate an expiatory attitude within German society: the recognition of guilt, responsibility, and the necessity of moral reckoning with the past (Banchoff 1996, 41-42). Democratic institutions were regarded as strong precisely because they were designed as safeguards against the return of totalitarian memory. Constitutional courts, federalism, and the protection of minorities – all these solutions were legitimised through the memory of catastrophe. Here, the mnemohistorical perspective operates in a manner opposite to the imperial model: the more dramatic the narrative of the past, the greater the acceptance of constraints on power. An institution is not strong because it dominates; it is strong because it restrains domination. Contemporary institutions, such as museums, truth commissions, and international tribunals, appear effective only when they do not close debates about the past, but instead create frameworks for their articulation. Their legitimacy depends on the capacity to accommodate a plurality of experiences, rather than on imposing a single interpretation. From this perspective, “strong institutions” should be understood as those capable of functioning under conditions of enduring social disagreement. Their strength lies in mediating between different memories and visions of the past, rather than in the superficial elimination of conflict.

### **Conclusion**

Analyses grounded in the culture of conflict perspective necessitate a fundamental rethinking of history education in contexts shaped by war and migration. It can no longer be conceived as a vehicle for transmitting stabilised knowledge about the past, nor as a mechanism for reproducing a singular national narrative. Rather, it should be understood as a mediating practice situated within a field of tension between competing memories. In this sense, history education becomes one of the key domains for operationalising “rescue history,” understood not as the reconstruction of the past, but as an intervention in contemporary social relations through critical engagement with memory. This perspective allows for the recognition that memory conflict, particularly evident in Polish Ukrainian relations, is not an anomaly to be resolved, but an enduring feature of social life that may either be reproduced or transformed. Crucially, the trajectory of this process is shaped less by the substantive content of historical narratives than

by the forms through which they are articulated within public and educational spaces. Where monologic models prevail, they tend to produce an illusion of interpretive control. The imposition of a singular vision of the past does not result in genuine internalisation, but rather in superficial convergence accompanied by a deeper segmentation of memory. Under such conditions, especially among migrant students, there emerges a (glo)cultural disjunction between official and private memory, manifesting in forms of surface-level adaptation, latent resistance, or epistemic disengagement. Conflict is thus not resolved, but displaced into latent forms, generating cognitive dissonance and fragmentation of identity. In such contexts, history education risks reinforcing antagonisms and increasing susceptibility to political and propagandistic instrumentalisation. These dynamics are further intensified by patterns of repeated migration and transitions between educational systems, which expose students to discontinuous and often contradictory historical narratives structured by differing interpretive and axiological frameworks. School history becomes a shifting register of official memory rather than a stable domain of knowledge, producing a rupture between students' biographical experiences and successive narrative regimes. This necessitates ongoing adaptation to changing interpretive contexts, often at the expense of coherence and critical engagement. By contrast, a dialogical model of history education, grounded in multiperspectivity, negotiation of meaning, and reflexive engagement, may initially generate experiences of cognitive uncertainty or axiological destabilisation, including the questioning of established identity frameworks. However, such controlled exposure to difference constitutes a necessary condition for integration and long-term social stability. Dialogicity does not eliminate conflict; rather, it renders it communicable and open to critical reflection, transforming history from an instrument of division into a space for cultivating trust and sustainable coexistence. From this perspective, a dialogical culture of memory is not merely a normative aspiration, but a functional prerequisite for the durability of social order. Its development requires coordinated efforts across multiple domains, including didactic practice, mnemonic frameworks, political governance, legislative structures, and institutional design. History education occupies a particularly significant position within this configuration, as it represents an early site of memory socialisation and the formation of interpretive competences that shape how individuals understand conflict and the methods of its resolution. In this light, the Sustainable Development Goals of the 2030 Agenda, particularly those related to education, peace, justice, and strong institutions, share a common foundation in the cultural governance of memory. With-

**NORBERT MORAWIEC**

**HISTORY EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF WAR AND MIGRATION:  
TOWARD A DIALOGICAL MEMORY CULTURE IN POLISH-UKRAINIAN RELATIONS**

---

out recognising this dimension, they risk remaining abstract and susceptible to technocratic reduction. Their effectiveness ultimately depends on the capacity of societies to cultivate forms of memory that do not suppress difference but enable its sustained mediation. Accordingly, the future of Polish Ukrainian relations, as well as the broader stability of the European order, is shaped not only within the domains of politics and security, but also through the ways in which the past is narrated, contested, and critically reworked. In this context, history education, conceived as a dialogical and *rescue*-oriented practice, emerges as a central instrument of peacebuilding, understood not as the absence of conflict, but as the capacity for its conscious and responsible governance.

## REFERENCES

- Amoroso, A., 2016. War and Politics in the Thought of Machiavelli. *Armstrong Undergraduate Journal of History*, [e-journal] 6 (2), Article 6, pp.85-96. <https://doi.org/10.20429/aujh.2016.060206>
- Banchoff, T., 1996. Historical Memory and German Foreign Policy: The Cases of Adenauer and Brandt. *German Politics & Society*, 14 (2(39)), pp.36-53.
- Chakrabarty, D., 2007. History and the politics of recognition In: S. Morgan, K. Jenkins, A. Munslow Eds. *Manifestos for History*. New York: Routledge, pp.77-88.
- Cox, M.R., 1993. Tocqueville's Bourgeois Revolution. *Historical Reflections / Réflexions Historiques*, 19 (3), pp.279-307.
- Davies, L., 2004. *Education and Conflict: Complexity and Chaos*. London: Routledge.
- Dill, J. and Hunter, J.D., 2010. Education and the Culture Wars. In: S. Hitlin, S. Vaisey eds. *Handbook of the Sociology of Morality*. New York: Springer, pp.275-291.
- Domańska, E., 2014. Historia ratownicza. *Teksty Drugie: teoria literatury, krytyka, interpretacja*, 5 (149), pp.12-26.
- Friedländer, S., 2000. History, Memory, and the Historian: Dilemmas and Responsibilities. *New German Critique*, [e-journal] 80, pp.3-15. <https://doi.org/10.2307/488629>
- Gabrielli, Ch., 2023. Political Violence between Myth and History: The Examples of Accius and Cicero. In: *Myth and History in the Historiography of Early Rome*. [e-book] Leiden: Brill, pp.140-154. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004534506\\_008](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004534506_008)
- Gallagher, T., 2004. *Education in Divided Societies*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Georgi, V.B., Lücke, M., Meyer-Hamme, J. and Spielhaus, R. hrsg., 2022. *Geschichten im Wandel: Neue Perspektiven für die Erinnerungskultur in der Migrationsgesellschaft*. [e-book] Bielefeld: transcript Verlag. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839457924>
- Hoyos, D., 2019. Livy on the Civil Wars (and After): Morality Lost? In: *The Historiography of Late Republican Civil War* [e-book] Leiden: Brill, pp.210-238. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004409521\\_011](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004409521_011)

Huzarski, M., 2020. Kulturoznawstwo ratownicze, czyli czego kulturoznawstwo Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej może nauczyć się od Ewy Domańskiej. *Przegląd Środkowo-Wschodni*, [e-journal] 5, pp.377-393. <http://dx.doi.org/10.32612/uw.2543618x.2020.pp.377-393>

Kryvosheia, I. and Morawiec, N., Polacy w Humaniu, Ukraińcy w Częstochowie: razem dla społeczności: idea i realizacja projektu wymiany młodzieży ukraińsko-polskiej (w druku).

Kühberger, C., 2025. Inclusive Historical Knowledge: Concepts of history education lacking in special needs schools. In: *Bridging History and Special Education*. [e-book] Kiel University Press, pp.25-39. <https://doi.org/10.38072/2703-0784/p59>.

LeBaron, M., 2003. Culture and Conflict. *New Beyond Intractability*. [online] Available at: <[https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/culture\\_conflict](https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/culture_conflict)> [Accessed 18 March 2026].

Livius, T., 2014. The History of Rome from Its Foundation. In: Ch. Francese and R.S. Smith, eds. *Ancient Rome: an anthology of sources*. Indianapolis: Hackett, pp.142-153.

McCormack, C., 2014. The Madres de Plaza de Mayo: Motherhood's Search For Answers During The Dirty War in Argentina. *Northwest Passages*, 1 (1), 7, pp.107-138.

Meyer, E., 2010. Memory and politics. In: A. Erll and A. Nünning. *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*. [e-book] New York: De Gruyter, pp.173-180. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110207262.3.173>

Mogilner, M., 2014. New Imperial History. POST-Soviet historiography in search of a new paradigm for the history of empire and nationalism. *Revue d'études comparatives Est-Ouest*, [e-journal] 45 (2), pp.25-67. <https://doi.org/10.4074/S0338059914002022>

Morawiec, N. and Zabolotna, O., 2019. History, "Little Motherland", and multi-, inter- and transcultural education. In: *Crossroads. Vol. 5, Past/present/future man in multicultural, intercultural and transcultural world*. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, pp.51-63.

Nikolakakis, N., 2024. Realist or Utopian Pacifist?: Jean- Jacques Rousseau and the Question of War. *Filosofia Unisinos*, [e-journal] 25 (3), pp.1-17. doi: 10.4013/fsu.2024.253.08

Pherali, T., 2016. Education: Cultural reproduction, revolution and peacebuilding in conflict-affected societies. In: O.P. Richmond, S. Pogodda and J. Ramovic eds. *The Palgrave Handbook of Disciplinary and Regional Approaches to Peace*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.193-205.

Schmid, C., 2022. Ukrainians in Polish Schools. *Educational Role of Language Journal*, 2 (8), pp.68-75.

**NORBERT MORAWIEC**

**HISTORY EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF WAR AND MIGRATION:  
TOWARD A DIALOGICAL MEMORY CULTURE IN POLISH-UKRAINIAN RELATIONS**

---

- Shulla, K., Filho, W.L., Lardjane, S., Sommer, J.H. and Borgemeiste, Ch., 2020. Sustainable development education in the context of the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 27(2), pp.1-11.
- Smaoui, A., Bensalem, H. and Jebali, A., 2025. The Glocal Dimension in Education: Critical Pedagogies in Transition. In: F.G. Paloma, P.A. di Tore, G.R.J. Mangione, eds. *Teacher Training and Student Learning - Past Values, Present Uncertainties and Future Prospects*. IntechOpen.
- Tomlinson, K. and Benefield, P., 2005. *Education and conflict: research and research possibilities*. Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Ullrich, M. and Lücke, M., 2014. Transkultureller Geschichtsunterricht. Neues Leitbild für die Konzeption historischer Lehr- und Lernprozesse? *Psychosozial*, 136, pp.11-22.
- Varner, K.J., Gerlach, D., Markides, J., Schrader, P.G., Muñoz, C.E., Opić, S., Bagnall, N., Mass, A.M. and Mikulec, E., 2021. Teaching, Learning, Leading, and Living in a Glocal World: Policy, Practice, and Praxis. *Global Education Review*, 8 (2-3), pp.1-7.
- Yarosh, Y.B. and Kalishchuk, O.M., 2020. History, historical memory, memory policy: theoretical and methodological aspect. In: *Contemporary issues of the world community and the role of social sciences in ensuring its development*. Toruń: Liha-Pres, pp.145-164.

Received: 19.03.2026; Accepted: 21.04.2026;

The article was first published online: 15.05.2026

Author's edition

## ІСТОРИЧНА ОСВІТА В УМОВАХ ВІЙНИ ТА МІГРАЦІЇ: ДО ДІАЛОГІЧНОЇ КУЛЬТУРИ ПАМ'ЯТІ В ПОЛЬСЬКО- УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ВІДНОСИНАХ

**Моравець Норберт**

*Кандидат історичних наук,*

*доцент Інституту історії,*

*ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5025-5528>*

*e-mail: [n.morawiec@ujd.edu.pl](mailto:n.morawiec@ujd.edu.pl)*

*Університет імені Яна Длугоша в Ченстохові*

У статті розглядається роль історичної освіти в умовах війни та міграції з акцентом на польсько-українських відносинах після 2022 року. Гіпотеза: вплив учнів із прямим або опосередкованим досвідом війни виявив обмеження трансмісивної моделі викладання історії, заснованої на однорідному національному наративі, в також підтвердив необхідність її критичного перегляду. Співіснування різних мнемонічних рамок у класі породжує напруження, які ставлять під сумнів усталені дидактичні практики та вимагають більш рефлексивних і адаптивних інтерпретаційних стратегій. Метою статті є концептуалізація історичної освіти як посередника між конкуруючими видами пам'яті в межах підходу «rescue history» та глокального підходу, що поєднує глобальні динаміки з локальними освітніми контекстами. Аналіз здійснено з багаторівневої перспективи, яка охоплює дидактичний, політичний, міжнародний, законодавчий та інституційний виміри. У статті також розглядається переосмислення окремих цілей сталого розвитку порядку денного 2030 у взаємозв'язку з освітою в умовах конфліктів та міграцій. У статті показано, що зіткнення різних історичних наративів у шкільному середовищі зумовлює необхідність переходу від асиміляційної моделі до діалогу та інклюзії, які узгоджують значення, відмінності та розвиток критичних компетентностей. Підкреслено важливість формування рефлексивності, емпатії та відкритості до множинних перспектив в освітньому процесі. Обґрунтовано, що історичну освіту слід розуміти як посередницьку практику та як інструмент формування діалогу культур пам'яті, що становить ключову умову соціальної згуртованості та мирного співіснування.

**Ключові слова:** історія; пам'ять; освіта; мир; Порядок денний у сфері сталого розвитку до 2030.

