

PhD Michał Latawiec*, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8803-4202>

Prof. PhD Anna Latawiec*, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0769-7328>

* Faculty of Christian Philosophy

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University
in Warsaw

Dialogue as a tool in nature conservation

Dialog jako narzędzie w ochronie przyrody¹

<https://doi.org/10.34766/fetr.v46i2.834>

Abstract: Nature is sensitive to human interventions. They often result in social conflicts. The dilemmas that emerge in this context require explanations. The aim of this article is to show the usefulness of dialogue in the process of making people aware of the essence of these dilemmas. For this reason, we first review the notion of dialogue and the features that characterise this process. The proposed definition of dialogue takes account of its specific role in the understanding of nature conservation. After indicating the meaning of activities undertaken to protect nature, despite emerging dilemmas, the usefulness of dialogue is indicated as a tool for explaining the causes and essence of the dilemmas.

Keywords: dialogue, dilemma, conflict, nature conservation

Abstrakt: Przyroda jest wrażliwa na podejmowane przez człowieka ingerencje. Ich skutkiem często pojawiają się konflikty społeczne. Rodzące się na tym tle dylematy, domagają się wyjaśnień. Celem artykułu jest wykazanie użyteczności dialogu w procesie uświadamiania istoty tych dylematów. Z tej racji, dokonano najpierw przeglądu określeń pojęcia dialogu oraz cech charakteryzujących ten proces. Zaproponowano własne określenie dialogu uwzględniające jego szczególną rolę w rozumieniu ochrony przyrody. Po wskazaniu sensu podejmowanych działań na rzecz przyrody, mimo rodzących się dylematów, wskazano użyteczność dialogu jako narzędzia służącego wyjaśnianiu przyczyn i istoty dylematów.

Słowa kluczowe: dialog, dylemat, konflikt, ochrona przyrody

Introduction

Dialogue is a concept present in our natural language. It is inflected in various ways, but also has different meanings depending on the context of a particular scientific discipline. This also applies to the term 'nature conservation'. For this reason, a brief overview of the notion of dialogue will first be presented, followed by the conditions for a fair dialogue.

Dialogue plays an important role at various levels of human presence: it may be the pursuit of security and understanding behaviour in specific social, psychological or sociological conditions. For a dialogue to be useful, its essence must be understood and its conduct must be reliable.

¹ Wersja w języku polskim na stronie:

<https://www.stowarzyszeniefidesetratio.pl/Presentations0/2021-2-18Lataw2.pdf>

Among human activities aimed at nature conservation, there are also those whose effects are not always known. This kind of situation requires reliable explanations. First, a modified definition of the term 'dialogue' will be introduced, which will take on particular importance in nature conservation. The article will show that dialogue is an important tool for informing about the causes of emerging ecological dilemmas. It is also worth emphasising that the area of nature conservation is sensitive to the interventions undertaken and requires a number of justifications and explanations enabling an understanding of the emerging conflicts and social protests.

1. Contextual approaches to the notion of dialogue

“«Dialogue» comes from the Greek word *diá-logos* («two-word» «conversation», Latin: *colloquium, sermo*) and means reaching the truth through (thanks to) reason and logic; *dia-legein* also means talking, persuading with words and reaching agreement” (Bronk and Salamucha, 2010, p. 16). This explanation is extremely valuable in discussions about dialogue. Firstly, it stresses bilateral action. Secondly, the essence of dialogue is a conversation leading to a consensus. This is how the notion and phenomenon of dialogue will be treated here. It is also worth emphasising the importance of the cited article as its authors place their analyses in the context of the truth about man (Bronk and Salamucha, 2010).

The concept of dialogue is very widespread in both everyday life and scientific works. Dialogue is an essential means of human communication. A review of related terms can be found in many publications (Latawiec, 2006, 2007; Parzyszek, 2000; Wojcieszek, M. Wojcieszek, 2019). This notion is used in different ways and in various contexts because it has many meanings. Dialogue is usually positive. The point is that the result of dialogue is an attempt to reach agreement on the issue under discussion. This kind of dialogue is proposed for establishing the reasons for different opinions, misunderstandings and conflicts. In common understanding, dialogue concerns two people who typically want to communicate with one another. In order to understand the causes of conflicts, they want to eliminate them through dialogue (Latawiec, 2006, 2007; Parzyszek, 2000; J. Wojcieszek, Wojcieszek, 2019).

At the beginning, it is worth quoting an extract from a book by Krzysztof Wieczorek, (1990) in which he analyses the philosophical views of Józef Tischner and Andrzej Nowicki concerning dialogue, among other issues. He writes:

“‘dialogue’: in its basic meaning, this word means the attitude of persons, characterised by reciprocal questions and answers. So, when we talk about the ‘formula of dialogue’, we mean some abstract model of this attitude. Sometimes the very term ‘dialogue’ is used in an abstract way, referring to the mutual relationship of, for example, two

worldviews (dialogue between believers and non-believers) or two systems of values (dialogue between Christianity and Marxism). The emergence of an attitude enabling the establishment of a dialogical relationship between persons and the emergence of reciprocity requires certain conditions to be met. This does not mean, of course, that a fixed set of conditions causes the occurrence of a dialogical relationship in a deterministic manner. Partners in a dialogue do not have to agree with each other in every respect (anyway, most likely such a dialogue would be just an apparent dialogue). ... You can be convinced that your partner is wrong, and still not avoid dialogue. This happens when searching for truth by all means and taking as many aspects as possible into account are considered more important and more valuable than sticking to one's own opinion at all costs" (ibidem, 1990).

In the literature on the subject, experts in many scientific disciplines comment on dialogue. In this article, particular emphasis will be put on those in the field of social sciences (such as psychology, sociology, pedagogy and security sciences) and the humanities (such as philosophy, history, linguistics and culture). For this reason, several proposals will be cited to document the ambiguity of this concept, on the one hand, and to outline the background for our proposed understanding of dialogue, on the other.

For example:

"Dialogue, public debate, is a form of practising public sociology. The dialogue of sociology with social groups justifies their existence. Since dialogue and debate inform about social problems, needs and expectations, they are a source of knowledge for public sociology, and this knowledge is reflective and communicative in nature" (Kosznicki, 2010, p. 54-55; Hułas, 2011, p. 41).

This definition is useful here because discussions about human interference with nature appear in the social context. Interestingly, in this sense, dialogue is understood by sociologists as a multi-person discussion and even reflection on the problem posed. Sociologists engaged in a discussion do not need to debate with people with a similar scope of knowledge or views. These discussions involve those who are interested in a specific problem of social nature (Hułas, 2011).

Elsewhere, one can read that:

"dialogue... raises doubts, signals a crisis, leads to reflection on the quality of social life. ... it can be a formula of human thinking about what is complex, that is, about social life, and of what the possibility of a broader look at dialogue consists... . In hermeneutic philosophy, dialogue is a 'way of being', a community of human communication, an ongoing 'conversation'. The meaning of the world - as is emphasised - cannot be revealed (created) in a monologue. Cognition is realised in a dialogue in which no one has the 'last word' "(Stadniczeńko, 2014, p. 317).

It may be surprising to say that dialogue does not lead to a consensus. A question arises whether it makes sense to engage in dialogue if we do not count on its positive effects.

However, the literature on the subject contains another proposal:

“Social dialogue is defined as all forms of negotiation, consultation and a simple exchange of information. Social dialogue is sometimes understood as a more or less institutionalised way of communication between the state authority and various social entities, representing the interests of significant sections of society, whose main function is to mutually communicate opinions and arrangements regarding goals, instruments and strategies for implementing some kind of public policy (...). Dialogue means a conversation, an exchange of views that can bring different approaches closer to each other and lead to compromise solutions that will make it possible to avoid open social conflicts (Stadniczeńko, 2014, p. 321; Liszcz, 2011, p. 502).

In family psychology, it is proposed dialogue is treated as a certain strategy or method aimed at ‘solving a problem and maintaining good relationships. It can take various forms, such as seeking a compromise, discussing or researching about outside help’ (Ryś, Greszta, Grabarczyk, 2019, p. 229; Kuncewicz, 2010, p. 127–128).

Humanistic texts contain a number of suggestions, such as:

“Dialogue is: a type of interpersonal communication; a place where truth emerges; a way of searching for truth through an exchange of thoughts (views); an interpersonal meeting; a way of being that enables a community to exist; an exchange of arguments (reasons) aimed at obtaining a rational consensus (unanimity, common consent) by publicly discussing reasons; a way of settling disputes in democratic societies; a meeting of people willing to agree on views and actions on which there are diverging views; a linguistic way of communicating with each other; a type of interpersonal relationship, consisting of recognising another human being as a person (condition for a successful dialogue) while resigning from his or her instrumentalisation and imposing one’s own beliefs by force or forcing specific ways of behaviour/action; a form of creating and maintaining a community of meaning; ... a conversation that someone has with oneself; thinking (cognition), which is always dialogical” (Bronk and Salamucha, 2010, p. 16).

Dialogue is also described as ‘a linguistic discussion between several people’:

Dialogue is a linguistic discussion between two or more people, characterised by oppositional speaking: in the form of a question and an answer (to clarify concepts), a statement and a counter-statement (to determine a judgement), evidence and its refutation (to reveal ways of reasoning) (Lorenz, 1980, p. 471–472).

It is also worth mentioning that different types of dialogue are determined by the disciplines they concern. An example is pedagogical dialogue (Ablewicz, 2019).

The above-mentioned definitions of dialogue should be treated as confirmation of the opinion that the discussed concept is characterised by ambiguity, contextual contradiction and diversity.

2. Conditions and the role of dialogue

Concern about the value of dialogue can be found in the statements of many authorities. It is worth paying particular attention to those formulated, for example, in encyclicals. Pope Paul VI refers to the value of dialogue in his encyclical entitled 'Ecclesiam Suam' (Paul VI, ES 1964). Although the pope primarily focuses on religious dialogue, with the Church and non-believers, the instructions he gives are extremely valuable (Paul VI, ES 1964).

Thus, the essential features of dialogue mentioned in this document include: clarity to be understood; gentleness to remove pride; trust in another person; and the prudence necessary to discern the mental and moral attitudes of the listener (ES, 82). The readiness to engage in a fair dialogue should be considered an important feature (ES, 93). Moreover, according to Paul VI:

"Dialogue involves entering the path on which mutual relations between people follow the principles of prudence and sincerity, and it brings the benefits of experience and wisdom, which urge everyone to focus their attention on the most precious higher values. The dialogue we undertake, not for our own benefit, is far from any arbitrary views, flows from a sincere heart, by its nature fosters a free and fair peace, and turns away in disgust from pretence, competition, betrayal and deception" (ES, 106).

It is important that people who really want to come to an understanding meet in dialogue. Bronk and Salamucha are right when they say:

"What gives unity, among others, to dialogue is a shared subject of discussion. Taking up many topics may result in misunderstandings due to insufficient control over the course of the dialogue. Dialogue requires the preliminary determination of shared views and values, because only against their background can actual – theoretical or practical – differences between the positions of the parties be perceived. It also requires a minimum of agreement on how to understand key words. Due to a lack of elementary agreement, the dialogue turns into a 'conversation of deaf people' or a purely verbal dispute. Therefore, it is impossible where all social ties have broken down and any communicative community has ceased to exist. On the other hand, it is difficult to talk about a real dialogue in the case of environments who have monolithic (world-)views, where there are no opposing positions. For genuine dialogue to take place, there must be contradictory positions and its participants must seek the best arguments to defend their views, while striving to develop a common position and language. Thus, we deal with the appearances of dialogue where the partners share the same views from the very beginning, debating (privately or publicly) only to confirm to themselves or others about the rightness of their own position" (Bronk and Salamucha, 2010, p. 24).

This means that the main goal of dialogue should be to truly strive for agreement, having opposing positions and presenting one's views with honesty and fairness.

At this point, it is impossible not to refer to the suggestion of Roman Ingarden formulated in his *'Książeczka o człowieku'* [*Little Book about Man*]. Since dialogue is to be a kind of discussion, it is worth taking a closer look at the conditions imposed on it (Ingarden, 1987, p. 173–176).

According to Ingarden, in dialogue understood as an effective discussion, all participants must respect the honesty of thinking directed at the desire to obtain an explanation of the problem. Thanks to this, the views, beliefs and theses of the participants of the dialogue can be suspended, and the arguments of others heard. Then these arguments must be understood without any bias or judgements. They must be accompanied by a real willingness to understand. Expressing one's own beliefs also requires complete honesty, openness and the readiness to accept other convictions, provided that they can lead to the truth. Searching for the truth can be a difficult process, but not an impossible one. The condition here is to resign from partiality and manipulation, and there must be a willingness to cooperate in the pursuit of truth (Ingarden, 1987, p. 173–176).

When starting dialogue, it is important to bear in mind that it is not about:

“eliminating differences in the approach to a subject, but about eliminating falsehoods, hypocrisy, delusions and illusions. ... Dialogue cannot be striving for fellowship in a lie, but for fellowship in the face of truth. Thus, dialogue is not only about the truth, but also about community; not only about the subject and subject matter, but also about the relationship between people. Dialogue presupposes freedom, solidarity, respect and trust. There is no, and there cannot be, dialogue where there is suspicion, a hidden or overt desire to dominate, coercion or the threat of coercion, a perfidious desire to gain the partner's trust in order to detect and expose their weaknesses and thus gain an advantage over them, as well as striving for compromise, blackmail and dishonest propaganda. Dialogue is an attitude that extends beyond the realm of consciousness. It also applies to projects, plans, aspirations and actions. In addition to discovering the truth together, the purpose of dialogue is to discover and realise values together, seek and create platforms for cooperation, transform the world together, create and transform each other and to stimulate development” (Wieczorek, 1990, p. 100–101).

Douglas N. Walton's (1989) article contains an opinion based on the principles of logical argumentation saying that dialogue requires the ability to grasp the advantages and disadvantages of the arguments given in the dialogue. The author distinguishes the following types of dialogues: persuasion as a dispute consisting of convincing others of one's theses; questions asked to gain more knowledge of a specific field; and negotiation, where persuasion and negotiation are difficult to distinguish (ibidem, p. 169–176).

It can be concluded from the above overview that the concept of dialogue has a rather positive or indifferent overtone. Against the background of the above-mentioned definitions of the concept of dialogue, another definition, which is particularly useful in the area of environmental protection, will be proposed. It is worth emphasising the specificity of this area because people with different views, interests, convictions, and so on, feel entitled to conduct this type of dialogue. It can even be concluded that almost every person feels empowered to express their opinions on the principles and solutions for nature conservation. This gives rise to a specific communication, which is most often associated with antagonistic groups of people conveying the content. Taking place between two people, it is considered dialogue in the classical sense, meaning the process of reaching a consensus. The point is to remember about the common problem undertaken in dialogue, its common specificity and, finally, the common language with synonymous concepts. Each of the negotiating parties is a whole whose members are connected by relations of identity, belonging to a group, a similar language, way of expressing themselves and looking for arguments for and against the thesis proclaimed. They also often use linguistic manipulation and hidden assumptions to justify their statements (A. Latawiec, 2006).

For the purposes of the discussion on nature conservation, in this article dialogue is understood as factual communication aimed at explaining the causes and, where possible, the emerging effects of decisions about human activities to protect nature. Often, human interference with nature is revealed as dilemmas resulting from these activities. Although, inherently, dilemmas cannot be unequivocally resolved, they can be explained and understood thanks to reliable dialogue conducted in a friendly atmosphere. It is obvious to the majority of society that the overriding aim of nature conservation is to keep the natural environment in the best possible condition. The lack of unequivocal findings regarding the understanding of the very idea of conservation necessitates the need to clarify the ambiguous concept of wildlife and nature, and finally to indicate adequate methods of action.

3. Conflict as a result of a lack of dialogue

A conflict should be understood as a clash of the conflicting interests of individual people, social groups, social organisations or institutions. This is a natural phenomenon. Conflicts are inseparable elements of the functioning of every social group. Conflict situations reveal tendencies that encourage its participants to recognise their own judgements as the only right ones, and the beliefs of others as wrong (Ryś, 2003, p. 95). According to Tadeusz Burger, a pathological situation occurs only when a conflict becomes a long-lasting and devastating event. Then, the space for dialogue is marginalised (Burger, 2007, p. 7).

There are a number of works devoted to ecological conflicts. Nevertheless, the definition of an ecological conflict is introduced intuitively. And so, three slightly different definitions can be cited: 1. An ecological conflict is a conflict the object of which is the possibility of natural environmental goods being used by various social groups (Jacaszek, 2012, p. 181); 2. An ecological conflict is a direct, overt social interaction in which the actions of each party aim to make it difficult for the opponent to achieve their goals related to the use of environmental goods (Dutkowski, 1995, p. 13); 3. An ecological conflict means the emergence of antagonistic relations as a result of a real or potential conflict of interests and priorities regarding the shaping, use and protection of the natural environment (Rumianowska, 2012, p. 90). It can be assumed that the subject of analyses is social conflicts that appear in the context of managing the natural environment. In other words, these conflicts are expressed, on the one hand, by the contradictory concepts and visions of human presence in nature and, on the other hand, by the interests of various forms of human activity.

The problem of ecological conflicts is often discussed in the context of nature conservation. The most recognisable conflicts in recent years have been, for example, the dispute over the Białowieża Primeval Forest (2016–2018), the dispute over the Rospuda Valley (2005–2009), and the earlier attempt to change the route of the road through St Anne Mountain in the 1990s. In Poland, demands for nature protection have been implemented for over a hundred years. During this period, problems with communication were also revealed. The ideas advocated were usually not fully understood. The demands expressed by the supporters of nature conservation were often met with a lack of understanding. Misunderstandings are often the result of, for example, the view that nature protection aims to stop the progress of civilisation (Brunicki, 1911). In his works, Pawlikowski explains that conflicts between supporters and opponents of nature conservation are very often the result of assigning different values to the same natural elements (Pawlikowski, 1932). Some of these conflicts are related to the fear of restricting property rights, and the ecological arguments used are only a pretext to achieve one's own goals. Many ecological conflicts are revealed in the context of disputes over the location of projects that, paradoxically, are intended to protect the environment. This applies, for example, to landfill sites, composting plants and various types of power plants (M. Latawiec, 2020).

It is worth emphasising once again that ecological conflicts are not created between humans and nature. Nature is not a party to the dispute here, although some conflicts are sometimes presented in this way. Only a person who perceives the functioning of nature in their surroundings differently can be a party to the conflict. Thus, the conflicts that are discussed here are of a social nature and their source is the problem of communication and dialogue. Sometimes it is the result of a lack of the public's conscious participation in the decisions made.

Ecological conflicts – which are rooted in communication problems – can be resolved through intensive dialogue. Conflicts should be prevented by access to information and public participation in decision making. Already existing and long-lasting conflicts can be resolved with the help of negotiation, mediation and facilitation. These methods resolve conflicts by the mutual agreement of the parties. If, however, these methods fail – and dialogue turns out to be an insufficient tool – one can resort to arbitration and the courts. In this case, the resolution of the conflict is imposed from above.

4. The meaning of nature protection

Nature conservation is understood mainly in three ways, as: 1. science; 2. an idea; and 3. practical action. Although the history of our activity for protecting the natural environment is rich, it is only from the beginning of the 20th century that we can speak of an organised and coherent vision of such protection. From then on, our approach to the natural environment has also evolved, taking cultural and national contexts into account.

The goals of nature conservation are to repair the damage caused by humans in the natural environment and to minimise the inevitable human impact, for example, on natural environmental processes. This is therefore an attempt to implement further civilisation development in harmony with the natural environment. In this context, it is worth remembering the problem of the idealisation of nature. On the one hand, such an idealised vision of nature can make it easier to convince people to protect the environment; on the other hand, it can make it difficult to make uncomfortable decisions. This is particularly important as most people live in a highly transformed or artificial environment.

The need to protect nature becomes apparent when people perceive the threat of the degradation of the natural environment. More precisely, this is the moment when they notice the risk that nature will lose the value that they have given to it. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the negative effects of the development of civilisation were realised and the global nature of many problems was also recognised. It was also at this point that the effects of the ecological crisis were noticed. Among many important studies on this subject are: the book entitled 'Silent Spring' by Rachel Carson from 1962, the report of Secretary-General of the United Nations U Thant from 1969 and 'Our Common Future', also known as the Brundtland Report, by the World Commission on Environment and Development from 1987. Currently, the literature on the subject includes many valuable publications discussing the issues from various perspectives. It is worth mentioning the book entitled 'Creation in Crisis', whose author describes the ecological crisis as a real threat to the Earth and, *inter alia*, its function as a home for people (Kureethadam, 2014).

However, the important thing is that no idea has a chance of success without social participation and acceptance. Therefore, if one wants to protect nature, the local community

should first be convinced to do so. According to Jan G. Pawlikowski, a pioneer of nature conservation in Poland, no concept will be effectively implemented without the appropriate attitude of society. According to his opinion, expressed over a hundred years ago, the idea of nature conservation can be spread 'in words and in print, through speeches, brochures, articles in the press, exhibitions and shows, cinema, radio, leaflets and postcards, celebrations such as "a tree festival" and, finally, by establishing associations' (Pawlikowski, 1932, p. 11).

Dialogue should precisely define the goals of protection, determine the values that guide us, justify the decisions made and emphasise responsibility for the decisions taken.

5. Usefulness of dialogue in nature conservation

The above description may suggest that ecological conflicts have a particular dimension. Dialogue, however, is ineffective when pragmatic, economic and political positions clash. However, it is dialogue that should be treated as a helpful tool in recognising the real premises of conflict, difficult and axiological situations, and not short-term interests. It is not about slogans such as 'man or nature' or 'who is more important, man or birds'. It is about a view of nature. Zbigniew Wróblewski has drawn attention to two evaluative views of nature in the era of the ecological crisis. The first is a classical vision, where nature includes an element of a fundamental assessment, in which nature is treated as a norm and a model of thinking, acting and manufacturing. The second is a contemporary vision where nature is a product of culture, that is, it is not given. This approach takes account of the actual process of the anthropogenic changes in nature and allows for the possibility of technical reproduction of nature (Wróblewski, 2003). Another division can be found in Zbigniew Łepko's work. He has juxtaposed Hans Jonas' view of physiocentric nature with the physiological view of nature by Lothar Schäfer. At the same time, the minimum conditions common to both positions have been indicated, so that these views contribute to shaping a world-friendly attitude of man and building a human-friendly world (Łepko, 2017, p. 156).

In the area of philosophical considerations, it is also important to determine what ideas, values and principles generate all our references to the natural world and to what extent we are able to respect them and implement them in practical activities (Tyburski, 1999, p. 154). According to Tyburski, adherence to the accepted values and norms should allow for: 1. solving or toning down conflicts; 2. making a moral evaluation of human attitudes towards nature; 3. motivating people to take actions for environmental protection (ibidem, p. 154).

In addition to a view of nature, it is important to define the human-nature relationship. Anthropocentrism and physiocentrism (biocentrism) are philosophical

positions whose task is to reveal the essence of nature and man's place in it. These proposals define the human-nature relationship, trying to find out the true objective character of nature (Lemańska, 2016).

A diligent dialogue may indicate areas of dilemma in nature conservation. Dialogue can help to choose:

“one of the equivalent options of the same importance, where choosing one means losing the alternative. Hence, the effects of this choice become apparent over time. One group of dilemmas stems from our ignorance when deciding what to do for the sake of nature. Consequently, this means that the effects of the action taken are unknown. For example, a decision regarding the choice of the subject of protection in a given area: the natural process or a form of nature as we know it today? Protecting one aspect excludes the other. A natural process is dynamic and changeable and so nature undergoes changes. This means that protected elements can be lost. In the second case, the protection of the present form of nature can be seen as an attempt to preserve a certain form of nature and prevent selected natural processes from taking place” (M. Latawiec, A. Latawiec 2020).

Another example of a dilemma is the occurrence of the unexpected effects of human activity. The Błędów Desert is a good illustration of this problem. Its present appearance is the result of the significant degradation of the entire area. Today, an accidentally developed habitat is protected by environmentalists and all their activities are aimed at preventing the restoration of the condition from before our first, significantly negative interference (M. Latawiec, 2016, p. 85; M. Latawiec, A. Latawiec, 2020).

Thus, the in-depth dialogue shows the hidden differences of positions. The aforementioned conflict over the Białowieża Forest illustrates this situation. Among the parties to the conflict are environmental organisations and foresters. In the media, the question was often asked about who was right in this dispute. It seems, however, that this was a poorly worded question. Instead, the parties to the dispute should have been asked about their views on nature. This can show differences in the perception and valuation of the nature with which we come into contact. On the one hand, there is the desire to leave all natural processes to nature (for example, by accepting the presence of species considered pests that can really affect the appearance of a given ecosystem). On the other hand, there is the intention to maintain the current management of natural resources and an attempt to preserve the present nature of the ecosystem for the next generations.

It should be emphasised that dialogue indicates the values affirmed and arguments for nature conservation. For the purposes of nature protection, these may be arguments which change social attitudes towards nature.

Summary: practical conclusions

First of all, it should be emphasised that this article deliberately addresses the topic related to dialogue – and not discussion – in action for nature conservation. Although some of the aforementioned definitions of dialogue describe it as a discussion, these terms should be distinguished. It is dialogue, not discussion, that plays an important role in explaining the phenomena and events accompanying human interference with nature. When comparing these two forms of human communication, authors dealing with the subject characterise both types of communication (Van Rossem, 2006; Jaskuła, Korporowicz, 2017).

Discussion is rhetoric which involves persuading others to one's point of view, adopting positions and giving answers. At the same time, it is about preserving individual opinions. Discussion involves a dispute, which takes the form of an attack on and defence of one's own theses and judgements. The main goal of discussion is to make a decision. The aim of dialogue (dialectics), on the other hand, is to learn the truth by listening to others and, on this basis, modifying one's beliefs and collectively searching for answers to the questions posed. Participants in dialogue are characterised by an inquisitive attitude and a need to seek solutions and explanations. The main goal of dialogue is to find insights into the value of the presented judgements and theses (Van Rossem, 2006, p. 49; Jaskuła, Korporowicz, 2017, p. 35). It should be noted that K. Van Rossem compares both ways of communication and analyses a specific, Socratic type of dialogue. In his research, he prefers this type of dialogue because he deals with practical philosophy and the philosophy of education, among others (web-01). The tools used in practical philosophy and the philosophy of education are useful in explaining dilemmas in the field of nature conservation.

It has been strongly emphasised in this article that dialogue can be useful if the goal is to get to the root of the dilemma. Dialogue makes it possible to grasp the full picture of reality and better understand the conflict situations that have arisen. Dialogue should analyse the justifications for the actions taken. At the same time, it should be remembered that an emerging conflict is the result of a lack of dialogue and access to complete information and reliable analyses.

Bibliography:

- Ablewicz, K. (2019). Cechy pedagogicznego dialogu oraz etapy ich uczenia się. Odniesienie do relacji: nauczyciel – uczeń, *Przegląd Pedagogiczny*, 2, 33-48, doi: <https://doi.org/10.34767/PP.2019.02.03>
- Bronk, A., Salamucha, A. (2010). Dialog jako droga do prawdy o człowieku, *Pedagogia Christiana*, 1/25, 11-32.
- Brunicki, J. (1911). W sprawie ochrony zabytków przyrody. *Sylwan: Organ Galicyjskiego Towarzystwa Leśnego*, 3 (29), 132-139.

- Burger, T. (2007). Konflikt ekologiczny - specyfika i studium przypadków, (w:) C. Strawczewski (red.), *Konflikt ekologiczny*, 7-15, Warszawa: Centrum Informacji o Środowisku.
- Carson, R. (1962). *Silent Spring*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Dutkowski, M. (1995). *Konflikty w gospodarowaniu dobrami środowiskowymi*. Gdańsk: Wyd. Uniwersytetu Gdańskiego.
- Hułas, M. (2011). Public sociology jako nowa subdyscyplina naukowa według Michaela Burawoya, *Roczniki Nauk Społecznych*, 3 (39), 29-67.
- Ingarden, R. (1987). *Księżeczka o człowieku*, wyd. 4, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Literackie.
- Jacaszek, A. (2012). Potencjalne konflikty ekologiczne w przestrzeni miasta Wrocławia, (w:) D. Ilnicki, K. Janca (red.), *Badania regionalnych i lokalnych struktur funkcjonalno-przestrzennych*, 181-193, Wrocław: Instytut Geografii i Rozwoju Regionalnego Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Jaskuła, S., Korporowicz, L. (2017). Współczesne paradygmaty dialogu międzykulturowego, *Edukacja Humanistyczna*, 2 (37), 33-43.
- Kosznicki, A. (2017). Modele uprawiania socjologii w ujęciu Michaela Burawoya a rola socjologa w społeczeństwie, *Progress. Journal of Young Researchers*, 1, 50-60.
- Kuncewicz, D. (2010). Rozwiązywanie problemów z partnerem a wzory relacji z rodzicami, (w:) T. Rostowska, A. Peplińska (red.), *Psychospołeczne aspekty życia rodzinnego*, 125-139, Warszawa: Difin.
- Kureethadam, J. (2014). *Creation in Crisis*, New York: Orbis Books.
- Latawiec, A. (2006). Dialog jako przestrzeń dla bezpieczeństwa człowieka, (w:) J. Dębowski, E. Jarmocha, A. W. Świdorski (red), *Bezpieczeństwo człowieka a proces transformacji systemowej*, 201-206, Siedlce: Wyd. ODN Akademii Podlaskiej.
- Latawiec, A. (2007). Dialog jako przestrzeń spotkania w wielokulturowości, (w:) Z. Plasienkova, E. Lalikova (red.), *Osobnosť slovenskej filozofie - Igor Hrušovský*, 206-212, Bratislava: Fu SAV, IRIS.
- Latawiec, M. (2016). Rozpoznawanie granic ingerencji człowieka w środowisko przyrodnicze, *Studia Ecologiae et Bioethicae*, 1 (14), 77-97, doi: <https://doi.org/10.21697/seb.2020.18.5.07>.
- Latawiec, M. (2020). Filozoficzne aspekty idei ochrony przyrody, (w:) P. Dąbrowski (red.), *Zaczęto się od Tatr. Historia i współczesność ochrony przyrody w Polsce*, 144-156, Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza WIERCHY.
- Latawiec, M., Latawiec, A. (2020), Użyteczność koncepcji przypadku Grzegorza Bugajaka w naukach przyrodniczych, *Studia Philosophiae Christianae*, 4 (56), w druku.
- Lemańska, A. (2016). Postawa człowieka wobec przyrody a skuteczność ochrony środowiska, *Teologia i Moralność*, 1 (19), 7-16, doi: <https://doi.org/10.14746/tim.2016.19.1.1>.

- Liszczy, T. (2011), *Prawo pracy*, wyd. 7, Warszawa: LexisNexis.
- Lorenz, K. (1980). Dialog, (w:) J. Mittelstraß (Hg.), *Enzyklopädie. Philosophie und Wissenschaftstheorie*, Bd. 1, Mannheim, Wien, Zürich.
- Łepko, Z. (2017). Filozoficzne obrazy przyrody ożywionej a idea zrównoważonego rozwoju, (w:) R. Sadowski, Z. Łepko, (red.), *Theoria i praxis zrównoważonego rozwoju. 30 lat od ogłoszenia Raportu Brundtland*, 155-168, Warszawa: Towarzystwo Naukowe Franciszka Salezego.
- Parzyszek, M. (2020). Dialog w narzeczeństwie, *Kwartalnik Naukowy Fides et Ratio*, 2 (42), 20-28, doi: <https://doi.org/10.34766/fetr.v42i2.267>.
- Pawlikowski, J.G. (1932). Ogólny rzut oka na istotę ochrony przyrody, jej znaczenie, zadania i sposoby realizacji, (w:) W. Szafer (red.), *Skarby przyrody i ich ochrona*, 1-15, Warszawa: PROP.
- Raport Sekretarza Generalnego ONZ U Thanta z dnia 26.V.1969 r. „Człowiek i jego środowisko”. (1969). Biuletyn Polskiego Komitetu do Spraw UNESCO, Nr specjalny.
- Rumianowska, I. (2012). Konflikty ekologiczne a działania zbiorowe w zakresie użytkowania i ochrony środowiska przyrodniczego, *Ekonomia i Prawo*, 1 (8), 89-105, doi: <https://doi.org/10.12775/EiP.2012.006>.
- Ryś, M. (2003). Zasady ingerującego rozwiązywania konfliktów, (w:) J. Czartoszewski (red.), *Konflikty społeczno-ekologiczne*, 95-106, Warszawa: VERBINUM.
- Ryś, M., Greszta, E., Grabarczyk, K. (2019). Intelktualna, emocjonalna i działaniowa bliskość małżonków a ich gotowość do rozwiązywania konfliktów oraz przebaczenia, *Kwartalnik Naukowy Fides et Ratio*, 2 (38), 221-254, doi: <https://doi.org/10.34766/fetr.v2i38.77>.
- Stadniczeńko, S.L. (2014). Konstytucjonalizacja dialogu społecznego, *Studia Iuridica Lublinensia*, 22, 317-332.
- Światowa Komisja ds. Środowiska i Rozwoju. (1991). *Nasza wspólna przyszłość*, tłum. U. Grzełońska i E. Kolanowska. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
- Tyburski, W. (1999). Aksjologia ochrony środowiska przyrodniczego, (w:) J. M. Dołęga, J. W. Czartoszewski (red.), *Ochrona środowiska w filozofii i teologii*, 153-169, Warszawa: Wyd. ATK.
- Van Rossem, K. (2006). What is a Socratic Dialogue?, *Filosofie*, 1, 48-51.
- Walton, D.N. (1989). Dialogue Theory for Critical Thinking, *Argumentation*, 2 (3), 169-184, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00128147>.
- Wieczorek, K. (1990). Dwie filozofie spotkania. Konfrontacja myśli Józefa Tischnera i Andrzeja Nowickiego, *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach*, 1074, 97-98.

Wojcieszek, J., Wojcieszek, M. (2019). Pogłębiony wywiad indywidualny jako przestrzeń spotkania i dialogu, *Kwartalnik Naukowy Fides et Ratio*, 2 (38), 254-260, doi: <https://doi.org/10.34766/fetr.v2i38.78>.

Wróblewski, Z. (2003). Wartościujące ujęcia przyrody w dobie kryzysu ekologicznego, (w:) J. Czartoszewski (red.), *Konflikty społeczno-ekologiczne*, 21-26, Warszawa: VERBINUM.

(Web-01), <http://europes.org/content/bio/kristof-van-rossem>, (dostęp: 9.04.2021).