

*The 2023 Annual Meeting (Summer Days) of the Research Network of History and Philosophy of Education with the theme “Democracy and Education in Transition”*

June 14 – 15, 2023

Faculty of Education, University of Helsinki

ABSTRACTS

Keynote talk: Democratic Education under Fire. Teaching Controversial Issues in the Context of War

Speaker: Prof. Johannes Drerup, TU Dortmund, Germany/VU Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Debating controversial issues in schools is considered one of the central practical means of realizing the aims of democratic education. Yet, which issues should count as controversial is itself contested, both in increasingly polarized political debates and in classrooms across the world. This makes the task of dealing with controversial issues in the classroom a politically fraught and practically complex challenge for teachers. As representatives of the liberal state and as educators in polarized political environments, teachers have to find ways to reconcile the necessity of impartiality in democratic education with the equally important goal of cultivating concrete civic dispositions and virtues in students that will make them active stewards of democratic life. These and related problems of teaching controversial issues gain a more intense and partly also different quality in cases where liberal democracies are at war. As is also indicated by a variety of historical studies, in times of war calls for patriotic unity and ideological conformity tend to trump tolerance for ideological diversity and a critical engagement with competing political perspectives. Dissenting political voices are increasingly perceived with suspicion, distrust and as lacking loyalty to the national cause. Ideals of impartiality and objectivity (e.g. in journalism) are undermined by a suppression of disagreement, straightforward lies and propaganda. Instead of public deliberation of controversial political issues, the spectrum of acceptable perspectives narrows and patriotic enthusiasm and the willingness to contribute to the war effort become the order of the day. How should teacher deal with these and related challenges? How can they uphold an ethos of dialogue and openness under these conditions? Should they remain politically neutral in classroom discussions about the war?

In my presentation I will discuss these and related challenges and problems that teachers face when dealing with controversial issues in the context of war. In order to do so, I will first provide an overview on the controversy over controversial issues in the Philosophy of Education and outline my own approach to teaching controversial issues. Based on a reconstruction of the major problems and paradoxes associated with teaching controversial issues in the context of war, I will then apply my approach to teaching controversial issues to concrete contemporary cases and problems, which are primarily related to the educational and political implications of the Russian invasion of Ukraine.

PARALLEL SESSIONS I

DEMOPOL workshop: Education for and through democracy

David Hansen (Teachers College, Columbia University): “The Value and Cultivation of a Democratic Imagination”

As John Dewey famously argued, democracy is more than a form of government, central as that institutional feature is. In his view, democracy is a mode of human association that requires mutual contact, mutual regard, and ongoing communication. Such a form of life depends, in turn, upon a dynamic family of human dispositions, proclivities, and sensibilities marked by openness, patience, abiding curiosity if not also a sense of wonder, and an ability and willingness to share one’s thoughts and to listen to those of others. Without this ‘soil’ of reciprocal encounter, democratic institutions cannot grow and be sustained. A pressing question that educators have long faced is how to cultivate and support the family of qualities touched on here. They cannot be hammered in from without. Students cannot be made to take them on. And while it is valuable to learn about such qualities, alongside learning about the structure and remit of democratic governance, none of this knowledge guarantees actual democratic conduct in the affairs of life.

In this presentation, I propose to reconsider a time-honored approach some educators have tried to enact, namely, the cultivation of democratic imagination in the school and classroom. I will suggest that imagination cannot itself be taught directly nor acquired through a scripted methodology. There can be no separate curriculum for inculcating it. Imagination can be triggered and provoked, but not forced: it can only be caught, not taught. But it can be caught in surprising and manifold ways: through modes of mutual interaction teachers can model and encourage, and through ways of working with curricular materials. I will touch particularly upon the place of poetry, as a core element in the humanities, in cultivating a democratic imagination. Such a step may seem like a non-starter given what many have called our ‘disenchanted age’, in which poetry simply no longer functions culturally as it has done in the past. Poetry no longer has a place, so the argument goes, in a social ethos dominated by economic and business dictates. Moreover, poetry has no discernible or at least obvious voice in current discourses in educational research, theory, and practice, given the dominance of critique, of reform imperatives, and of instrumental mentalities.

However, this rather resigned outlook does not take into account the inextinguishable quest for meaning that, however inchoately, characterizes the thinking and emotional being we call the human being. The arts writ large continue to ‘speak’ to people everywhere, at least once they have serious occasion to engage them. I will suggest in the presentation that teaching poetry whose subject matter itself has to do with democratic dispositions and sensibilities provides a promising way for teachers to tap into students’ underlying, sometimes smothered desire for mutual contact and recognition in their lives with others. The engagement with poetry can potentially leave an enduring mark on students, such that when confronted with anti-democratic ideas and practices they will recoil and seek ways to respond generatively and collectively.

I will embed these claims in a perspective on what I take to be the dynamic play of imagination in poetry. Along the way I will spotlight Walt Whitman's (1819-1892) extraordinary political poem, "Song of Myself," which in fact constitutes a 'song of ourselves', as well as Aimé Césaire's (1913-2008) magisterial epic poem, "Journal of a Homecoming," which is a powerful critique of colonialism juxtaposed with an acute self-examination regarding participation in collective life. Keywords: democratic imagination, poetry, philosophy, Walt Whitman, Aimé Césaire

Veli-Mikko Kauppi (University of Oulu): Swarm intelligence, angry mobs, and herds of sheep. Democratic education and the complexity of populism

Different kinds of populist movements pose challenges to democratic societies, some may be seen even threatening them or attacking their core ideas. Yet the whole idea of populism depends on a certain level of democracy, as populist movements can only thrive in societies that provide the necessary political liberties for their citizens. It could be thus alleged that populism is an inherent feature of democratic societies. Whether it is a threat or a possibility for the society depends on the consequences of the actions of the particular populist movement, not populism itself. Taking Deweyan pragmatism as a starting point, I claim that many of the problems connected with populism can be traced back to epistemic questions, or what I call shallow fallibilism. The scientific worldview, as well as philosophical discourses during the past century, have replaced old authorities of knowledge and challenged the whole process of knowledge formation and absolute truths.

However, without a deeply revised understanding of knowing, we might only end up replacing old certainties with new ones that are convenient, yet possibly even further from what might collectively be considered to be true. The potential of a populist movement, I argue, depends on how much it stimulates inquiry into matters that it takes to be essential, not simply on the far-reaching aims of the movement. The potential of a public is not in any truth it possesses, but in the knowledge formation process that it is able to facilitate. I argue that the questions raised by populist movements deserve our attention, as well as the (possible) consequences of their suggested actions. Populism isn't necessarily a negative or positive force in a society, it can be either (or both). In education, this can be examined by using real-life examples from our surrounding societies, and observing their take on knowledge, inquiry, and truth, as truth still seems to be an inherent value even for those inventing their own truths. I present an example of examining political action and populism in education using three simple metaphors: Swarm intelligence, angry mobs, and herds of sheep. Looking at different possible political acts through these metaphors, we may examine the relativity of different political stances without subsiding into relativism. Observing the inquiries and knowledge formation that these stances foster or hinder provides a chance to practice the epistemic virtue of fallibilism, a task that has proven very difficult to be done profoundly.

Keywords: pragmatism, John Dewey, populism, democratic education

Ingrid Geier (Salzburg University), Ulla Hasager (University of Hawai'i): Between global politics and local action: Let's listen to the students and do it right

Keywords: engaged pedagogies, service learning, active-citizenship learning, civic-mindedness, democratic education

It is well documented that engaged pedagogies can further civic engagement, openness to democracy, social equalities, and cultural diversity, when students engage in problem-solving in collaboration with the communities. The two presenters have through their research and work with students from opposite sides of the globe, compared specifically European and US policies - and listened to the students. They found that engaged pedagogies such as service learning and active-citizenship learning can help ensure inclusive and equitable quality education with a substantial potential to strengthen and sustain a culture of democracy.

A positive attitude towards social and cultural diversity along with civic-engagement activities promote knowledge, skills and values that are essential for the 21st century including the importance of “learning to live together” in the sense described by J. Delors and others more than 25 years ago. But to learn to live together, we must understand the needs of the communities - global and local - and the institutions of higher education as well as know how to create partnerships for community and educational improvement. We need to be able to create learning experiences for students to develop positive attitudes, and we need to hone in on which competencies are needed today.

The presenters suggest that engaged pedagogies such as service learning and active-citizenship learning – done right – are uniquely suited to create true, durable, respectful, and meaningful partnerships with the communities, as well as opportunities to enhance education for diversity-sensitive attitudes and action. Although obtaining data about lifelong social action represents a central theoretical and methodological problem in any social research, it appears that students involved in activities focusing on the common good are diversity-sensitive and that engaged pedagogies that aim to enable a culture of democracy enhance possibilities for students to contribute to the social, cultural, ecological, economic, health, and political fields of our communities that have diversity, inclusion and equity at the center. The presenters aim at inspiring both a practice service learning, active-citizenship learning, or similar pedagogies to strengthen and sustain democracy, including inspiring research of learning outcomes of civic-engagement pedagogies in relation to civic-mindedness.

DEMOPOL workshop: Problematizing Western and humanistic models of democratic education

## Marleena Mustola (University of Jyväskylä): Posthuman democracy? Utopias of Thoreau and others

Democracy is supposed to be rule by people, but despite this ostensible participation and ruling of all, not all are included. Some people, for instance children and disabled, are excluded, and we could also criticize the whole idea of democracy of being human-centric construction that could face its own impossibility in the Anthropocene. Johannes Voelz (2019) imagines that Henry David Thoreau's ideal state could be recognized as "posthuman democracy" in which society can be found in nature and in which state is at once natural and political. In this presentation, I will consider how Thoreau's political theory and nature writings can build an idea of posthuman democracy, and further, what current posthuman scholarship has to offer in picturing the kind of social order. The posthuman utopias show the imperfection of both democracy and posthuman thinking, but they also help us imagine more-than-human idea of governance.

## Prakash Iyer (Azim Premji University): Political Education and Disagreement

Political Education (PE) in democratic societies center on knowledge, skills, values, and associated attitudes and dispositions considered necessary for ideal democracies and political identities of citizens that ought to form polity. Resultantly school curriculum is based on an imagination of citizens who aim to agree and desire to amicably resolve disagreements; which is seldom the case in reality. Indian society and its citizens bring into question this presumptive imagination of an ideal and static democracy and its citizens.

India has a history of cultural richness and syncretism that also harboured systemic hierarchies, marginalization, communal conflicts, collective experiences of humiliation and contempt, and immense economic and social disadvantages (Sheth & Mahajan, 1999. p.30). This results in passionate disagreements over divergent ideas of the nation's history with one side refusing the existence of oppression or conflicts, and the other emphasizing the need to remember extremities of oppression and conflicts in order to comprehend them in contemporary times. Similarly conflicts related to the Constitution arise between an originalist and fixed interpretation of constitutional values, and the constitution itself being a site of contestations with differing interpretations of those values.

School curriculum evades this problem by providing a univocal and singular view to Indian history and imposing singular interpretations of constitutional values. This antiseptic and neutral curriculum, invokes a pedagogy based on positive emotions and collective agreement. On the other hand, social and political institutions provide radically different historical narratives and political spaces where Constitutional values "affect and modify these [social and political] institutions and concepts and thus take away the purity of their idealistic form." (George, A. 2007) . As a result of these differences, students "ruthlessly dissect and casually discard" (Roy, 2021) learnings from

school curriculum and accept learnings from the real world they inhabit, which is fortified by their positionalities and identities of the privileged or disadvantaged. This results in furthering oppression and conflicts rather than containing them.

I argue that History and Civics curriculum should be reconstructed to mirror social realities and provide the space for students to be trained to deal with disagreements and deal with associated emotions. To this end history curriculum should be based on competing historiographies and Civics curriculum should include conflicting interpretations of constitutional values. This is required in order to “foster disagreement as a democratic capacity” (Ruitenbergh, 2010, p. 49) and to develop the “ability to hold one’s ground or to claim the ground one was denied.” (Ruitenbergh, 2018).

School education with a porous curriculum that both mirrors the real world and converses with it, fulfills the purpose of transitioning children from a safe private space that schools are meant to be, to the harsh adult political world with disagreements and conflicts (Azada-Palacios, 2021). Teacher education ought to be humanized by acknowledging teachers as representatives of particular groups and associated identities, and aim at developing the knowledge and skills required to deal with their own political anger as well as conflicting opinions of learners.

Keywords: political education, disagreement, Constitution, History

Hugo Wei Li (KU Leuven): A world of double caves and the crisis of individualism: Beyond Plato’s “cave metaphor” and the essentialist trap of democratic education

Key words: crisis of individualism, genuine communication, multi-culturalism, atomizing world, international understanding

People sometimes talk about non-democratic countries as if they talk about dark caves from the sunny outside of “democracy”. Those within the caves are seen as needing to be educated or “saved” by “us”, those who seem fortunate enough to be outside. However, this attitude can demonstrate arrogance towards “the others” (cf. post-colonial theories) and shirk potential problems in “our” own systems. In contrast, another opinion goes to the opposite extreme, featuring an overemphasis of multi-culturalism. As criticized by Sowell (2011), “If the dogmas of multiculturalism declare different cultures equally valid, and hence sacrosanct against efforts to change them, then these dogmas simply complete [...] sealing off many people in lagging groups from the advances available from other cultures around them.” (p. 469)

Both the former condescending way of talking about “the others” and the latter stance to keep a “respectable distance” imply an “I-it” attitude rather than an “I-thou” vision (cf. Buber, 2008). They do no good to genuine communication, which is key to (democratic) education (Biesta, 2013). In a

dynamic, constructive view of democracy, fostering genuine communication and international understanding is even more vital in today's de-globalizing and atomizing world.

The crisis of individualism is key to perceive the current issues in both the “democratic” and non-democratic worlds. For the former, as predicted by A. de Tocqueville (1835) long before, “Individualism is of democratic origin, and it threatens to spread in the same ratio as the equality of condition... thus [democracy] throws [every human] back forever upon himself alone and threatens in the end to confine him entirely within the solitude of his own heart.” (webpage)

According to Tocqueville, French individualism stems from and contributes to “the lack of intermediary groups to provide a framework for the individual and protection against the State” (Lukes, 2006, p. 26). Meanwhile, the non-democratic world presents a risk of instrumentalizing a form of German individualism, which strongly associates a person's individuality with that of nation-states (p. 32). As Simmel (1917) notes, “this individualism, which restricts freedom to a purely inward sense of the term, easily acquires an anti-liberal tendency” (p. 82).

A deeper understanding of the crisis of individualism today lays the foundation for a constructive, international perspective on our democracy. Therefore, I suggest using the concept of “double caves” – let's keep the artificial dichotomy for the moment – to replace the traditional view of the “cave metaphor” in examining the relationships between nation-states. This perspective provides a vision for democratic education by promoting modesty in communication and avoiding lightly-made criticism from a moral high ground. Second, it helps us to envisage a shared future, recognizing that both sides live in caves, but not one inside while the other outside. Most importantly, it highlights what is truly at stake: the free and effective flow of information across the borders (e.g., to denounce Internet blockage) and individuals (e.g., to address echo chambers), which will become even more crucial for education in the face of powerful AI and deep-fake technology (cf. Satariano & Mozur, 2023).

Peter Mukiibi (Cell Action Network Uganda), Raymond Musiima (Michigan Fellows Africa Initiatives): Challenging Eurocentric Approaches to Democratic Education: A Case Study of Uganda's Education System (Theme: Theoretical Controversies in the Theory of Democratic Education)

This paper argues that Eurocentric approaches to democratic education have dominated global discourses, marginalizing diverse voices and experiences in educational practices. It explores the Ugandan education system as a case study to challenge the Eurocentric approaches to democratic education, as it relates to the context of postcolonial societies in Africa. Drawing on the insights from postcolonial theory and critical pedagogy, the paper deconstructs the inherent Eurocentric

biases in democratic education theories and practices, especially those derived from liberal and deliberative traditions.

The paper shows how the legacy of colonialism continues to impact Ugandan educational policies and practices, leading to a lack of representation and recognition of African cultures, languages, and values. It further argues that this cultural hegemony has had significant implications for the democratic potential of Uganda's education system, creating a disconnection between the formal education system and the lived experiences of marginalized groups in the country. The paper contends that a democratic education system should be inclusive of the experiences, perspectives, and values of diverse groups and those Eurocentric approaches to democratic education are incompatible with this goal.

Through a critical analysis of Uganda's education system, the paper identifies specific instances of how Eurocentrism manifests itself in the Ugandan context. The paper highlights how the Western model of democracy, which emphasizes individualism, universalism, and competition, is privileged over African conceptions of communalism, particularism, and cooperation. Additionally, the paper identifies the exclusionary practices of Ugandan educational institutions, such as the imposition of a foreign language as the medium of instruction, which further compounds the marginalization of local languages and cultures.

The paper concludes by proposing a decolonial approach to democratic education, which emphasizes the need to acknowledge and value local cultures, languages, and knowledge systems. This approach seeks to empower marginalized groups by providing them with the tools and resources to participate actively in democratic processes. This decolonial approach is grounded in critical pedagogy, which values the experiences of learners and recognizes the role of education in challenging power structures and promoting social justice and democratization.

Keywords: Democratic Education, Eurocentric Biases, Cultural Hegemony, African Cultures, Decolonial Approach

[KAHIFI: International perspectives to democracy and education](#)

[Pia Mikander, Henri Satokangas \(University of Helsinki\): Portraying democracy and its threats in Finnish social studies textbooks](#)

Today, there are increasing threats to democracy due to polarization and support for anti-pluralist parties (V-dem Institute, 2022; Levitsky & Ziblatt, 2018). Democracy is simultaneously questioned by those advocating for expert rule in times of emergency, ranging from pandemics to climate crisis (Wikforss, 2021). Democracy can be understood narrowly, as merely electoral, and with limited rights, or thicker, as encompassing minority rights, equality and increasing social justice (Näsström,



2021). Another distinction is between democracy as a set of procedures and democracy as an ideology, with increased inclusion of voices from the margin as its goal (Arnstad, 2018). In Finland, social studies is taught as a subject in the years 4-6 and year 9. Democracy is at the center of two of four content areas within social studies. Using discourse theoretical analysis (Laclau & Mouffe 1985/2001), we ask how democracy is portrayed in Finnish school textbooks in basic education social studies (taught for years 4 to 6 and 9).

We find democracy to work as a floating signifier. Discourses portrayed include democracy as procedures, democracy as non-dictatorial government, democracy as a duty, and democracy as imperfect. The textbooks infrequently indicate examples of thicker democracy descriptions. Threats to democracy are conceptualized rarely as an outcome of rightwing populism or calls for expert rule, but as citizens' disengagement, or disregard of their democratic duties. We find this normative, even incriminating approach to active citizenship education (Satokangas & Mikander, forthcoming) as a deviation from the overall explanations of threats to democracy and consider what role the stronger anti-pluralist / rightwing populist parties play in the uneasiness to consider thick descriptions of democracy within social studies education. In accordance with Zembylas (2022), we suggest that there is a need to rethink pedagogically how social studies education can work with negative feelings of democratic disenchantment, in a way that would engage, not discredit students.

Keywords: social studies, democracy, textbooks

Inka Achtelik, Stefan Walter (INFOGES Duisburg): Allowed to fail? An analysis of failure culture in democracy education based on the model projects by the German project "Democracy Live"

Extracurricular activities in democracy education are often carried out with a lot of commitment by a variety of organizations, associations and institutions.<sup>1</sup> Together with other cooperation partners, they often develop concepts for time-limited projects that are financially supported and implemented within the framework of democracy education programs after being reviewed and discussed by experts. At the end of a project, its funding institution is informed about the progress of the project in a report. Some funding programs also require external evaluation of projects, while scientific support is rarely required.

A project idea that seems theoretically plausible and is supported by experts does not guarantee that a project will achieve its goals in practical implementation. Projects in the field of democracy education can also fail. This is the case when they fail to achieve their goals or, in the worst case, create anti-democratic attitudes and structures.

Given the large number of projects carried out, it is surprisingly rare to read about failed extracurricular democracy education projects. Although limitations are sometimes reported, the projects usually seem to have achieved their goals. Are these projects that good that they meet all

expectations? Or are failures simply not reported, perhaps for fear of being deemed unsustainable and not being considered for the next round of funding?

In the federal program 'Demokratie leben', the project failures are considered possible. It is even explicitly demanded not only to show conditions of success but also to increase the knowledge about conditions of failure of democracy education. Failed projects are not evaluated negatively here. Instead, they provide new knowledge and thus open up new paths and opportunities for democracy education. This 'positive' perspective on failure presupposes a certain 'failure culture' in the implementing organization, which allows for 'mistakes' or unfavorable constellations and conditions in practical democracy work. They thus remeasure the success of a project and communicate these openly. But what do we know about the failure culture in democracy education? Which factors favor and prevent the open handling of mistakes and failures in practical democracy education?

In our presentation, these questions will be addressed by the examination of the organizations' online presence whose projects are going to be funded in 2023 as model projects within the federal program 'Demokratie leben'. Using an online document analysis, we would like to find out to what extent failure culture is expressed in these sources.

Keywords: extracurricular democracy education - failure culture - online document analysis

Sonja Trifuljesko (University of Helsinki), Anna Medvedeva (Tampere University): Student Unions as Avenues for Inclusion and Participation of International Students: A Case from Finland

Universities are built around the notion of participation. The Latin word *universitas* literally means 'whole' or 'total'. To participate, Gritt Nielsen (2015:12) explains, 'means to take part in, be a part of and/or have a share or interest in something.' Scholars have argued that student participation is beneficial both on the individual and collective level. Through participation, students activate their agency and claim their rights in the educational system (Klemenčič 2014). Moreover, by participating in university governance, students can gain additional educational experience and acquire new skills (Lizzio and Wilson 2009), which can also increase their sense of civic participation and empowerment (Thornton and Jaeger 2007). This also means that the benefits of student involvement in university governance could even spread to the larger society (cf. Matikainen 2005).

All this makes the current exclusion of international students from student politics highly problematic. By student politics we mean here participation in the formal representational structures, as well as attempts to gain formal representation (Klemenčič and Park 2018). In this paper we investigate the possibilities for international student voices to be heard within the existing university governance structures, known as student unions. Our empirical data is tied to the Finnish

context, but it responds to the challenges to participation of international students in the university community that could also be observed in many other national settings and higher education systems.

Javed Siddiqui, Madhubanti Bhattacharya (Transforming Rural India Foundation): Democracy in Education

In essence, India has been a feudal society. After independence, the political democratic structure provided an opportunity for us to evolve into a society with democratic values and practices. In this context, education becomes a crucial platform to inculcate such values and practices among children. Many philosophers especially Dewey's work has been very relevant in this context for advocating democratic processes and practices in education. However, despite so many policy documents highlighting the need and importance to bring it in process, the inbuilt feudal structure of our society, embedded hierarchies at various levels and gap in policy-implementation process, creates challenges to adopt democratic structure in our mass education system. It's really very pertaining to discuss about the new norms emerged out from the field, raising some hope as a way forward.

In present context, where everything is under controlled and democratic rights either shadowed or under surveillance of current political regime, there is an emerging trend in the field where community participation in decentralised planning and decision making has emerged as a hope from the real ground. Although, this paper only illustrates the work of Community members specially women from women collectives in villages started participating in education and school support, which mostly lacks due to deficit trust and the distance between community and school. This practice of women participation is not just limited to the education or but as their aspirations have connected with the larger economic developmental process and involvement in local governance empowered them to participate in various other activities in villages through these community led processes. This collective consciousness of communities in villages have developed an ecosystem in villages where community and schools have broken their silos were community crossing a boundary and entering in schools to have active governance but also taking part in academics. This paper present few highlights of ground realise and experiences in hard core land of Tribal belt where TRIF is working...

For example, ensuring inculcation of democratic values and practices in a child's life, we worked in all aspects around children. For example "child cabinet", it's not just a role play but rather a platform where children are encouraged to practice participatory decision making process in a consensual way. Apart from giving agency to the children, it makes her future ready plus activates school function effectively. Child cabinets have been introduced as an important activity in the schools for around a decade (initiated from RTE 2009). Since then many efforts have been made to make this platform effective but in most places it remained as a tick mark activity with no real impact on children. When we engaged with community to implement this idea we found it to be very effective in participatory platform for children. The decisions taken in the child cabinet involves conversation with the key stakeholders such as parents, teachers and peers. This creates an opportunity for activation of platforms like PTM, and SMCs resulting into a collaborative and participatory decision making process around schools in particular and education in general.

## KAHIFI: Demokratia koulussa: historia, teoria ja käytäntö

### Selja Koponen (Helsingin yliopisto): Yhteisten asioiden hoivaaminen – oppilasdemokratiaa kuljeskellen

Peruskoulun tehtävänä on kasvattaa lapsia ja nuoria demokraattisen yhteiskunnan aktiivisiksi jäseniksi, jotka kokevat osallisuutta ja oppivat esimerkiksi rakentavan keskustelun taitoja. Kuitenkin oppilasdemokratian on todettu olevan valikoitunutta eikä moni oppilas osallistu edustuksellisen demokratian toimintaan koulussa. Edustuksellinen oppilasdemokratia pohjautuu liberaalin demokratian teoriaan, mutta sen rinnalla deliberatiivinen teoria voidaan ajatella yhdeksi lähtökohdaksi koulun demokratiakasvatuksessa, sillä sen keskeisenä piirteenä on edustuksellisesta demokratiasta poiketen laaja osallisuus päätöksentekoprosesseissa. Tässä tutkimuksessa tarkastelen deliberatiivisen demokratian kokeilua yläkoulussa. Laajennan tarkastelua hoivan etiikan näkökulmasta, jota ei ole deliberatiivisen demokratian kasvatustieteellisessä tutkimuksessa aiemmin huomioitu.

Osallistuvassa toimintatutkimuksessa (PAR) tarkastelen 'kuljeskelua' deliberatiivisen demokratiakasvatuksen menetelmänä yläkoulussa, sillä oppilaiden osallisuutta tukevia konkreettisia keinoja deliberatiivisen oppilasdemokratian lisäämiseksi on tutkittu Suomessa verrattain vähän. Tarkastelen yhteisten asioiden hoitamista jaettuna hoivaamisena ja suhteisena ilmiönä, jossa fokus ei ole individualistinen vaan yhteisöllinen ja jossa yhteisellä toiminnalla ja tunteilla sekä niiden käsittelyllä on merkittävä rooli. Demokratiakasvatusta uudistetaan tutkimuksessani hoivan etiikan näkökulmasta, sillä lähestymistavan avulla voidaan kehittää sellaista moninäkökulmaista demokratiakasvatusta koulussa, joka tukee oppilaan osallisuutta kouludemokratiassa.

Tutkimusta ohjaa tutkimuskysymys:

- Kuinka deliberatiiviseen teoriaan pohjaavia demokratiakasvatuksen käytäntöjä, kuten keskustelua ja yhteistä harkintaa, voidaan tuoda konkreettisesti ja inklusiivisesti koulun arkeen?

Aineistona on osallistuvan toimintatutkimuksen aikana toteutettu 'kuljeskelu' yhdessä pääkaupunkiseudun peruskoulussa. Tutkimuksellisenä lähestymistapana PAR pyrkii kontekstuaalisen tiedon yhteiseen tuottamiseen ja sen demokratisoimiseen kanssatutkimuksen kautta. Kuljeskelu on paikkaan liittyvä tutkimuksellinen menetelmä, jossa esimerkiksi tila pyritään ymmärtämään sen kokijoiden kanssa ja avulla. Tässä tutkimuksessa yläkouluikäisten kanssatutkijoiden (n=11) kanssa tuotettiin aineistoa ongelmalliseksi koetusta uudesta koulurakennuksesta. Kuljeskelussa hyödynnettiin lisäksi photovoice-menetelmää, jossa osallistujat saavat kuvata ympäristöään tai yhteisöään. Aineisto on moninainen sisältäen oppilaiden ottamia kuvia ja videoita sekä keskusteluja kuljeskelun havainnoista. Lisäksi aineistossa on oppilaiden

kuljeskelun pohjalta tuottama rakennuksen suunnittelun epäkohtiin liittyvä mielipidekirjoitus, joka julkaistiin sanomalehdessä sekä heidän saamansa vastine siihen lukijakommentteineen.

Analyysimenetelmänä on teemoittelu, jonka keskiössä on, millaisiin koulun (epä)demokraattisiin rakenteisiin ja konteksteihin oppilaiden osallisuus kietoutuu. Analyysin viittekehäksenä on hoivan etiikka, jossa hoiva - arkisista yhteisistä asioista välittäminen - haastaa vallitsevan tilanteen käytännön, affektien ja eettis-poliittisen toiminnan tasolla.

Tutkimus osoittaa, että oppilaiden tuottaman moninaisen materiaalin hyödyntäminen tiedon tuottamisessa mahdollistaa inklusiivisen osallisuuden toimintana, joka ei perustu vain valmiisiin kielellisiin kykyihin tai argumentaatiotaitoihin, mistä demokratiakasvatusta on kritisoitu. Visuaalisen ilmaisun yhdistäminen kuljeskeluun mahdollistaa myös asiaan liittyvien tunteiden esittämisen ja niiden käsittelyn. Aiemman tutkimuksen valossa oppilaiden osallistuminen koulun päätöksentekoon voidaan nähdä välineellisenä keinona opettaa opetussuunnitelman mukaisia kansalaistaitoja, joita oppilas tarvitsee vasta tulevaisuudessa. Kuljeskelun kautta koulussa harjoiteltavat demokratiataidot eivät kuitenkaan ole vain tulevaisuuteen liittyvä valmius, vaan transformatiivinen kyky ja mahdollisuus, joka tapahtuu ja kehkeytyy oppilaiden sen hetkessä todellisuudessa ja tekee yhteisistä asioista henkilökohtaisesti merkityksellisiä. Oppilaiden osallisuuteen ja demokratiataitojen kehittymiseen liittyvistä opetussuunnitelman mukaisista tavoitteista huolimatta näiden toteuttamiseen suhtaudutaan aineistossa ristiriitaisesti. Nuorten koulusta toimintaympäristönä tuottamaan tietoon ja kansalaisvaikuttamiseen suhtaudutaan aineistossa osittain kriittisesti, esimerkiksi mielipidekirjoituksen laatimista pidettiin epätarkoituksenmukaisena toimintana. Hoivan etiikan näkökulmasta kuljeskelu mahdollistaa kuitenkin yhdessä ajattelemisen, toimimisen ja monimutkaisen todellisuuden kerrostumien avautumisen eri näkökulmista niin koulun aikuisille kuin lapsille. Käytäntönä kuljeskelu on oppilaan osallisuuden mahdollistava kuulemismenetelmä, joka konkretisoi perustuslain ja lapsen oikeuksien sopimuksen mukaisen lasten osallisuuden heitä koskevassa päätöksenteossa. Kuljeskelun avulla demokraattisen päätöksenteon ja systeemin tueksi voidaan tuottaa kouluun liittyvää tietoa, joka ei irtaudu siitä lasten ja nuorten todellisuudesta, johon päätökset vaikuttavat.

### Elina Hakoniemi (Helsingin yliopisto): Sivistyksellisen demokratian käsite osana sosiaalidemokraattista koulunuudistusajattelua 1940- 1960-luvuilla

Toisen maailmansodan jälkeinen avoimien tulevaisuuksien hetki on kiinnostava vaihe demokratiakehityksen historiassa. Demokratia-käsitteelle ei vielä tässä vaiheessa ollut vakiintunut mitään yhtä määritelmää – päinvastoin, eri tahot läntisistä demokratiamaista Neuvostoliiton kansandemokratiaan ja jopa fasistiseen kansallissosialismiin puhuivat edustavansa ”todellista demokratiaa”. Maailmansodan jälkeisinä vuosina demokratiakeskustelussa kamppailivat itäiset ja läntiset näkemykset demokratiasta, ja tämä keskustelu heijastui eri tavoin eri maiden sisäiseen poliittiseen elämään ja keskusteluun.

Demokratiakäsitteen muuttuvat merkitykset ja pyrkimykset ohjata demokratiakehityksen suuntaa näkyivät laajasti myös suomalaisessa politiikassa, mukaan lukien koulutuspolitiikassa. Esitelmässäni demokratian avoimien menneiden tulevaisuuksien hetkeä tarkastellaan sosiaalidemokraattisen koulunuudistuspolitiikan avainkäsitteeksi muodostuneen ”sivistyksellisen demokratian” käsitteen kautta. Esitelmässä keskitytään tämän käsitteen käyttöön sosiaalidemokraattisessa koulutuspuheessa Suomen sosialidemokraattisen puolueen ja Työväen Sivistysliiton piirissä ajanjaksolla 1945—1970. Käsitettä tarkastellaan hyvinvointivaltiokehityksen viitekehyksessä.

Sivistyksellisen demokratian käsittehistoriallinen analyysi kertoo tarinaa sivistyksen asemasta osana laajaa yhteiskunnallista kehitystä. Käsitteen taustalla vaikutti aktiivinen ja laaja kansansivistystyön kenttä, jolla myös sosiaalidemokraatit olivat olleet aktiivisia aina 1800-luvun lopulta alkaen. Kansansivistys demokratisoi sivistystä: sivistyksestä oli kehittynyt jotakin, joka kuului kaikille, ei vain yläluokille. Sivistyksellisen demokratian puhe oli jatkumoa tälle kehityslinjalle ja sen tulkinnoille.

Demokratia ja sivistys kytkettiin sosiaalidemokraattisessa koulutuspuheessa valtion, yhteiskunnan ja yksilön – sekä luokan – välisen suhteen kehitysprosessiksi. Tasa-arvopuheen lisäksi sivistyksellinen demokratia käsitteli kansallisen kulttuurin ja ”henkisen” elämän aktivoimista, työväenluokan integroimista koulutukseen ja kulttuuriin, sekä työväenluokan vaikutusmahdollisuuksien lisäämistä sivistyksen kentällä. Sivistyksen ja demokratian liiton kiinnostava erityispiirre on, että se sisälsi uutta ja vanhaa: sivistyksen demokratisointi merkitsi uudistusta ja edistystä, mutta samanaikaisesti sivistykselle annettiin hyvin perinteisiä sisältöjä. Sivistyksellisen demokratian käsite katosi sosiaalidemokraattisesta koulutuspuheesta 1970-luvun alussa. Tilanne nousi koulutuksellisen tasa-arvon avainkäsite. Muutoksen myötä koulutuspolitiikka kapeni laajan yhteiskunnallisen muutoksen tavoittamisesta yksilön asemaan koulutuksen kentällä. Samalla supistui käsitys demokratiasta ja sen mahdollisuuksista.

Eenariina Hämäläinen (Tampereen yliopisto): Etiikka, katsomus ja demokratia

Koulun kautta yhteiskunta hallitsee ja määrittelee käsityksiä hyvästä ihmisestä ja hyvästä kansalaisesta. Yhdeksi koulun tehtäväksi onkin perinteisesti nimetty integraatio, jonka miellän tässä laajasti. Pelkän oppilaiden sosiaalistamisen sijaan viitataan sillä demokraattisen yhteiskunnan yhteiselämän (minimi)ehtojen määrittelyyn ja niihin sitouttamiseen, eräänlaiseen eettisesti tietoisien kansalaisen kasvattamiseen. (Sihvola 2005; Launonen 2000; Rinne 1987)

Peruskoulun opetussuunnitelman perusteiden (2014) mukaan kouluopetuksen kokonaisuudessaan pitää tukea oppilaiden kasvua ihmisyyteen ja eettisesti vastuulliseen yhteiskunnan jäsenyyteen. Oppiainetasolla etiikanopetusta on annettu itsenäisyyden alusta lähtien katsomusopetuksen eli uskonnon ja siveysopin/elämäkatsomustiedon osana.

Pitkään eettiseksi kansalaiseksi kasvamista määritteli kodin, uskonnon ja isänmaan kolmiyhteys, jaettu kristillis-kansallinen identiteetti. Lähes kaikki lapset osallistuivat luterilaiseen uskonnon- ja näin myös etiikanopetukseen. Yhdenmukaisuus alkoi murtua viime vuosisadan loppupuolella maallistumisen, individualismin ja yhteiskunnan pluralisoitumisen myötä. Nykyään opetetaan neljäntoista eri uskonnon oppimäärää sekä elämäkatsomustietoa. Etiikka opiskellaan siis eriytetysti katsomusryhmittäin. Piilo-opetussuunnitelman näkökulmasta järjestelyn voi tulkita viestivän siitä, että eri uskonto- ja katsomuskuntien etiikat eroavat siinä määrin toisistaan, ettei ryhmien yhteinen etiikanopetus ole mahdollista.

Etiikan irrottamista uskonnosta kaikille yhteiseksi oppiaineeksi on ehdotettu neljä kertaa viimeisen sadan vuoden aikana: oppivelvollisuuskoulua luotaessa 1920-luvulla, peruskoulu-uudistuksen yhteydessä 1960-luvulla, lukion tuntijakouudistuksessa 1990-luvulla ja peruskoulun tuntijakouudistuksessa 2010-luvulla. Tutkin väitöskirjassani etiikanopetuksesta noissa vaiheissa käytyjä keskusteluja. Selvitän argumentteja kaikille yhteisen etiikan puolesta ja sitä vastaan sekä etiikanopetusdebatin luonnetta katsomuskamppailuna.

Perusteet yhteisen etiikan puolesta ovat liittyneet (erityisesti 1960- ja 2010-luvuilla) mainittuun demokraattisen yhteiselämän (minimi)ehtojen määrittelyyn ja niihin sitouttamiseen. Usein (esimerkiksi 1960-luvulla peruskoulun opetussuunnitelmakomiteassa) yhteisen etiikan normatiiviseksi perustaksi nostettiin YK:n Ihmisoikeuksien julistuksen periaatteet. Peilaan yhteisen etiikan puolustusta eettisen kasvatuksen formaalis-rationaaliin, proseduraaliin suuntauksiin sekä John Rawlsin poliittiseen liberalismiin ihmisoikeusetiikan filosofisena oikeutuksena. Yhteistä näille on oikean, eli yhteiselämän perustavien periaatteiden, korostaminen hyvän, eli partikulaarisen kokonaiselämäkäsityksen, sijaan.

Rawlsilla (1993; 1999 [1971]) oikeuden ensisijaisuus johtui pluralistisen yhteiskunnan faktuaalisesta elämäkatsomuksien moninaisuudesta. Yhteisymmärrys yhteismitattomien kulttuuristen ja katsomuksellisten yhteisöjen välillä voi Rawlsin mukaan löytyä näiden päällekkäin menevistä poliittisista intresseistä (overlapping consensus) ja jokaisen omaa elämää koskevien valintojen vapaudesta, edellyttäen että yksilö ei vastaavasti vahingoita muiden vastaavaa vapautta.

Liberalistisen etiikan perinteeseen sijoittuva eettinen kasvatusajattelu (Wilson 1973; 1990; Shaver 1976; ks. myös Airaksinen 1993; 1995; Niiniluoto 2000) korostaa moraalista rationaalisuutta, demokraattisen yhteiskunnan perusarvojen ymmärtämistä, oppilaan autonomiaa ja eettisen perustelun taitoa. Arvojen siirtämisen sijaan etiikanopetuksen tarkoitus on harjoituttaa oppilasta etiikan käsitteellisten välineiden hallintaan, itsenäiseen moraaliarviointiin eli eräänlaiseen moraaliseen täysi-ikäisyyteen.

Postsekulaarissa ajattelussa tällaista liberalistista kansalaispuhetta on kritisoitu historiattomuudesta, individualisoimisesta ja proseduraalisesta valtio- ja etiikkakäsityksestä (Taylor 1994; Nussbaum

2000). Taylor korosti että yksilölle on tärkeää tulla tunnustetuksi paitsi kansalaisena, myös merkityksellisen (kulttuurisen, uskonnollisen tai etnisen) yhteisönsä jäsenenä.

Suomalaisessa katsomusopetuskeskustelussa esimerkiksi Poulter (2013; 2017; 2019) on puolustanut postsekulaaria kansalaiskäsitystä ja peräänkuuluttanut katsomustietoista kasvatusta ja katsomuksellisen ulottuvuuden tunnustamista demokraattisen yhteiskunnan rakentumisessa.

Tutkimukseni yksi keskeinen johtopäätös on, että pedagogien ja kouluvaikuttajien etiikkaehdotus on perustunut ajatukselle yhteisen perustan etsimisestä pluralistisessa, demokraattisessa yhteiskunnassa mutta kilpistynyt ehdotuksia seuranneissa debateissa katsomuspoliittiseksi kamppailuksi. Väitän, ettei ole lainkaan selvää, missä mielessä etiikka oppisisältönä on katsomuksellinen kysymys ja pitäisikö sen sitä olla. On myös kysyttävä, merkitsisikö kaikille yhteinen etiikka katsomuksellisen tunnustamisen sivuuttamista.

Ehdotan kesäpäiville esitelmää, jossa tarkastelen yhteisen etiikan puolesta esitettyjä argumentteja liberaalin demokratian eettisen kansalaisihanteen kehityksessä. Kysyn, mikä tila yhteiselle etiikanopetukselle avautuu rawlsilaisen liberalismiin ja postsekulaarin katsomustietoisuuden välissä.

Kati Keski-Mäenpää (Jyväskylän yliopisto - Kokkolan yliopistokeskus Chydenius):

Toimintatutkimus demokraattisen osallisuuden edistäjänä koulussa: tapaustutkimukset Etiopiassa ja Sierra Leonessa

Tämä empiirinen tapaustutkimus tarkastelee etiopialaisten opettajien ja sierra leonelaisten opettajankouluttajien kokemuksia siitä, miten toimintatutkimukseen osallistuminen voi edistää kokemusta demokraattisesta osallisuudesta peruskoulu- ja yliopistokontekstissa. Demokraattinen koulutus nähdään tässä koulutuksena, jonka suunnitteluun ja toteutukseen opettajat ja opiskelijat voivat osallistua tasa-arvoisina jäseninä sen sijaan, että toimintaohjeet ja raamit koulutukselle annettaisiin sellaisinaan ylhäältä käsin. Demokraattisessa koulussa opettajat ja opiskelijat ovat aktiivisia reflektioijia, luovia suunnittelijoita ja osallistuvia toteuttajia.

Tutkimukset on toteutettu Saharan eteläpuolisessa Afrikassa maissa, joissa koulutus perustuu jäykkään hierarkkiseen rakenteeseen. Siinä opettajien ja opettajankouluttajien vaikutusmahdollisuudet koulutuksen sisältöön ja toteutukseen ovat perinteisesti hyvin vähäiset, eikä opetushenkilökunnan aktiivista osallistumista koulutuksen kehittämiseen ole juurikaan kannustettu.

Toimintatutkimuksen on lukuisissa tutkimuksissa todettu olevan osallisuutta lisäävä, reflektointiin kannustava ja voimaannuttava työkalu (mm. Kemmis et al., 2017, Stringer 2007, Worku 2017). Tässä tutkimuksessa tarkastelen osallistujien voimaantumisen kokemuksia suhteessa aktiiviseen ja demokraattiseen toimimiseen koulukontekstissa, sekä toimintatutkimuksen vaikutuksia siihen. Tutkimukseen osallistui Etiopiassa 21 opettajaa ja Sierra Leonessa 29 opettajankouluttajaa.



Toimintatutkimus Etiopiassa kesti neljä vuotta ja Sierra Leonessa puoli vuotta. Toimin projekteissa ulkopuolisena neuvonantajana.

Tutkimuksen aineisto kerättiin koko prosessin aikana tapahtuvilla teemahaastatteluilla, ryhmäkeskusteluilla, kenttämuistiinpanoilla ja kyselyillä. Aineisto analysoitiin teema-analyysin ja sisällönanalyysin avulla.

Tulokset osoittivat, että sekä Etiopiassa että Sierra Leonessa koulutuksen hierarkkinen systeemi asetti haasteita, mutta osallistava toimintatutkimus pystyi myös rikkomaan asetelmaa. Opettajankouluttajat Sierra Leonessa kuvailivat, että yhteisen toimintatutkimuksen suunnittelu opettajaksi opiskelevien kanssa oli hyvin haasteellista. Opiskelijat olivat tottuneita siihen, että kouluttajat luennoivat ja opiskelijat ovat passiivisia vastaanottajia. Toimintatutkimuksessa heitä rohkaistiin ottamaan tasavertainen asema toimintatutkimuksen suunnittelijoina ja toteuttajina. Toisaalta osallistujat kertoivat siitä, miten yhteinen toimintatutkimus rikkoi totuttua arvoasetelmaa ja lisäsi demokraattista päätöksentekoa opintojaksojen sisällöissä. Projektin aikana luotiin täysin uudenlaisia, yhdessä toimisen malleja opettajien ja opiskelijoiden välille, opettajien välille ja paikallisen koulun ja alueen koulutoimiston välille.

Etiopiassa opettajat kuvailivat, miten he kykenivät nelivuotisen projektin loppupuolella näkemään itsensä aiempaa enemmän aktiivisina vaikuttajina koulutuksen alalla. Kun he perinteisesti olivat ottaneet ohjeet vastaan ylemmältä taholta, kuten opetusministeriöstä ja alueelliselta koulutustarkastajalta, yhteinen projekti rohkaisi heitä tarttumaan yhteisönsä käytännön haasteisiin, kehittämään uudenlaisia toimintamalleja ympäröivän yhteisön kanssa ja työskentelemään tasa-arvoisemmin opiskelijoiden mielipiteet huomioiden.

Perinteistä, hierarkkista asetelmaa on kuitenkin hyvin vaikea ja hidas muuttaa. Jotta pysyviä muutoksia koulun demokraattisessa toiminnassa saataisiin aikaan, ulkopuolisen neuvonantajan tuki olisi hyvä olla saatavilla. Koulumaailmaan kuuluvat tekijät, kuten opetusministeriö, koulutoimisto, oppimateriaali ja opettajankoulutus, eivät tule Etiopiassa ja Sierra Leonessa opettajien aktiivisuutta toiminnan kehittämisessä tai oppilaiden aktiivisuutta demokraattisina osallistujina. Myös perinteinen kulttuuri tukee ennemminkin lasten ja nuorten passiivisuutta suhteessa opettajiin ja opettajien suhteessa ylempiin tahoihin.

Avainsanat: demokraattinen koulutus, toimintatutkimus, osallisuus, Saharan eteläpuolinen Afrikka

Keynote talk: Autonomous rational agents or adherents of responsible practices? A pragmatist approach to an educational ideal

Speaker: Prof. Katariina Holma, Faculty of Education, University of Oulu, Finland

Rational autonomy as a central educational ideal has been at the heart of educational philosophy since the Enlightenment and some versions of it can be traced back to Plato or even earlier. At the same time, and recently more often, the ideal has been criticized from different angles by feminist, posthumanist, and postcolonialist theories. Furthermore, based on contemporary neuroscience and moral psychology, some philosophers – myself included – have criticized the idea of human nature underlying a particular interpretation of rational autonomy. One critique of rational autonomy is of special interest for the tradition of educational philosophy, as it comes from one of the key figures of the history of our tradition, and from the earlier proponent of rational autonomy, Paul H. Hirst (1927-2020). In his various works from 1990s, Hirst stated that his earlier idea that ‘a good life is one of rational autonomy is both inadequate and mistaken’. Instead of rational autonomy, he argues that the main constituent of the good life is the satisfaction of needs and interests in relevant social practices; therefore, the main aim of education should be the initiation into social practices.

Although I partly share the various concerns of the above-mentioned critiques and agree with Hirst about the crucial role of the satisfaction of needs and interests in responsible social practices as central for the survival of democracies, I argue that instead of the outright rejection of rationality and autonomy, there are some conceptual questions to be analysed in more detail in order to provide philosophically justified and more nuanced criticism for this ideal. Three interrelated questions that I am going to discuss are 1) the interpretation of rationality, 2) the relationship of empirical reality and philosophical ideals, and 3) the tension between two educational ideals: individual autonomy and membership in responsible social practices. In order to address these questions, I utilize the framework of philosophical pragmatism, especially the work of such pragmatists as Charles S. Peirce, Nicholas Rescher, and Israel Scheffler.

## PARALLEL SESSIONS II

### DEMOPOL workshop: Democratic education and the tradition of *Bildung*

#### Robert Schneider-Reisinger (University of Vienna): On Exteriority and its importance for Democracy Education – A critical plea by Inclusive Education

(1.) Inclusive Education – regardless the with of its reading – has been associated with democratic education from the outset (e.g. Hinz 2006; Hershkovich/Simon/Simon 2017). Especially, if dealing with inclusion as a philosophy – »a way of thinking about people, diversity, learning and teaching« (Graham 2020: 11) –, (2.) an interesting range of questions opens up that, to my mind, also leads to the core of the connection between (inclusive) education and democracy. As Dewey (94, 101 – displays set by me) points out as »democratic conception in education [...] A democracy is more than a form of government ; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience. The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import of their activity. These more numerous and more varied points of contact denote a greater diversity of stimuli to which an individual has to respond; they consequently put a premium on variation in his action.«

(3.) Thinking about diversity also means dealing the relationship of difference and equality – subsequently: equity (Graham 2020: 37–45; Sen 1992; UN CRPD: art. 1, 24). (Furthermore, this question leads to the problem of justice; in addition to freedom, an essential aspect of democracy as a structural form. I take up this thought again towards the end.) (4.) An actual (which means real) upheaval – Marx' (1990) »revolutionary practice« – of this context (totality in this thinking) could result, if we introduce a decolonial figure of thought, such as materialistic disability education/ studies (Feuser 1995; Jantzen 2007) suggests (Jantzen 2019). (5.) This can be concretized by Dussel's (1985) exteriority, which can be used to carry out a decolonial- inclusive pedagogical perspective on democracy education. Last but not least, this work ties in with a critical-materialist examination of equality and justice (e.g. Marx/Engels 1990; Marx 1987; Engels 1975) and transforms it into a practice of alterity and liberation (Dussel 2008; Freire 1993). (6.) The article concludes with an outlook on the irritations caused by this figure for democracy education and first attempts to ‚capture‘ this in practice/praxis.

Ines Langemeyer, Eike Zimpelmann (Karlsruhe Institute of Technology KIT): Bildung as a core requirement for democracy

In Germany, the very intense and controversial debate about the SARS-CoV-2 virus led to anger, hatred and scorn on several sides. Even politicians referred to people with other opinions as fools. This is a very serious situation for a democratic system because democracy is based on open discussions and respectful cooperation.

From our point of view, the problem described before is a consequence of a lack of Bildung. We'd like to talk about the relationship between democracy and Bildung. Bildung includes the toleration of different opinions and to take them respectfully into account. It also includes understanding what leads to that opinion and what is the utmost concern of the other person. Another part of Bildung is the ability of reflecting one's own opinion. It allows people to critically reflect what their own guidelines and their own behaviour provoke. Hence, it allows people to overcome destructive guidelines they learned and developed earlier.

Another issue is that Bildung empowers people to help shape their social environment. People that can influence their surrounding don't feel powerless. In psychology, especially in the context of psychotherapy, it is well known that feeling powerless and having the feeling of being at the mercy of other people leads to anger. In the political context, this is an issue when politicians don't take the opinions and wishes of people into account or don't respect them. The feeling of having to accept what "the top brass" does can come up and can lead to this kind of frustration, mistrust and anger.

And why should people partake in the democratic process when they have the feeling that they can't influence anything? Why should they be interested in politics, when they can't change anything at all? And why should they stand behind democracy when their interests are – in their point of view –

not taken into account? Knowing that one can influence the political process and the social environment motivates to do this and to take part in the political process. That's why Bildung is crucial for the acceptance of democratic systems.

Dr. Carlos Willatt (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile), Dr. Marc Fabian Buck, Dr. Miriam Diederichs (University of Hagen, Germany): Glocalization and Political Bildung At the Example of Colonia Dignidad—A Theoretical Counter Offer to Global Citizenship Education

Keywords: Colonia Dignidad; Glocalization; Democratic Education; Bildung; Klafki

Against the background of widespread discussion on the validity and normativity of Global Citizenship Education (GCE) put forward by mainly postcolonial studies (Andreotti 2010; Drerup 2019), we would like to present a “novel theoretical opening[] in the field” as a counter offer to the theoretical, epistemological and empirical framework of GCE (manifested in the ICCS studies) as means for political education and its evaluation the world over. Our offer stems from two sources: Robertson's (1994; 1995) and Roudometof's (2014; 2016; 2018) theory of Glocalization and Klafki's (1964; 2018) concept of Bildung within the context of global education goals. Our approach's main focus lies within the field of political education and human rights.

Our criticism of GCE is not identical to the one mentioned above. We suspect a very strong output orientation towards learning outcomes in its conception at the expense of other dimensions—as in other ILSAs. Our framework based on Glocalization, however, utilizes the concept of Bildung to counter the learnification (Biesta 2010) of schools and in the same vein the homogenization of political education. Political Bildung (Caruso & Schatz 2018), in contrast, enables us to think about schooling as something that transcends learning outcomes and standardized testing. The term and concept of Bildung in Klafki's reading allows us to establish a notion of Political Bildung with a broad scope of self-formation and critical thinking as well as didactical ideas that might also help battling the fatigue for political/democratic education (Ryen 2020; Sørensen 2021). Combining both theoretical sources, our concept allows us a) to develop a bottom-up theory of political education besides GCE that relies on local, relatable examples while keeping both the students and global goals in focus and b) to facilitate the discourse on the inherently international entanglement of seemingly national policies.

Drawing from interviews and ethnographic material gathered in November 2022, we would like to illustrate the benefits of our proposed theoretical framework at the example of the Chilean Colonia Dignidad (1961-1994), located some 400 km south of the capital Santiago. This enclosed area was not only home to a cult founded by German convict and child molester Paul Schäfer, it also served as a place for clandestine torture and murder/disappearance of opposing and critical Chileans during the Pinochet regime (1973-1990) (Basso Prieto 2022). It wasn't until this decade the historical reappraisal of the Colonia (1961-1994) began. As a relatively stunning fact, the Colonia persists as a

kitschy tourist destination called Villa Baviera (Bavarian Village), that serves German food and offers accommodation on site. This continuity and lack of political reappraisal reminds us of the need of a Political Bildung which relies on local peculiarities and examples in a post-nationalistic world.

DEMOPOL workshop: Radical democracy, political emotions and education

Elodie Guillemin (University of Oslo): Democracy, education and climate: A reconfiguration of the sensible

In this PhD project, I explore the question of whether children can be understood as present political subjects from a rancièrian perspective and what implications this has for thinking democratic education. The idea is to examine the event of the school strikes for climate insofar that this event shows some of the tensions, ambivalences and challenges in considering children's participation and/or representation in democratic processes.

Malafaia (2022, p. 436) claims that “the School Strikes for Climate comes as a paradigmatic example against the visions of young people as politically ‘in formation’” inasmuch as young activists are “challenging dominant values and norms by going against what they are expected to do: attend school every day” (Malafaia, 2022, p. 436). Moreover, children manifest and express their will about climate and sustainability questions. However, the latest UNICEF report (2021) indicates that despite being the most affected by the effects of the climate crisis, children's and youth's voices are left unheard. From a rancièrian perspective, the very fact that a part of the young generation momentarily stopped doing what they were supposed to do and struck would constitute a movement of dis-identification, a movement of political subjectification (Rancière, 1995, p. 60). By marching in the streets, refusing to attend school and expressing themselves publicly, children made themselves visible in the political landscape. They made visible the fact that they too are affected by political decisions. In the words of Rancière, they made apparent the miscount of those who have parts in the distribution of the sensible (Rancière, 1995, p. 25). With the school strikes, children made it visible that they have the part of those who have no part, which is characteristic of the demos, according to Rancière (1995, p. 169). They operated a reconfiguration of the sensible by refusing their primary assignation and finding out new ways of being and doing.

Thus, on the one hand, one could argue that children and young people show by their presence and their different forms of expressions that they already are full members of the demos, that they already are citizens – and not only future citizens. An idea that has strong implications for thinking the relationship between democracy and education. On the other hand, one could also argue that the school strikes also show the limits of the idea of radical equality as proposed by Rancière insofar as many children and young people, including Thunberg and Nakate, ask “the adults” to take responsibility for the crisis and explain the lack of political actions by the ignorance of the people (Thunberg, 2019; Nakate, 2021). Moreover, even in the literature arguing for listening to children's

voices, it is often older and very well-articulated children that are mostly represented, if their voices are reproduced at all (e.g., Malafaia, 2022, Kvamme, 2019, Biswas, 2021). This could invite further reflections on how far one could go with Rancière's radical commitment to equality and ask the question: is there still room for democratic education if children are understood as present political subjects?

Keywords: School strikes for climate, Rancière, democratic education, equality, subjectification.

Sonja Helkala (Tampere University): Political emotions in democratic education - theoretical and empirical considerations

Emotions and affects have been a subject of growing interest in the research of politics and democracy. The debate on emotions has also increased in the field of democratic education. This has been reflected especially in theoretical debates between educational approaches based on deliberative theories of democracy and so-called agonistic concepts of democracy. Agonistic views have stressed the importance of conflict and group identifications while criticizing educational practices and theories based on deliberative democracy for being consensus-oriented and overemphasizing rationality (e.g. Ruitenberg, 2009; Zembylas, 2018). These features have been seen as leading to a failure to take into account the role of emotions and passions in politics or education. On the other hand, agonistic theories have also been challenged, for example, for their harmful emphasis on affective identities rather than on questions of political substance (e.g. Englund 2016; Leiviskä & Pyy 2020).

Empirical research on the topic, however, has been less frequent. Emotions, passions and conflicts are integral to the interaction between people and communities in a democratic society, and political questions can also be highly emotional in the classroom - therefore it is necessary to explore democratic education practices in schools, particularly from the perspective of emotions. In the presentation I will ask what kind of democratic educational possibilities and questions open up when the political nature of emotions and the affectivity of the political are brought to the center of the attention. The presentation is based on my dissertation research, in which I explore how political emotions are manifested in democratic education practices. I explore the role of emotions in democratic education by addressing emotions both as socio-cultural phenomena (Ahmed, 2004) and subjective experiences. The empirical data of the research is generated in Finnish schools in lower and upper secondary education and consists of observational material and interviews with teachers and pupils. In the presentation, I shed light on the theoretical framework of my research and discuss the empirical findings.

Keywords: emotions, affects, democratic education

Liat Ariel (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem): Is it the Time for a Transformation of Civic-Democratic Education? The Agonistic Democratic Theory Confronts the Post-Truth Era

Keywords: Post-Truth, Emotions, Democratic Education, Discussion, Agonistic Democracy

The literature describes post-truthful societies as extremely polarized and distrustful of everything around them. That is because social media platforms are full of disinformation and misinformation, which spread confusion to such an extent that manipulation and deception often become unrecognizable. Consequently, instead of relying on experts and objective facts, people embrace “subjective truths”, based on emotions and beliefs. These subjective truths are directly manipulated by algorithms, echo chambers, and bubble filters that formulate people's feed to display content according to what they search, like, and share. People can filter the information they consume, to a point where they completely avoid encountering others with different viewpoints than theirs. They also find approval for their 'truth' in their virtual communities who "like" the posts they share. The result is an extreme affective polarization of strong negative feelings for other groups.

Since post truth, hinders democratic participation,<sup>i</sup> there is a need for educational systems to develop new pedagogies and methods that promote democratic participation and face the challenges post-truth surfaces to democratic societies. So far, to strengthen the democratic society, philosophers of education have turned to Gutmann and Thompson’s deliberative democratic education,<sup>ii</sup> which prepares youth to become informed citizens who can critically analyze, assess, and construct reasonable arguments. Deliberative discussions neglect the role of emotions in students’ arguments and accept only rational, evidence-based arguments. But under the post-truth condition, emotions interfere students’ knowledge construction and limit their ability for reasonable thinking.<sup>iii</sup> Research shows that teachers today find it extremely difficult to facilitate deliberative discussions in their classrooms, mainly because students arrive at school with feelings of animosity and strong political emotions.

This paper examines whether the agonistic democratic theory, which was developed by Chantal Mouffe<sup>iv</sup> as an alternative to the deliberative theory, can better succeed in promoting democratic discussions in post-truthful educational settings. The first part reviews the basic tenants of agonistic democracy, which in contrast to deliberation, allows the expression of emotions in a more “open” discussion, in which different positions should advance their argument over the others. The second part offers a synthesis of the agonistic theory with the conditions of post-truthful societies. The paper will then discuss three significant limitations that this synthesis surfaces to agonistic democratic education in post-truthful classrooms: (1) The theory of agonistic democracy is neither developed enough as an educational theory nor as a form of democratic discussion. (2) the political education that is required as a pre-condition for an agonistic discussion is not perceived as common knowledge in post-truthful societies and (3), the agonistic legitimation of every emotional

argument regardless of truth and rationality might increase the post-truth condition. These will be followed with conclusions and recommendations for future research.

### KAHIFI: Democracy and recognition in educational institutions

#### Birgit Schaffar (University of Helsinki): Selling one's educational soul

The educational policy and institutional reforms of the last 30-20 years implied several fundamental changes for educators and educational institutions (privatization of educational institutions, global comparability).

These changes imply severe professional conflicts and they are challenging the democratic purpose of education in its core. In order to analyze these, Nordic researchers often use Freidson 2001 who distinguishes between a bureaucratic, professional and market-oriented logic. Fredriksson (2010) adds another category that he calls user-oriented. Many of the empirical analyzes based on these categories focus on teachers' challenges in navigating between bureaucratic rule management, market-oriented customer satisfaction, and their own professional pride and autonomy (e.g. Lundström & Parding 2011). These lines of conflict concern the relationship between teachers and their mandate from the public or private institution. There are many professional ethical pitfalls here that are worth analyzing more closely.

However, the paper argues that these conflicts are secondary. It is argued that the market adaptation of pedagogical work rather creates existential conflicts of loyalty and corrupts the spirit of pedagogy. (Løvlie 2020, Ball 2007, Giouraux 2004).

The paper reminds of Erich Weniger's (1929) distinction between three levels of pedagogical autonomy. a) The pedagogical praxis itself, b) the pedagogical institutions and the teaching profession, and c) the pedagogical science (Weniger 1929/1975). The autonomy in these areas are internally related, but most fundamental is the educator's autonomy in the concrete pedagogical relation with the child/student.

According to Weniger, pedagogical autonomy expresses the teacher's responsibility to protect the students' integrity from possible external interests that try to gain power over the growing persons. Autonomy is "the ultimate means of preserving human freedom and dignity in the face of absolutist power claims" (ibid. p. 12f). Weniger emphasizes, that the pedagogical autonomy in educational praxis is both possible and necessary, even in situations of institutional lack of freedom, when e.g. powerful structures in the education system or employment conditions (from e.g. state-political, religious-ecclesiastical or economic interests) pressure the educator to instrumentalize the student for the interests of others.



The paper will argue that the pedagogical relationship rests on the awareness and manifestation of the teacher's responsibility. The educational relationship is a very basic, existential relationship of responsibility and trust that is not captured by either the concept of customer, client, user or citizen. (Lövlie 2020).

### Onni Hirvonen (University of Jyväskylä): School, recognition, and democracy

This talk analyses school as an institution of recognition, and examines what consequences does the recognition-perspective offer for the discussions on democracy in schools.

The Hegelian theories of recognition claim that individuals are constituted in relations with other persons. Furthermore, these important relations are institutionally mediated. According to the Hegelian story, in modernity recognition gets differentiated into three spheres: (1) family represents love and care, (2) markets embody esteem for achievements and merits, and (3) democratic civil society and legal sphere are based on equal respect for every citizen.

However, the Hegelian description of institutional spheres of recognition can be challenged. It is clear that societies have other central institutions, such as education institutions, which can also be analysed from the perspective of recognition. Further, the neat match-up with different forms of recognition with different institutional spheres is questionable. With these expansions of the Hegelian picture in mind, this talk describes school as an institution of recognition.

The approach is mostly philosophical and analytical, and the first aim is to clarify what senses of recognition are central for school as an institution. School could be interpreted as an institution of recognition in at least two senses. 1) School itself is an environment within which recognition is given. On the one hand, school in its current form is partly based on completing various tasks that aim for learning a range of skills and competences. This creates a basis for achievement of esteem within a school. On the other hand, school is a collaborative environment and thus respect has a major role in it. 2) School as an institution is directed beyond itself: it also prepares students for the broader society. From the perspective of recognition this means that, ideally, the learned principles and expectations of esteem and respect could be transferred to other social contexts.

The second aim of this contribution is to discuss in what sense the expectation of respect is connected to the idea of democracy. In the context of democratic civil society, respect-relations are essential as they imply citizens' equal status as co-authors of the normative realm. In other words, everyone ought to have an equal say on the norms by which we live. Is this principle of respect equally realizable within a school? To what extent the school institution is necessary for a functioning democracy? The second part of this talk presents the various (theoretical and practical) promises and challenges that come from seeing the ideal of respect as intrinsic to school institution.

To anticipate some of the challenges, school is not an institution outside of broader society, which could provide somehow external principles of recognition – such as respect – for use in a society. Although respect-recognition could give a solid normative basis for democratization of institutions, it is not clear whether the norms of recognition that apply within other institutions are applicable within school and vice versa. This talk discusses the extent to which the expectation of respect within schools is connected to democracy.

Lorenz Lassnigg (IHS Vienna), Anja Heikkinen (Tampere University, Finland): Some critical issues in the role of adult education for democracy – knowledge based reflections on current rhetoric

A rhetoric of the function and efficacy of adult education for the improvement and sustainability of democracy is increasingly coming up in political and research discourses. Basic principles of redeveloping adult education can be found in the wording of European Union guidelines and international bodies such as UNESCO on the right to Education. Democracy education is based on the historical development of the concept and understanding of democracy in its three different dimensions: (1) the development of democratic institutions, (2) the development of basic democratic and social rights and human rights, and (3) the development of the potential for democratic intervention and change, meaning to support citizens that actively participates in their community and own their actions. The Delor's Commission (1996) four pillars have received new attention globally and have now been expanded to include a fifth pillar: learning to change, learning to transform, and so characterise the concept of Bildung in an extended way.

The European Association for the Education of Adults (EAEA) has aggressively proclaimed this instrumental and functional use of adult education on its webpage: "Adult education is the tool for the development of critical thinking and empowerment, a lively and inspired civil society, and knowledge and know-how." Some research items are explicitly mentioned in support for this statement. However, a closer look on these sources from the OECD and the Wider Benefits of Learning (WBL) Study shows, that they are already quite old, from the mid-2000s, and that these documents give quite weak support to this functional proclamation.

In our paper we point to questions concerning the justification and practices of democratic education.

- First, some issues were already raised in the classic about "Democratic Education" by Amy Gutmann (1987, 1999). She has pointed to the topic raised in the WBL-Study about the relationship between the (fight for) democratic institutions and the impact of education for democracy, the old question about "Wissen ist Macht" vs. "Durch Macht zum Wissen". Education depends on the democratic institutions and practices, and not the other way round. She highlights the skill of deliberation as the main purpose of public education, that is interestingly not given much emphasis in the current lists of skills and competences.

- Second, there is much evidence available that institutionalised (formal) adult education must build on the results of previous children and youth education, and on the results of informal learning in work and everyday life. Thus, if we ask for the potentials of adult education for democracy, we must consider these issues in positioning adult education, if we don't want to run in the trap of illusions.
- Third, we recently often hear very optimistic statements about the role of (adult) education for the emergence and sustainability of Nordic welfare capitalism ("Nordic Bildung"). However, social science and historical research sees the provision of education rather as a result/service than as a cause for the establishment and viability of welfare and wellbeing, as well as popular values and trust/responsibility – thus pointing back to our first point.

### KAHIFI: Demokratia ja ideologiat koulutuksessa

#### Niko Nojonen (Kuopion taidelukio Lumit): Holhouksen alta kansalaiseksi – tasavaltalaisen kasvatuskäsityksen lähtökohdista

Kuinka kasvaa kansalaiseksi? Kuinka kasvattaa kansalaiseksi? Apua näiden kysymysten tarkempaan muotoilemiseen ja jonkinlaisia suuntaviivoja vastaamiseenkin voidaan hakea tasavaltalaisesta poliittisen ajattelun ja käytännön perinteestä. Myös modernin länsimaisen demokraattisen ajattelun kansalaiskäsitteiden juuret ovat tasavaltalaiset. Moderni liberalistinen ajattelu ottaa kansalaisten muodollisesti tasaveroisen aseman ja oikeudet annettuna eikä onnistu käsitteellistämään kunnolla sitä, miten keskinäistä tasaveroisuutta ja vapautta on tuotettava ja niiden uhkia torjuttava. Tasavaltalainen yhteiskuntafilosofinen ajattelu korosti osallistumista sekä sen edellyttämiä kykyjä, kuten hyveitä, ja riittävää taloudellista riippumattomuutta. Osallistumaan ja sen edellyttämiin kykyihin oli opetettava ja kasvatettava.

Kansalaisen käsitteeseen kuuluu sisäsyntyisesti kasvatuksellinen tai kehityksellinen ulottuvuus myös toisella tapaa. Kansalaisen käsite edellyttää välttämättä vastinparikseen ja vertailukohtakseen käsitteeseen siitä, millainen on asemaltaan se, joka ei ole kansalainen. Tasavaltalaisesta näkökulmasta katsoen ajatus keskinäistä vapautta ja itsemääräämistään ylläpitävistä kansalaisista on kytkettävä ajatteluun holhouksen alla olevista ja elävistä. Antiikista juontuvassa tasavaltalaisessa poliittisessä ajattelussa kansalaisen aseman saavuttanut nimenomaan vapautui holhouksen alaisuudesta. Keskenään vertaisilla kansalaisilla ei ole holhoajaan vertautuvaa isäntää, herraa tai hallitsijaa.

Perinteisen tasavaltalaisen kansalaisuuskäsityksen tarkempi hahmottaminen aatehistoriallisesti voi auttaa hahmottamaan liberalistisia lähestymistapoja paremmin kansalaiseksi kasvamisen ja kasvattamisen sekä siten osallistuvaan demokratiaan ja demokratiakasvatukseen liittyviä kysymyksenasetteluita ja ongelmakohtia.

Esitelmä pohjautuu tuoreeseen artikkeliini ”Miten torjua herruutta – itseään määräävien kansalaisten tasavaltalainen vapaus” (teoksessa Itsemääräämisoikeus – Teoriasta käytäntöön, toim. Paul Tiensuu, Maija Aalto-Heinilä ja Anna Mäki-Petäjä-Leinonen, Vastapaino, Tampere 2023, s. 51–71).

### Jani Sinokki (Oulun yliopisto): Rasismi ja muita tekosyitä vihalle

Maailma tuntuu olevan täynnä vihaa ja vihollisuuksia. Rasismi, nationalismi, misogynia, homo- ja islamofobia, verkkoviha, susiviha, vainoaminen, maalittaminen, salaliittoteoriat, viharikokset, väkivallasta ja seksuaalisesta nöyryyttämisestä fantasioivat nimettömät uhkaukset ovat lisääntyneet erityisesti demokraattisissa, sananvapautta arvostavissa länsimaissa. Vihaa ja sen kasvavaa määrää on yritetty selittää koulutuksen puutumisella, näköalattomuudella, ennakkoluuloilla, pelolla, poliittisella polarisaatiolla, sosiaalisen median tunnereaktioita ruokkivilla algoritmeilla, kuplautumisella, ja disinformaatiokampanjoilla. Lähes kaikki lajimme moraaliseen keskeneräisyyteemme liittyvät viat ja informaatioaikaan sopeutumattoman evolutiivisen luontomme puutteet on jo käyty läpi, ja silti mysteeri säilyy: miten viha ja sen avoin ilmaiseminen lisääntyy erityisesti juuri siellä, missä tasa-arvon, koulutuksen ja hyvinvoinnin kasvu antaisi syyn olettaa kehityksen olevan täysin päinvastainen – siis demokraattisissa yhteiskunnissa?

Esitelmäni Rasismi ja muita tekosyitä vihalle kysyy: mitä jos olemme käsittäneet vihan ja sen ilmentymien keskinäisen suhteen väärin? Mitä jos esimerkiksi rasismi ei olekaan syy ja selitys vihalle, vaan pikemmin seuraus sitä edeltävästä vihasta – jos moni vihan näennäinen ilmentymä onkin yritys rationalisoida tiedolliseen muotoon edeltävää, vaistonvaraista vihollisuusrefleksiä? Vihollisuuden käsitteelle perustuva selitys korostaa vihan luonnetta intentionaalisenä tilana: viha esittää kohteensa pahana ja vääränä. Tarkemmin ottaen viha esittää kohteensa uhkana itselle ja omille arvoille, ja omalle identiteetille. Viha esittää kohteensa siis vihollisena. Vihollinen on vastustaja, erityisesti sodassa. Vihollinen pyritään tuhoamaan, nujertamaan, tai alistamaan omaan tahtoon. Vihollinen ei siis ole kunnioitettu kilpailija tai vastustaja, joita useimmissa sivistyneissä kilpailuasetelmista, kuten urheilukilpailussa esiintyy. Vihollinen, vihan kohde, pitää neutralisoida tuhoamalla tai rikkomalla se – joko fyysisesti, henkisesti tai symbolisesti – ennen kuin se ehtii tehdä saman itselle. Tästä syystä vihassa yhdistyy tarve ylentää itseä ja halu alentaa muita. Tämän tarpeen toteuttaminen voi tuottaa myös suurtakin nautintoa, minkä vuoksi vihaaminen ei liity pelkästään negatiivisiin emootioihin, ja siihen voi jopa kehittyä riippuvuus.

Ehdottamassani selityksessä olennaista on se, että vihollisuus on ystävyuden (toinen yleinen moraalisen asennoitumisen luokka) binäärinen pari. Tämän jaon puitteissa (tyypillisesti, muttei aina tiedostamaton) asennoitumisemme ihmisiin, mutta myös muihin asioihin, on aina vihollisuuden tai ystävyuden alaan kuuluvaa.

Tämä mustavalkoisuus – ns. vihollisuuden kolmannen poissuljetun laki – selittää osaltaan sitä, miksi negatiivisiin tunteisiin vetoaminen mahdollistaa tehokkaan manipuloinnin valheilla, mis- ja disinformaatiolla ja salaliittoteorioilla. Ärtymys, suuttumus, pelko ja muut kielteiset tunteet riittävät sysäämään meidät vihollisuusasenteen piiriin, ja vaatii erityistä vaivaa ja ponnisteluja suhtautua näiden emootioiden vallassa ystävällisyydellä niihin, jotka ärsyttävät meitä tai ovat väärässä tai vieraita. Tämä kuitenkin tarjoaa mahdollisuuden myös interventioille – myös ystävyden lisääminen on mahdollista.

Ehdotan myös, että näkemykseni puitteissa interventiot ovat mahdollisia, ja mahdollisesti jopa helposti toteutettavia. Esimerkiksi reaktiivisen vihollinen–ystävä-dikotomian tiedostaminen itsessään voi riittää ei-patologisten vihaajien asenteen muuttumiseen – myös erimielisiin ihmisiin voi suhtautua kuin ystäviin (ja jopa sosiaalisessa mediassa). Toisaalta muiden outoja näkemyksiä (esim. uskomus, että tuulivoimalat räjäyttävät lepakoita) voidaan ymmärtää paremmin, kun niitä ei lähestytä pelkkinä tosiasiauskomuksina, vaan pikemmin yrityksinä sanallistaa omia vihollisuusreaktioita ja -kokemuksia (tässä: oman kodin läheisyyteen nousevaa tuulivoimaa kohtaan).

#### Tuomas Tervasmäki, Tuukka Tomperi (Tampereen yliopisto): Yliopistot ja demokratia – katsaus nykytilanteeseen

Yliopistojen ja demokratian suhdetta voi väittää molempien osapuolten kannalta ratkaisevan tärkeäksi. Demokraattinen yhteiskunta edellyttää säilyäkseen ja kehittyäkseen jatkuvasti vahvistuvaa sivistystä, korkeatasoista koulutusta, vapaata tieteellistä tutkimusta ja yhteiskuntakriittistä demokratiakasvatusta, joiden vaalimisessa yliopistoilla on ollut avainrooli. Tieteen ja koulutuksen autonomia on puolestaan mahdollista vain demokraattisessa ja vapaassa poliittisessa järjestelmässä. Samalla monissa maissa yliopistoissa itsessään on ollut pitkät sisäisen demokratian perinteensä. Suomalaisyliopistot olivat 1900-luvun viimeisinä vuosikymmeninä sisäisen demokratian varassa hallittuja organisaatioita, joissa niin sanottu edustuksellinen kolmikanta miellettiin perustuslain yliopistoille takaaman itsehallinnon ytimeksi. Opetuksen ja tutkimuksen autonomian ja itsehallinnon yhteyttä kolmikantaiseen demokratiaan on kuitenkin 2000-luvulla asteittain purettu. Tässä esityksessä pohditaan, millainen on yliopistodemokratian tila 2020-luvulla, millaisilta vaikuttavat kehityssunnat ja mitä yliopistot voivat tehdä demokraattisuuden vahvistamiseksi yhteiskunnassa.

OECD:n ja Euroopan unionin edistämässä globaalissa tietotaloudessa yliopistot näyttäytyvät kansantalouden kilpailukyvyn moottoreina. Yliopistoja on alettu ajatella yritysten kaltaisina strategisesti johdettuina organisaatioina, joiden johdon ja hallituksen toimivaltaa on haluttu lisätä. Vuoden 2009 yliopistolakiuudistus ja sitä seuranneet rahoitusuudistukset olivat Suomessa yliopistoja mullistanut historiallinen vedenjakaja. Kolmikantademokratiaa on korvattu hierarkkisella linjaorganisaatiolla ja ammattijohdolla, ja tulosperustaisen rahoitusmekanismin

lietsoma kilpailu niukoista resursseista on kiihdyttänyt talouden ensisijaisuutta painottavaa akateemista kapitalismia. Kilpailu on saanut korostamaan kustannustehokkuutta ja virtaviivaisia hallinnollisia rakenteita, jotka jättävät vain vähän tilaa demokraattisten prosessien erimielisyyksille ja hitaudelle. Uudistukset ovat aiheuttaneet jännitteitä, demokratiavajetta ja vieraantumisen tuntemuksia: henkilöstössä strategisen johtamisen ja managerialistisen kilpailuyliopiston piirteet herättävät paljon tyytymättömyyttä.

Yliopistojen muutos on osa yleisempää kehitystä, jossa demokraattinen hallinta ja managerialistinen hallinta törmäävät yhteen. Yhteiskuntatieteilijät ovat viime vuosikymmeninä analysoineet edustuksellisten demokraattisten järjestelmien heikkenemistä, autoritaarisen managerialismin lisääntymistä sekä kansalaisten kasvavaa tyytymättömyyttä demokraattista päätöksentekoa kohtaan kaikkialla maailmassa. Demokraattisia käytäntöjä on haastanut taloustieteistä ja yritysmaailmasta lainattujen johtamisoppien, markkina-ajattelun ja teknokraattisten politiikkakäsitysten vahvistuminen jälkiteollisissa yhteiskunnissa.

Esitelmässä jäsennetään yliopistodemokratian nykytilaa kahteen tutkimushankkeeseen perustuen. Hankkeessa Kohti parempaa yliopistomaailmaa: strateginen johtaminen ja yliopistoyhteisön kokemukset Tampere3-fuusiossa 2019–2022 (Kuusela ym.; Koneen säätiö) -tarkasteltiin Tampereen yliopistofuusion ja säätiöpohjaisen hallintomallin tuomia muutoksia. Syksyllä 2023 käynnistyvässä hankkeessa Demokratia yliopistoissa: edustuksellisen demokratian kriisi ja yliopistojen itsehallinto (Kuusela, Poutanen, Tervasmäki & Tomperi; Koneen säätiö) selvitetään suomalaisten yliopistojen demokraattisuuden nykytilaa, niiden sisäisen demokratian ja edustuksellisen itsehallinnon rapautumista sekä kartoitetaan mahdollisuuksia kehittää yliopistoja edustuksellisen demokratian kasvualustoina. Esityksessä luodaan nykytilanteen yleiskatsaus edellisen hankkeen havaintoja tiivistäen ja samalla avaten näkymää tutkimustarpeisiin, joihin uusi hanke pyrkii vastaamaan.

### PARALLEL SESSIONS III

#### DEMOPOL workshop: Populism, democracy and democratic education

#### Krassimir Stojanov (University of Eichstätt-Ingolstadt): Democratic Education as Anti-Populist Project: A Neo-Hegelian Perspective

My central claim in that paper is that democratic education is best understood ex negatio, in particular as negation of populist ideologies and attitudes. In the contemporary political science seems to be a consensus that most distinguishes feature of populism is its anti-pluralism. The latter is closely connected to the antagonistic opposition between “the people” and the “elite” which the populists propagate. Within this opposition “the people” appears as a kind of organic unity, as a homogeneous entity with a collective will and consciousness.

This construct comes very close to Hegel's understanding of the pre-political Volk (people) on the level of what he portrays as the unmediated spirit of a natural ethical community. According to Hegel, this kind of community is grounded on blood ties that are not a subject of choice and subjective will. It should be understood as a kind of "big family" with a collective will and a collective self. Here there are, strictly speaking, no distinguishable individuals, but only an undifferentiated community. Thus the Volk, understood as an extended natural family, is a pre-political, or even anti-political category. According to Hegel, the Volk gains political meaning only as Staatsvolk and not as a "natural", family-like community, that is, only as constituted by the institutions of the state. These institutions should guarantee the development of individual subjectivity to an "independent extreme of personal particularity" (Hegel 1821/1986, p. 407).

This development is first triggered out by individual's transition from the organic community of the family to the one of the civic society which consist of autonomous and unique individuals who cannot be reduced to a collective identity, but who nevertheless have to co-operate with each other. The transition in question is exactly what Hegel calls Bildung in the precise sense of the word. It is a negation of the unmediated spirit of the organic community and it's main feature is the development of individual's ability of conceptual articulation of her or his needs, interests, values and skills as a prerequisite for his or her interacting with the other members of the civic society who are characterized by their irreducible otherness.

In a next step, I shall link the Hegelian understanding of Bildung as conceptual self-articulation through negation of organic homogeneity to Dewey's conception of democratic education as personal growth by individual's participation in a pluralistic and open life-form that breaks down the borders of closed communities and social groups. Finally, I will share some thoughts on how critical dealing with populist ideologies in the classroom might function as promising tool for democratic education.

Keywords: Populism, Hegel, Conceptual Self-Articulation, Dewey, Democratic Education

Paul Adams (University of Strathclyde): Aligning/contrasting pedagogy and populism as a support for democratic education

As a political term, populism has a long and varied history (Abromeit, Chesterton, Marotta, & Norman, 2015). Populism itself presents shifting statements in response to social, political, and economic conditions and when tied to 'myths' of nationhood, populism presents as the antithesis of democracy in favour of strong leadership and 'electioneering'. It is not, though, built upon opposition to democracy per se; right leaning views challenge governments who prioritise minority groups over the (God Fearing) majority. Left-leaning populism challenges neoliberalism for its disenfranchisement of 'ordinary people'. As populism's foil, however, is democracy, if only as that to contest. Accordingly, there is a need to consider how populism interacts with democratic

education (Mårdh & Tryggvason, 2017); that is, can populism perhaps strengthen democratic approaches to education?

Populist narratives deploy both anti-democratic and democratic educational challenges. The former seeks to deny agency to some (Petrie et al., 2019) and has led to structural reform to remove democratic oversight or the introduction of ‘consumer selection’ through parental choice and free schools: an international phenomenon. Petrie et al. (2019: 490) note that such hollowing out generates conditions for ‘epistemological populism’: open hostility towards intellectuals, an impatience for complexity, and valorisation of ‘common sense’ solutions. However, while liberally minded democrats may seek to engender harmony and contentment, they themselves often locate ‘the unacceptable Other’. Provocatively, Petrie et al. (2019) propose that the contingent ‘filling out’ of populist rhetoric could provide the impetus for greater democratic educational involvement given that ‘politics as normal’ has not resulted in reigning in inequality or poverty.

Further, pedagogy requires democracy, not simply in terms of voting rights, but also to understand socio-cultural horizons and their achievement: a debate about what we do and do not value (Klitmøller, 2018). Problematically, Anglocentric visions of pedagogy often deploy ‘officially sanctioned’ teaching method/s (Adams, 2022). This offers simple interpretations: a smorgasbord of ideas or prescriptive/proscriptive approaches (Bell, 2003). Alternatively, pedagogy as ‘being in and acting on the world with and for others’ (Adams, 2022), favours alternatives to post-industrial, empirically based Anglocentrism (Klitmøller, 2018).

Accordingly, I argue that pedagogic discussions can enrich education about/for/through democracy via positionings for populism. I examine how populism can locate pedagogy as living with and in complexity: a means to ensure educational projects become neither inured to populism nor taken by its seeming simplicity.

Tobias Lench (University of Eichstaett-Ingolstadt): Why Half-Education (Halbbildung) serves as an accelerant for anti-democratic attitudes

Keywords: Dialectics, Critical Theory, Frankfurt School, Half-Education, Truth

This presentation defends the argument, that in order to understand and analyse the many challenges to democracies one has to understand the structures and conditions that support anti-democratic attitudes, actions and populism. The aim is to make today's social conflicts as conflicts of Half-Education more visible and recognizable in research and society as well. With authors of the early Critical Social Theory of the Frankfurt School (Horkheimer 1953, Adorno [1969/70] 2015, 2019) it can still be shown and examined, that Half-Education represents the structures and conditions that, in the end, lead to Barbarism in the society and that critical thinking must be part of a solution to work against it. This work must continue.1 What are these conditions in particular?



To address this question, I want to take a step back and first illustrate, what Half-Education might be, and then show that Half-Education has a serious connection to anti-democratic attitudes in a person's life and network of beliefs - in the sense that it can function as an (fire) accelerant for those attitudes, when we understand Half-Education as three major issues or questions that have to be addressed by educational systems, researchers, teachers, parents, peers etc.:

How do we have to talk to younger generations and with young adults, to fight

- totalitarian and/or authoritarian thinking?
- the absolutization of leading images?
- ignorance of truth and a shared reality?

How and why might critical thinking be of help here (Horsthemke 2021)?

If it is true, that Half-Education can present itself with these characteristics, we are able to address political movements like Trumpism (not only but also) as a social conflict that is asking for educational answers and measures.

Also, by illustrating these questions on the interface of empirical and theoretical contributions together with (also contemporary) examples and surveys in German society and political attitudes found there connected to young adults (Brumlik 2018), the (almost invisible) conditions of the climate of Half-Education may become more and more visible.

1. Adorno used the term "Bewegungsgesetze" (social laws) for an analysis of which social aspects have favored, promoted or at least not hindered anti-democratic beliefs and claims, so they could grow in the German society and culture - not only before WWII, but also afterwards, because the conditions that made Half-Education possible are still there and they are growing.

DEMOPOL workshop: Democracy and Human Rights Education

Vihtori Kylänpää (Non-Military Service Center in Finland (Siviilipalveluskeskus)): Educating young adults to undertake actions for human rights

A vibrant democracy presupposes citizens who are willing to undertake actions for their own and other peoples' human rights. Citizens who undertake actions for certain human rights, especially civil and political rights, enable also other citizens to participate in democratic processes. Previous research has shown that good-quality human rights education may support students to undertake those actions. However, less is known about the relationships between students' individual backgrounds, the diverse ways in which they understand human rights, and their willingness to undertake actions for human rights. This presentation is based on the author's dissertation

(Kylänpää, 2022), which utilized student voice method. The aim of the study was to find ways to educate young adult students with diverse backgrounds to undertake actions for human rights.

The study participants were carrying out their non-military service in 2017–2018. They took part in one of six human rights courses, 20 lessons (45 min) per course and designed and taught by the author. The presentation is based primarily on 22 individual interviews that were conducted after the courses, and a typology construction and thematic analysis from the data. The presentation concentrates especially on those students, whose answers did not imply a strong willingness to undertake actions for human rights, but who could still be ready to undertake those actions in some circumstances.

The presentation concentrates on the following results of the study: First, four ideal types characterizing distinct stances toward undertaking actions for human rights were identified. These types showed the concrete ways in which the students interpreted their human rights obligations and the changes in their willingness to undertake these actions over the course. Second, the thematic analysis identified various obstacles that limit the students' engagements in actions for human rights. The students reported practical difficulties that hindered them from undertaking actions for human rights.

All in all, the results offer a more nuanced explanation of different students' various considerations regarding undertaking actions for human rights. The findings help clarify which options are at the teachers' disposal for finding human rights subjects that are more relevant to the students' practical situations. The results also imply that good-quality human rights education during childhood could enable young adults to undertake actions for human rights, as before the course they did not seem to know enough about the topic.

Keywords: citizenship education, democratic education, human rights education, student voice, young adults

Josefine Scherling (Viktor Frankl University College of Teacher Education): The concept of resistance in critical Human Rights Education – a tool to promote democracy?

Keywords: Resistance, human rights education, global challenges, democracy Abstract

The multiple global challenges we face are spawning many new resistance movements (e. g. Fridays for Future, Black Lives Matter, etc.). Scholars have outlined the importance of disobedience because of, e.g., growing social injustices and inequalities of wealth. This is reason enough to take an in-depth look at the concept of resistance in order to identify its significance for coping with global challenges from a human rights perspective and promoting democracies.

In everyday language, resistance is primarily interpreted as ‘being against something’. However, closer scientific considerations reveal a differentiated and complex picture of this concept. A separate scientific discipline, called resistance studies, deals with resistance in depth and attempts to initiate a differentiated scientific debate on it.

This presentation will take up this debate in order to anchor human rights (HR) and human rights education (HRE) within it and to link them to the question of their relationship to democracy. Resistance is closely tied to the history of HR as an uprising against regimes of injustice in the second half of the 20th century and as resistance to current human rights violations (Butler et al. 2017). Although the concept of resistance is of great importance in HRE, it is rarely addressed in its complexity in HRE discourse. Discussions of resistance in the context of human rights are mainly limited to discussing a human right to resist (Blunt 2019). Recognizing that the concept of resistance is underdeveloped in HRE (Coysh 2017; Zembylas/Keet, 2019), this paper aims to contribute to establishing resistance as a central element of HRE. It presents preliminary findings of a literature review for a wider research project aiming to fill the gap by starting with a conceptual/philosophical analysis.

In a first step, some aspects of a differentiated concept of resistance are presented and critically reflected on in the context of critical HRE. ‘Critical’ here means that HRE also deals with prevailing narratives (e. g. neoliberal, colonial) and their entanglements with HRE, i. e. critical HRE also questions its (normative) foundations and itself in order to develop further based on this critique. (See, e.g., Gruber/Scherling 2020, Zembylas/Keet 2019, Williams/Bermeo 2020). Thus, this work draws on various critical theories, such as, e.g., critique of neoliberalism or postcolonial critique.

In a second step, these findings will be brought to bear on a debate on the relationship between resistance and democracy. In particular, the question will be addressed as to what extent critical HRE (with resistance as one of its central elements) is a tool for promoting democracy. Based on the analysis, resistance in the context of critical HRE can form a fruitful approach to emphasise marginalised voices and neglected narratives in order to critically analyse the established democratic structures and manifestations.

As this is a very large and complex field of research, this presentation will provide only an initial outline of this relationship. In raising the issue of resistance in human rights education this paper will contribute to the field of philosophy of education.

Tuija Kasa (University of Helsinki): Conceptualizing invisibility as inequality in education – Widening moral vision through critical human rights education

Several marginalized accounts have characterized the experience of their invisibility in education and society. This paper seeks to conceptualize invisibility as a form of inequality in education and a possibility to widen moral vision through critical human rights education (CHRE). CHRE and

human rights are a relevant part of democratic education, which aims to advance inclusivity and give abilities for students to act in democratic societies and hold governments critically accountable. The need for CHRE stems from the context that human rights education (HRE) and human rights have faced critiques for overemphasizing concepts like autonomy, rationality and individuality. In addition, they have been criticized for false referrals to abstract universality while neglecting non-western and feminist perspectives. Critiques offer important insights for revising HRE. However, because of failed practices, the criticism of conceptual ground is somewhat unjustified and there is a need for a more nuanced analysis of the philosophical ground of HRE.

This paper contributes to the current lack of moral philosophical analysis of HRE. Thus, this approach also offers insights into moral education. The discussion of the philosophical foundations of human rights is somewhat polarized between “orthodox” and critical accounts. I propose an approach to CHRE, which responds to several critiques but does not abandon the moral core of human rights. More specifically, the aim of my moral examination of CHRE attempts to enhance concepts and practices that widen moral vision to address invisibilities as inequalities in education. My approach is a philosophical analysis informed by literature and results from social and educational sciences.

The paper’s theoretical background draws from the “classic” philosophical theories and critical research on education such as feminism, postcolonialism and alternative accounts. The ambitious aim is to combine these. The aspects of invisibility and moral vision in moral philosophy draw on the theories of Iris Murdoch and Raimond Gaita in dialogue with literature references of marginalized experiences such as Adrienne Rich and Toni Morrison. I will present different approaches to invisibility and evaluate their suitability in education. Murdoch’s philosophy’s appeal is the description of the moral character of education, its rejection of autonomy as a main goal of education and striving for letting go of one’s self-centered ego to be able to see more clearly. These insights are presented in dialogue with literature references of marginalized voices and feminist and postcolonial scholarship.

I draft a novel approach to broadening moral vision in education, especially in the context of CHRE and democratic education. This approach holds the potential to unsettle the self-evident conceptions but simultaneously does not deny the moral core and shared ground in humanity which obligates us to strive for global justice. By crossing boundaries to decrease polarization, educational practice and theory can be developed to be more responsive to diversities and democracies may develop to respond to the crisis of legitimacy. Deriving from marginalized positions, but at the same illustrating common values, education may foster ways to defend common core values and diversity.

Keywords: human rights education, critical theory, moral philosophy, invisibility, moral vision

## KAHIFI: Tieto, sivistys ja dialogi

### Jenni Marjokorpi, Mikko Puustinen (Helsingin yliopisto): Tieto, dialogi ja keskustelun vaikeus

Esityksessä tarkastelemme tieteellisen tiedon ja tasa-arvoisen dialogin välisiä jännitteitä opetustilanteissa. Teoreettisesti ammennamme merkityksellisestä ja vaikuttavasta tiedosta (powerful knowledge), demokratiakasvatuksen perinteestä sekä Martha Nussbaumin ja Amartya Senin kehittämästä toimintavalmiusajattelusta (capabilities approach). Pohdintamme kirvoittavat liikkeelle muutoksessa olevat käsitykset soveliaista keskustelun aiheista ja tavoista sekä yhteiskunnallinen polarisaatio Suomessa ja yleisemmin länsimaissa.

Merkityksellinen ja vaikuttava tieto tarjoaa vaihtoehdon ylhäältä annettulle valtaa pitävien tiedolle (Future 1; knowledge of the powerful) ja vastareaktiona edelliselle syntyneelle kokemuksellisuutta ja kompetensseja painottavalle suuntaukselle (Future 2) (Young & Muller 2010). Historiallisesti Future 1 -tyyppisessä kouluopetuksessa on keskitytty ennalta määrättyihin sisältöihin, joiden muistamista kuulustellaan. Future 2 taas on pyrkinyt irtaantumaan oppianeista ja korostamaan yleisiä taitoja tai kompetensseja. Näin kumpikin sivuuttaa tiedonalojen episteemiset kysymykset. Merkityksellinen ja vaikuttava tieto (Future 3) perustuu oppiaineiden ja niiden taustatieteiden tiedonrakentamisen tapoihin, ja siten mahdollistaa esitettyjen väitteiden arvioinnin sekä henkilökohtaisen kokemuksen ulkopuolelle ulottuvan kuvittelun.

Opetustilanteissa tiedon roolin korostaminen voi kuitenkin asettua ristiriitaan osallistujien tasapuolisen kuuntelemisen ja kunnioittamisen kanssa. Jos keskustelussa painottaa tietoa, on dialogisuus uhattuna. Jos taas painottaa dialogia, keskustelu jää helposti arkitiedon tasolle (Future 2), eikä kytkeydy oppiaineiden tiedollisiin ja ajattelullisiin tavoitteisiin (Puustinen & Khawaja 2021). Yleisemmällä tasolla ristiriita kytkeytyy erimielisyyden ja sen sietämisen merkitykseen demokratialle sekä kysymyksiin tasa-arvoisesta puhetilasta (Eskelinen 2019) ja epistokratiasta (Van Bouwel 2023).

Esityksessä pohdimme mahdollisuutta hakea edellisiin kysymyksiin teoreettista ratkaisua toimintavalmiusajattelun kautta (ks. myös Muller & Young 2019). Tällöin opetuksessa voisi rakentaa toimintavalmiuksia, joissa merkityksellinen ja vaikuttava tieto yhdistyy retoriseen osaamiseen ja kunnioittavaan dialogiin. Argumentoimme, että tällaisia valmiuksia tarvitaan polarisaation, informaatiovaikuttamisen ja globaalien kriisien keskellä.

### Kauko Komulainen, Anna-Leena Riitaola (Helsingin yliopisto): Kasvatus, tieto ja sivistys (Bildung) nykyisessä käsitteellisessä murroksessa

Viime aikoina on ollut havaittavissa tietynasteinen 'representaation kriisi' (Marcus & Fischer 1986), joka koskee kasvatusta, tietoa ja sivistystä (Bildung). Käsissämme on vakavia globaaleja, ihmiskunnan olemassaolon kyseenalaistavia sosiaalis-ekologisia haasteita. Koulutuspolitiikan

kansainväliset ja kansalliset toimijat ja sidosryhmät, kuten OECD, Opetus- ja kulttuuriministeriö tai Opettajien ammattijärjestö OAJ, ehdottavat näihin vaikeisiin ongelmiin ratkaisuksi 21. vuosisadan taitoja. Olemme eri mieltä, sillä taitoihin keskittyminen jättää huomiotta käsillä olevien ongelmien historialliset juuret sekä niiden poliittisuuden. Niin ikään toimenpiteisiin siirrytään pohtimatta, miten varsinainen ongelma on muodostettu ja miten kyseiseen tilanteeseen päädytty (Bacchi 2009). Samalla sivuutetaan kysymys siitä, ovatko globaalit ongelmat luonteeltaan metodologisia, epistemologisia vai ontologisia, ja ovatko pedagogisiin välineisiin ja kompetensseihin perustuvat ratkaisut riittäviä, vai onko kriisien takana laajemminkin suhteemme maailmaan (Andreotti et. Al. 2018).

Yhden ilmeisiä tarkennuksia edellyttävän näkökulman ovat viime aikoina nostaneet esille tutkijat, jotka erilaisia posthumanistisia ja antroposeeniin pohjaavia käsityksiä esitellessään ovat todenneet nykyisten ekologisten ongelmien lähteen löytyvän humanistisesta traditiosta ja sen ytimenä olleesta ihmiskeskeisestä ajattelusta. Aristotelisessa traditiossa ihmiskeskeinen ajattelu on kuitenkin liittynyt ihmisen itsetietoisuutta kehittäneeseen humanistiseen filosofiaan, jonka edustajat ovat monin eri tavoin kritikoineet planeettamme tuhoamista. Sen sijaan pääasiallinen tuhoava vaikutus on ollut modernilla luonnontieteellä, joka selvittämiinsä lainalaisuuksiin pohjaavan metodologisen monismin ja liiallisen reduktionismin periaatteita noudattaen on tuhonnut luontoa erityisesti tuottamansa teknologian avulla (Radnitzky 1970; von Wrihgt 1970; 1971; Hietajärvi 2022).

Toinen esittelemämme näkökulma nousee puolestaan dekoloniaalisesta näkökulmasta, joka korostaa nykyisen modernin ja samanaikaisesti koloniaalisen sekä kapitalistisen maailman järjestyksen ja onto-epistemologian (Grosfoguel, 2002) merkitystä globaalien ongelmien kehittymisen ja jatkuvuuden taustalla. Tässä esityksessä tarkastelemme, millaisia uusia tutkimuksellisia ja toimintaa ohjaavia näkökulmia vähemmän tunnetut humanistisen tradition suuntauksat ja dekoloniaalinen ajatteluperinne voisivat tuoda globaalien ongelmien sekä niiden kasvatuksellisten ulottuvuuksien ymmärtämiseen.

Keywords: Global crises, anthropocentrism, Aristotelian humanism, modern/colonial world system, decolonization

Jyrki Kaarttinen (Tampereen yliopisto), Matti Taneli (Turun yliopisto): Sivistyskasvatus demokratian kivijalkana

Sivistys on mielestämme ihmiseksi tulemisesta ja ihmisenä olemisesta. Sivistyskasvatuksella tarkoitamme kasvatuksen eri osa-alueiden, so. älyllisyyden, eettisyyden, esteettisyyden, uskonnollisuuden tai elämänkatsomuksellisuuden ja toiminnallisuuden, tasapainoista kasvattamista. Sen tavoitteena on antiikin suurten filosofien sivistysohjelman kaltainen paideia, jossa monipuolisten taitojen ja tietojen harjoittamiseen yhdistyy pyrkimys hyvään ja arvokkaaseen elämään.

On sanottu, että ”sivistys ei ole rakenne, sitä ei voi uudistaa eikä sen suhteen voi olla kestävyysvajetta” (Salo 2014, 182). Sivistyskasvatus itsessään liittyy olennaisesti demokratiaan ja sen toteutumiseen koulussa ja yhteiskunnassa ja se haastaa yhteiskunnassamme olevat vaihtoehdottomat totuudet. Jos koulussa opiskelijat perehdytetään vain mekaanisiin tietoihin ja taitoihin markkinahegemonian hengessä, niin saattaa käydä niin, että tämä vaikeuttaa, jopa estää, demokratiaan kasvamisen.

Kasvatusnäkemys, jossa arvostetaan vain talouden ja tekniikan arvoja, väheksyy mielestämme sitä humanismille keskeistä lähtökohtaa, että tiedot, taidot ja suhtautumisvalmiudet muuttuvat sivistykseksi vasta kasvattaessaan ihmisen koko ajattelussaan ja toiminnassaan ilmentämää laajakatseisuutta, objektivisuutta ja oikeamielisyyttä. Tässä mielessä kasvatus tarvitsee ”taistelevaa humanismia kaikkialla, missä vallanpitäjät kätkeytyvät väärän tietoisuuden valepukuun.” (von Wright 1981, 17, 172.)

Koulussa saatetaan olla kadottamassa antiikista periytyvä, mittaamattoman arvokas sivistysperintö, jos kasvatettavista ja koulujen välineellistämisestä tulee, uusliberalistisen konformismin hengessä, koulutoiminnan pääsisältö. Tämä realisoituu nykykoulussa monin tavoin, kun ulkoista yrittäjyyttä tuodaan kouluun kokonaisvaltaisen sivistyskasvatusajattelun kustannuksella. Lisäksi koulujen taloudelliset resurssit vaihtelevat eri puolella Suomea niin paljon, ettei ole aina takeita siitä, että koulu voisi säilyttää teknologisen metafysiikan korostuessa suhteellisen itsenäisen ja riippumattoman asemansa. Siksi kasvattajien tulisi olla valppaana, ettei sivistyskasvatusajattelulle aivan vieras talous- ja kilpailuajattelu valtaa pedagogiikan eetosta (Värri 2018, 134–135).

Kritisoimme nykypedagogiikan teknistaloudellista kasvatuspuhetta, jossa kasvatuksen perimmäisistä arvoista lähtevä puhe on jäänyt euforisen ja totaalisoivan talous- ja teknologiaeetoksen puristuksiin. Kasvatuksen kieli vaikuttaa hahmottuvan taloudellisen ja teknologisen kehityksen vaihtoehdottomuudesta. Kirjoituksessa käsittelemme kasvatuksen ontologista kriisiä, jossa kilpailu- ja markkinaoikeudenmukaisuus vaikuttavat syrjäyttäneen sivistyskasvatusajatteluun kuuluneen humanistisen arvoperinnön, tasa-arvon ja oikeudenmukaisuuden ihanteet pedagogiikan eettisinä periaatteina. Lisäksi esitämme kirjoituksessa, millaisia mahdollisuuksia ja keinoja sivistyskasvatuksella on torjua kasvatusajattelun kaventumista vain ihmisen hyötyä ja käyttökelpoisuutta mittaavaksi yhden totuuden teknologia- ja talouspuheeksi.

PARALLEL SESSIONS IV

DEMOPOLE workshop: Epistemology and ethics of democratic education

Anniina Leiviskä (University of Oulu): Political polarization and education for deliberative democracy

Political polarization is often argued to be a major threat to democracy. In this presentation, my purpose is to examine from a philosophical perspective whether the two different forms of polarization – ideological and affective – may risk some of the core assumptions of deliberative democracy. I argue that the risk associated with ideological polarization, in so far as it means that increasingly extreme ideological positions are accepted as legitimate contributions to democratic discussion, may lead to crossing the threshold of toleration (Forst), and thus undermine the right to justification that underlies the concept. Affective polarization, in turn, presents a risk to the type of reasoning that deliberative democracy presupposes as it renders agents incapable or unwilling to engage in rational deliberation in a way that can yield reasoned belief-change and/or collective will-formation. The presentation presents some preliminary remarks on how these forms of polarization could be pre-emptively addressed in education: first, by demonstrating to students the nature of democracy as a value-system that rests on certain irrefutable core principles that cannot be abolished (democratically or otherwise) without consequences; and, second, by organising educational practices that enable addressing such tendencies as motivated reasoning and confirmation bias, which are strongly associated with affective polarization.

Keywords: ideological polarization, affective polarization, toleration, deliberative democracy, motivated reasoning

#### Henri Pettersson (University of Oulu): Critical Thinking and Democracy revisited

Critical thinking and democratic citizenship are linked as educational objectives to the extent that they may seem inseparable. This connection is present both in texts by scholars of critical thinking (e.g. Dewey, 1910, 1916; Siegel, 1988) and by those who have studied democratic citizenship education (e.g. Gutmann & Thompson, 1996). The idea is that by promoting critical thinking in education, we strengthen democracy by enabling citizens to follow and participate in decisions that affect them in a more informed way. At the same time, critical thinking could also act as an antidote to emerging challenges such as misinformation and conspiracy theories that threaten the stability of societies.

Pettersson (2020) challenges this established wisdom in his article “The Conflicting Ideals of Critical Thinking and Democracy in Citizenship Education”. He argues that in open classroom discussions, education that promotes critical thinking may even end up questioning the foundational ideas of democracy. It may then be tempting to surgically remove these controversial elements from the curriculum, for example in the case of philosophy courses (as has actually been suggested in Finnish discussions, see Pettersson 2020 for details). According to Pettersson, however, this would be a mistake. We must give priority to critical thinking, because narrowing it down in the name of protecting democracy would be a problematic move that would also go against the very ethos of democracy itself.

Burbules (2020) responds to Pettersson's text arguing that Pettersson gets the situation only half right. Pettersson seems to rely on simplified understanding of the nature of democracy and critical thinking as educational ideals. Neither of them are finalized and static dogmas, but even their most fundamental theses are subject to constant self-evaluation. Pettersson thus seems to display a similar



misunderstanding as Missimer (1990), when Missimer criticised views that incorporate certain intellectual dispositions and virtues, such as open-mindedness and humility, within our model of critical thinking. In Missimer's view, if such ethical stances are already directly written into our theory of good critical thinking, this move at the same time frames them outside healthy rational discourse. In his response to Missimer, however, Siegel (1997) stresses that the debate about the nature and necessity of these intellectual virtues, even if they are part of a theory of critical thinking, does not end there. They can still be the subject of open debate. Seen in this way, the “conflict” between critical thinking and democracy becomes illusory.

I pick up the debate from here. I call the just described way of looking at our theory of critical thinking meta-theoretical fallibilism. In critical thinking, fallibilism is not only manifested in the individual's attitude towards his or her beliefs (which can always be corrected by new and better evidence), but also at the meta-theoretical level, whereby critical thinking itself is subject to constant reassessment and reworking. In my presentation, I do not wish to challenge the idea of meta-theoretical fallibilism, but I do consider how much taking it seriously devalues our faith in critical thinking and democracy if these values are left theoretically contested and open for further discussion.

Keywords: critical thinking, democracy, theories of citizenship

### Henri Huttunen (University of Oulu): Deliberative Democratic Education Through the Perspective of Longtermism

Longtermism is the name used for a recently articulated perspective that is primarily concerned with how the actions we take today affect the long-term future. It asks us to take seriously the potentially enormous size and scope of future and with it, the equally enormous consequences of our actions as they echo on for centuries to come. Thus, longtermism is especially interested in curtailing threats that could be viewed as existential in nature. If such threats were to come to manifest as reality, a truly staggering amount of potential human flourishing (and other things of value) could be lost. Lately, some longtermist thinkers have suggested that a rise of a stable totalitarian regime could be viewed as an existential threat due to life under such rule losing most of its positive qualities. It has also been argued that our current moment in time is ripe for just such a development. This is due to an unprecedented convergence of circumstances, best characterised as both emerging technologies and the sophistication of the tools we are more familiar with being used (both intentionally and unintentionally) to amplify the existing political polarisation in societies. If we are not measured in our response, these elements could combine into a perfect storm of developments that could lead us down a path towards a dystopian future. Adding to the worries, William MacAskill has argued that developments in artificial intelligence could lead to what he calls a value lock-in – an event after which one set of values would become globally dominant and remain so for a very long time.

This paper argues that in the light of such threats, deliberative democratic education committed to the idea of societies being inherently pluralistic in nature and to the principles of cooperation could act as a key factor in safeguarding the future from totalitarian domination. The perspective of longtermism also lends credibility to the argument that even if we might not know that deliberative democracy is the very best approach possible, it is arguably the least harmful out of those available for promotion through universal education, should we take seriously the idea of what we teach today echoing through long into the distant future. By accepting the limits of our own understanding through embracing value plurality, and encouraging deliberation also on its own principles, deliberative democracy can be argued to defuse the threat of value lock-in and remain open for revisions in the future when the need for such arises. Also, should a value lock-in still occur, if said values are ones fostering plurality and cooperation, it would nevertheless set a much more desirable future trajectory for most people than a selection that would emphasise the hegemony of one value-set.

Keywords: democratic education, deliberative democracy, longtermism, existential risk, emerging technologies

DEMOPOL workshop: Political dimensions of democratic education

Vasco d'Agnesse (University of Campania Luigi Vanvitelli): Democracy and education as 'not-yet'. Rethinking teaching commitment via Arendt

Keywords: democratic engagement; Arendt; teaching commitment; plurality; being-with-others.

Over the last two decades, the phenomenon of right-wing populism and growing forms of militarism and authoritarianism have posed serious threats to democracy. It should be noted that far from being just a momentary halt in the development of democracy, these phenomena seem to be the prevailing political tendency across Europe, the U.S., and Asia. The rhetoric of “America First,” the growing influence of sovereignist parties in nations such as Italy and France, the UK’s Brexit, anti-immigration movements rising across the globe, the increasingly authoritarian governments of Russia, China, and Hungary, and misleading narratives about fascism (Salvio, 2022), clearly define nationalism as the prevailing tendency of the current international political scenario.

These phenomena intersect, in a way that is anything but benign, with increasing levels of inequality and precariousness in liberal democracies and with “the suspicion that far from educating democratic citizens, schooling simply perpetuates the authority, influence, and affluence of those who are already privileged.” (Säfström, 2022, p. 349) Such phenomenon can be traced back to the rise of educational neoliberalism, which, at least from 1990, has widely affected educational discourse, policies and practices worldwide (Ball, 2003; Biesta, 2010; Brown, 2015; Clarke, 2012; Olssen and Peters, 2005; Shahjahan, 2011; 2013).

Of course, I do not wish to equate very different phenomena such as a) militarism, which is a threat to peaceful coexistence; b) complicity with fascism, which is a crime against humanity; c) processes such as Brexit, which arise from democracy itself; and d) neoliberal mindset, which is a way of framing educational policies and practices. What I am arguing, instead, is that the combination of these diverse features on a planetary scale is pushing educational institutions and processes as well as what we may call educational subjectivities (of both teachers and students) toward a significant transformation. Such a transformation implies, I argue, a lack, if not an eclipse, of invaluable educational features such as democratic sharing among all the actors of educational processes and practices, meaning creation, and the possibility for newness to emerge. The failure to recognize such features and phenomena results in an impoverished conception of education at the individual and collective levels.

Against this background, I argue that, as educators, we should recover, in a Derridean vein, the “promise” of teaching as related to the expectation of the future, “of waiting for someone to come”, of the not-yet, and of the “democracy to come.” (Derrida, 1996, pp. 22-23) Such a recovery is not a task fulfilled theoretically or once and for all; rather, it is a daily commitment to the other pursued through care, caution and listening, which is never completely fulfilled.

Arendt’s thought here becomes important, particularly her critique of any already-established account of humanity - as Arendt states, “Plurality is the law of the earth” (1977/1961, p. 19). For Arendt, in fact, whatever we may think of it, the human condition is always-already beyond the thought that attempts to capture it. This is so because human beings come to establish who they are in ever-ending and ever-changing processes whose structure and aims are defined in concrete living situations, through action and speech (1998/1958). In this sense, classrooms and educational spaces should be conceived as spaces in which human living takes form in all of its features, not only as places where competences are acquired at will – as in the neoliberal mindset - to face a pre-conceived notion of what is worthy and what is not – as in authoritarian forms of teaching.

According to Arendt, in fact, thinking does not offer “any moral propositions or commandments, no final code of conduct... least of all a... final definition of what is good and what is evil.” (2003/1978, vii) Thinking and educating, rather, represent a call to listen and be attentive, grounded in uncertainty, and even failure; a call which, nonetheless, requires a response and a choice, whose anchor point stems from one’s being-by and being-with-others, namely, from democratic engagement.

Kjetil Horn Hogstad (University of Oslo): Narratological Research and Democracy Education: A theoretical preparation for a study of democracy education

Keywords: Narratology, democracy, education, terrorism

This paper is a theoretical preparation for a study that is to be conducted at the program for democracy training at the Utøya island, where 69 young people were murdered in the 2011 Norway attacks. The program invites groups of 15-16-year old students and their teachers to spend three days at Utøya discussing issues of and in democracy. The students then return to their school and teach their peers (1), effectively materialising the idea of education as an institution for the production or strengthening of democracy.

The relation between democracy and education has been a staple of Western thinking since Plato's Republic (Plato, 1997) via Dewey's Democracy and Education (Dewey, 1916) to the Council of Europe's hope for education that it be "a defence against the rise of violence, racism, extremism, xenophobia, discrimination and intolerance" (CoE, 2022). Though the nature of the relation between education and democracy has been a matter of much discussion (Sant, 2019), the relation itself appears almost to be taken for granted – the call for the strengthening of democracy through education is loud and clear (Apple et al., 2022; Jackson & Peters 2020; Peters & Besley, 2021). The 2011 Norway attacks show that even in strong democracies, fascist tendencies lurk (Bangstad, 2014), leading us to ask whether or how education can strengthen democracy, i. e. question the nature of the relation between education and democracy. Questioning the relation between 'democracy' and 'education' could involve investigating either concept in itself, but also the narratives that surround and underlie them, as narratives reference and reveal unspoken values, ideas of causality, ontology, epistemology, aesthetics, history and more.

According to Roland Barthes, narratives are structured stories, and they always consist of semiotic references that expand their meaning far beyond their explicit content (Barthes, 1974). His methodological approach involves using five 'codes': The hermeneutic, semic, symbolic, proairetic and cultural codes. These codes provide a basis for the researcher to make sense, so to speak, of the informants's own "translat[ion from] knowing into telling", which is how Hayen White explains narratives (White, 1980, p. 5).

The narratological approach accepts that texts are culturally embedded and fundamentally relational (see Barthes, 1986, and Derrida, 1998). The approach opens for an investigation of what the words mean in themselves, but also what else they refer to, either in terms of what is said or what is not said (i. e. what the codes help reveal). As an example, if the narratological analysis suggest that there are unspoken systemic, political, metaphysical, epistemological, linguistic and/or material barriers for democracy education, the analysis opens up for discussing those even if they are not explicitly mentioned in the narrative as it was recorded. One single narrative can yield rich analyses, as a hermeneutic between what the informant said and what the interpretation brings to the issue (Tohar et al., 2007).

1. <https://demokratiwerksted.no/international/>

Ivan Zamotkin (University of Oulu): Revisiting Arendt's notion of collective responsibility in the context of "curriculum wars"

The "curriculum wars", referring to the clash between proponents of social justice education who aim to advance equality in terms of race, gender, and sexuality, and those who see such forms of education as politicized indoctrination, has become one of the most highly contested manifestations of the broader "culture wars" in the US (and to certain extent in some other countries). Usually, critics of social justice education invoke two interrelated rhetorical tropes aimed at achieving maximum impact: first, they claim that an antiracist curriculum could make white students feel "discomfort" because of their identity while they, as individuals, were in no way associated with historic wrongs committed by white people in the past. Second, it is stated that with this type of civic education, schools do not provide a necessary foundation for democratic citizenship in the form of attachment to the present political community, which leads to the distortion of this community. Both claims could be refuted from the outset, given the evident misinterpretations embedded in this type of critique. However, because this rhetoric is so effectively used by politicians to influence school policies and practices, it is beneficial to engage with these claims in more depth.

In this context, I suggest revisiting Arendt's distinction between such notions as guilt and responsibility that could help to reconceptualize and defend the practice and aims of antiracist education not in terms of assigning guilt, which, according to Arendt, is always a judgment of individual wrongful actions, but rather in terms of collective responsibility. By revoking the original Arendtian definition of collective responsibility as being based on one's membership in political community through the common reference to the events of the past, I argue that it is the failing to engage with this responsibility in the classroom – and not the other way around, as the "patriotic" counterargument to social justice education implies – that leads to the loss of the community bond that is necessary for creating a healthy democratic society. With Arendt, I claim that to have this responsibility is not a burden but a recognition of human togetherness, which can only be escaped or rejected at the cost of leaving the community (Arendt refers to this rejection of responsibility as "inner emigration"). This attitude can easily be adopted in the realm of education, as we currently witness occurring in the context of many states in the US, as they have employed legislation to prevent antiracist education in public schools.

The argument thus is that the task of civic education, in Arendtian terms, is to present the world as it is to newcomers with the understanding that the time will come for them to renew this world in ways that could not be predicted beforehand. In this sense, the Arendtian account also provides a profoundly open-ended conception of education that stands in sharp contrast with the argument of antiracist education as a form of political indoctrination. Rather, the Arendtian premise is that not knowing about the past and properly reckoning with it will prevent young people from acquiring the type of social and political agency and a sense of community that is required for social transformation.

Keywords: Hannah Arendt, collective responsibility, guilt, social justice, democratic education.

KAHIFI: Philosophy for and with children

Eelis Mikkola (University of Helsinki): Bayes Meets Lipman: Creating a Theoretical Model to Guide Empirical Research on Philosophy for Children

Keywords: “Philosophy for children”, “P4C”, “Bayesian Network”, “systematic review”, “causal model”

Philosophy for children (P4C) is an educational practice based on communal inquiry and discussion. It was created by Matthew Lipman in the late 1960’s with the aim to develop critical, creative, and caring thinking on its practitioners. Achieving this kind of multi-dimensional thinking can be seen as valuable in itself, but Lipman emphasizes that this is needed so that children can achieve their potential as reasonable human beings in a modern, inquiry-driven society, where democracy is the valued social structure. Thus, Lipman gives us a framework that helps in raising capable citizens who will make reasonable judgements in a democratic manner.

Even though Lipman is heavily influenced by Dewey, it can be noted that his goals are quite similar to the ideas of virtue ethicists: Humans should have certain modes of thinking that can be seen as epistemological (and ethical) virtues, and education needs to tend to these. These virtues help us create better societies and individuals that can reach their full potential. Unlike many other philosophers of education Lipman gives a precise and working description of a pedagogical practice that explains how these goals can be achieved.

Empirical research on P4C has mainly focused on pre-post-measurement interventions that have tried to answer the question “Does P4C work?” but it has left the question “Why?” mostly unanswered. If we are to truly understand how P4C works, and if it truly is a well-designed model for attaining crucial skills for democratic citizens, both questions must be answered. If we do not know why P4C interventions seem to work in some cases and not in others, we cannot evaluate if it is something that should be implemented in schools in Finland or in any arbitrary context, as we do not know how different variables affect the results.

There have been no overall theoretical attempts to combine and define the variables measured in empirical research into a single theoretical model that could be used in answering the “Why?” question. For this presentation I constructed a theoretical model, a Bayesian network, that combines variables discussed in recent meta-analyses and reviews of empirical P4C research. This model can be used in guiding future empirical research on P4C and in answering the “Why?” question. I present the model and the variables in accessible graphical form.

[Arie Kizel \(University of Haifa\): Why Educational Systems prevent Philosophy with Students as an Educational Platform for Self-Determined Learning of the Citizen-Agent](#)

Key words: Philosophy with Children, self-determined learning, Matthew Lipman, pedagogy of searching, pedagogy of fear

This presentation develops a theoretical framework for understanding the applicability and relevance of Philosophy with Students/Children in and out of schools as a platform for self-determined learning of citizen-agent. Based on the philosophical writings of Matthew Lipman, the father of Philosophy for Children (P4C), and in particular his ideas regarding the search for meaning, it frames Philosophy with Children in six dimensions that contrast with classic classroom disciplinary learning, advocating a “pedagogy of searching” to replace the “pedagogy of fear” that dominates traditional learning systems.

Being a meta-approach and field practice, Philosophy with Children exists both within and without educational institutions, thus not being confined to a specific time or place such as a school. As a way of life and educational method, Philosophy with Children differs from philosophy as taught in schools and academia alike. While the teaching of philosophy is becoming increasingly common in schools (especially high schools), within the history of philosophy and philosophical thought Philosophy with (and for) Children has established itself as a model for cultivating human beings who ask existential questions about themselves, their world, and their surroundings from an early age. In contrast to the academic study of philosophy, in which students are passively exposed to philosophical ideas, Philosophy with Children seeks to create a place and space for active engagement in philosophical thought that promotes broad, critical thinking skills in its young practitioners. Rather than focusing on acquaintance with philosophy as a field of knowledge to be mastered, it revolves around questions relating to the pupils’ existence in the world. It thus develops young people’s philosophical sensitivity, presenting questions to them as a living, breathing, vigorous space that fosters creativity, caring, and concern.

In contrast to the competitive atmosphere and rivalry frequently promoted (even if only tacitly) in many schools today, communities of inquiry encourage cooperation and collaboration in order to support self-determined and shared learning. The diminishment of the competitive element in classrooms in and of itself further promotes the establishment of communities of inquiry characterized by democratic deliberative inclusion, partnership, and cooperation. These traits enable the openness necessary for the emergence of—and sometimes solutions to—democratic and philosophical ideas.

The presentation will also focus on the reasons why many countries still tend not to include Philosophy with Students/Children as a compulsory method, mainly in primary schools. Among other reasons is the opposition from conservative political parties to allow young children to participate in communities of philosophical inquiry and to enable them to open democratic discussions.

Jenni Nilsson (Uppsala University): Raising ideal citizens in a zombieland? A curriculum study of Swedish early childhood education & juridification

The presentation derives from the first study in my PhD project. The aim of this paper is to contribute with knowledge on ideological governing of Swedish early childhood education (ECE) by exploring the educational task of promoting democratic ideals and how it is affected by juridification of educational policy. The study is motivated by the declining democracy globally (Freedom House 2022, Varieties of democracy 2022), tensions between child-centered curriculum and subject curriculum within the Swedish ECE policy (Liljestrand 2021, Sjöstrand Öhrfelt 2019), and the increased legal regulation of education changing the educational task (Arneback & Bergh 2016, Novak 2018, Murphy 2020). Research on juridification of education policy is still scarce, and several scholars are calling for further research on this topic (Novak 2018, Murphy 2020, Rosén 2022). Particularly the field of juridification related to early childhood education is wide open for further inquiries. Scholars also raise the ambivalent relation not only between legislation, democracy and citizenship (Magnussen & Nilssen 2013, Blichner and Molander 2008, Magnussen & Banasiak 2013) but even between the different democratic values and ideals (Mouffe 2008). The study is conducted within a qualitative interpretive research paradigm. With neopragmatic curriculum-theory and its interests in educational values and language as the point of departure (Englund 2011, Säfström & Östman 1999), the governance of democratic citizenship is explored through a text analysis. A historical and intertextual approach on speech act theory by Quentin Skinner is applied (1988). The empirical materials consist of a selection of Swedish authoritative ECE policy texts published between 1986 and 2020.

The findings indicate several shifts regarding the ideal citizen in ECE curricula. The idea of citizenship, previously expressed as a horizontal relationship within a community, is now defined as a vertical relationship between the individual and the state. The citizenship ideal has shifted from a lived citizenship ideal emphasizing equity and belonging to citizenship as individual status constituted by ownership of rights. It is argued that juridification can be seen both as a symptom and an enabler in this change.

Keywords: Educational policy, Democracy, Juridification, Speech act, Early childhood education

### KAHIFI Paneelikeskustelu: Kasvatuksen historian ja filosofian kaunis ystävyys?

Kesäpäivät ovat kasvatuksen historian ja filosofian tutkimusverkoston (<https://kasvatus.net/signyryhmat/kasvatuksen-historian-ja-filosofian-verkosto/>) tärkein vuotuinen tapahtuma, mutta miten kasvatuksen historialla ja filosofialla muuten menee ja miltä niiden suhde näyttää suomalaisissa yliopistoissa? Paneelissa kysytään, onko kasvatuksen historian ja filosofian kaunis ystävyys rapautunut ja mistä se johtuu. Liittyykö kasvatuksen filosofian etääntyminen historiasta siihen, että se samaistuu entistä enemmän filosofiatieteeseen? Onko kasvatuksen historiallinen tutkimus näivettynyt vai onko historiallistava lähestymistapa sulautunut alan opintojen ja tutkimuksen valtavirtaan? Onko kasvatustieteiden profiloituminen Suomen pienessä tiedeyhteisössä liian yksilösidonnaista, mistä on seurannut ennakoimattomia ja tarkoittamattomia käännteitä tieteenalan kehitykseen? Miten muutokseen ovat vaikuttaneet koulu- ja opetussuunnitelmapoliittiset linjaukset



– kuten ekososiaalisen sivistyksen ja demokratiakasvatuksen korostaminen -, yliopistorakenteiden ja -hallinnan sekä tiedejulkisuuden muutokset tai globaalien akateemisten kilpailun kärjistyminen?

Kasvatuksen historian tutkimusverkosto käynnistyi kasvatustieteilijöiden ja historiantutkijoiden sekä heidän taustaseurojensa aloitteesta vuonna 2005 (<https://journal.fi/aikuiskasvatus/article/view/93656>). Verkostossa oli alkuvuosina mukana kasvatustieteilijöiden lisäksi erilaisia historian tutkijoita ja keskustelua käytiin muun muassa kasvatustieteen ja historiantutkimuksen suhteesta ja siitä, kumpi tuottaa 'oikeampaa' kasvatustieteen tutkimusta. 2010-luvulla keskusteluyhteys kasvatustieteen filosofiaan vahvistui ja vuodesta 2014 verkoston nimi muuttui Kasvatustieteen historian ja filosofian verkostoksi. Sittemmin historiallinen lähestymistapa alkoi harvinaistua, mikä näkyy myös Kasvatus ja Aika-lehden muuttuvassa profiilissa. Nyt ajankohtaiselta kysymykseltä näyttää se, onko kasvatustieteen historialla ja filosofialla mitään yhteistä ja tarvitsevatko ne enää toisiaan.

Pikainen suomalaisten yliopistojen kasvatustieteen historian ja filosofian opetustarjonnan vertailu verkoston vuonna 2011 tekemään kartoitukseen osoittaa yliopistojen välisiä määrällisiä ja sisällöllisiä eroja, mutta varsinkin kasvatustieteen historian lähes kadonnutta tarjontaa. Helsingin yliopistoa lukuun ottamatta filosofisia opintojaksoja on ainakin perusopinnoissa sekä pakollisina tai valinnaisina aine- ja syventävissä opinnoissa. Perusopinnojen nimikkeet vielä muistuttavat siitä, että kasvatustieteen historiaa ja filosofiaa pidettiin perinteisesti toisiinsa kytkeytyvinä, kasvatustieteitä integroivina ja niiden tiedeperustaa rakentavina tiedonaloina. Emme silti tiedä paljon siitä, miten etäällä ne ovat olleet historia- ja filosofiantieteistä tai lähempänä vaikkapa yhteiskunta- ja psykologiantieteitä. Ilmeistä kuitenkin on, että tietyn aihepiirin ja lähestymistavan katoaminen tutkinto-ohjelmista johtaa varsin pian niiden katoamiseen myös tutkimuksesta.

Voisiko kasvatustieteen historialla ja filosofialla yhdessä ja/tai erikseen edelleen olla integroiva tai tiedeperustaa rakentava merkitys kasvatustieteille? Mikä niiden aseman pitäisi olla kasvatustieteellisissä opinnoissa ja millainen niiden suhde historia- ja filosofiantieteisiin tai muihin tieteenaloihin? Pitäisikö historian ja filosofian tematiikka jättää siihen erikoistuneiden huoleksi vai pitäisikö kaikkien kasvatustieteen tieteellisesti perehtyneiden ja kasvatusta tutkivien olla niistä kiinnostuneita ja vaikuttaa niiden tilaan ja tulevaisuuteen? Mitä seurauksia kasvatustieteen historian ja filosofian aseman ja suhteen muutoksilla on (ollut) kasvatustieteen tutkimukselle, käytännöille ja politiikalle?

Kesäpäivillä aihepiiristä keskustelelee kiinnostava joukko kasvatustieteen tutkijoita

- poliittisen historian väitöskirjatutkija Elina Hakoniemi (Helsingin yliopisto)
- kasvatustieteen filosofian postdoc-tutkija ja K&A-lehden päätoimittaja Hanna-Maija Huhtala (Oulun yliopisto)
- kasvatustieteiden väitöskirjatutkija, lukion historian ja filosofian lehtori Eenariina Hämäläinen (Tampereen yliopisto)
- sukupuolentutkimuksen väitöskirjatutkija Aleksis Paavilainen (Helsingin yliopisto)
- koulutussosiologian ja -politiikan emeritusprofessori Hannu Simola (Helsingin yliopisto)

Keskustelua johdattaa kasvatustieteiden emeritaprofessori Anja Heikkinen (Tampereen yliopisto).

PARALLEL SESSIONS V

DEMOPOL workshop: Art, media and democratic education

Torill Strand (University of Oslo): Cinema, Philosophy and Paideia: A Badiouan analysis of the Iranian movie “Hit the Road”

In this paper, I explore the Iranian film *Hit the Road* (Panahi 2021) through the eyes of the French philosopher Alain Badiou. In doing so, I adopt a philosophical methodology with the dual ambition to explore the pedagogies of this film and to acquire insights on the distinctiveness of Badiou’s conception of the triadic link between cinema, philosophy and paideia (ethical-political education).

*Hit the Road* tells a story of a family of four on a mysterious road trip. “We’re being followed,” mother whispers as she looks in the side mirror. The grumpy father in the back wrestles an apparently toothache and a broken leg, while the silent elder son drives the car. A sick stray dog rests in the trunk, while an energetic six-year-old brother leaps around, babbling his observations on life, the universe and everything. His numerous whims drives his family to distraction, but some of his jabber reminds of Psalm 8:2 “Through the praise of children and infants you have established a stronghold against your enemies ...”

This funny, tragic and moving film is written and directed by Panah Panahi, son of the distinguished Iranian filmmaker Jafar Panahi who recently was imprisoned for six years in a campaign by the Iranian authorities to silence this form of art (Zeydabadi-Nejad 2010). The Iranian authorities seems to consider the political power of cinema as quite strong. So what may be the latent pedagogy of this film? How can we link the film to paideia?

To explore, I adopt a philosophical methodology with the dual ambition to describe Alain Badiou’s philosophy of cinema and to acquire deeper insights on the triadic link between cinema, philosophy and paideia (Badiou 2013, 2015, 2022). Next, I expose how the narrative of *Hit the Road* uncovering a silenced or hidden real, while confronting us with some ethical-political paradoxes (Badiou 2022). I close the paper by considering Badiou’s claim that cinema is a democratic emblem. Cinema is for everybody and there are no distinctions between elitist and vulgar forms. Cinema is therefore a question of democracy (Badiou 2013, 2015). Since the task of philosophy is to examine the contradictions of the contemporary world and to propose an orientation, philosophers should therefore “go to the cinema, take part in its democratic dialectics, and participate in this form of contemporary education” (Badiou 2015).

Keywords: cinema, paideia, ethical-political education, philosophy, Badiou

Minna-Kerttu Kekki (University of Oulu): Democratically sustainable use of media: formal education for informal learning

Can there be too much democracy? The question is sparked by the expansion of the Internet, especially the social media. The development of the Internet-based, i.e., digital media has expanded

possibilities of political action and discussion for regular citizens all over the world. In theory, discussions in digital media in modern democratic societies enable us to informally learn and grow as citizens (e.g., Habermas, 2022). In practice, digital media has brought many challenges to contemporary democracies, such as spreading of disinformation and hate speech (e.g., Persily & Tucker, 2020). For being able to navigate and use the media in which political matters are discussed, formal media education is required.

In this paper, I argue that many of the central features of the contemporary media forms are considered as risk factors of democracy, while, at the same time, the very same features are also considered central aspects of democracy. To demonstrate this twofold nature of the digital media, I compare the plurality of voices, freedom of expression, and emotionality in the contexts of democratic citizenship and digital media. As a conclusion, I suggest that democratically sustainable media education must primarily foster democracy as an intrinsic value, together with media literacy. The intrinsic value of democracy functions as a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for sustainable use of media a) because of the risky features of media also being crucial to democratic societies and b) because media are a constantly changing field, which means that skills related to just one platform quickly grow old. In the end, the changing nature of contemporary media makes it an object of mostly informal learning in practice, for which formal education provides the democratically sustainable framework.

Keywords: media – democratic education – informal learning – formal education – sustainability

Jack Bryne Stothard (University of Derby): ‘Whose democracy counts? Constituting individual subjects within the hermeneutical field of democratic agency.’

Keywords: Epistemic Injustice, Hermeneutical, Discourse, Agency

This presentation concerns the interconnectedness of education and democracy and questions these concepts as forces of social good in modern times. Popular readings of education profess its ubiquitous virtues. Equally, the West’s democratization project still endures and seeks to bring all under the moral righteousness of democratic education despite the looming shadows of demagoguery and intense political exchange characterised by its recalcitrant dialogue. However, to explore how ‘democratic education [can] be understood in the context of the current political, cultural and theoretical landscape’ a new reading of the connection between democracy and education through the sphere of epistemic injustice is offered.

In this presentation I explore education as a domain of epistemic production and commodities, which encounters discourse as a means of producing understanding and meaning. Far from popular and simplistic readings of pedagogy and curricula as systems of equitable and unprejudiced knowledge transference, I argue that education can be seen a site of intense political, cultural and

economic epistemic struggle. Utilising Fricker's (2018) conception of hermeneutical epistemic injustice, it becomes possible to reread the democratic project, one which renders (or excludes) and reconceptualises the democratic citizen as consumer or producer of epistemic goods. Thus, it becomes possible to offer a different reading of the fall of democracy - alternatively know by such terms as 'Democratic Backsliding' or the rise of Trumpism (Brabazon, 2018). As such, disengaged or disenfranchised democratic agents, who are often labelled as uneducated or simplistic, can be understood as marginalised subjects unable to contribute to or influence the epistemic field due to their lack of erudition, their lack of proficiency in utilising discursive mechanisms or technologies or, simply, their lack of hermeneutical sufficiency. As Hartsock (1998) suggests:

The dominated live in a world structured by others for their purposes – purposes that at the very least are not our own and that are in various degrees inimical to our development and even our existence (p. 241)

Using discursive artefacts from journalism, education and politics, this presentation will examine how democratic agents can, instead, be situated as subjects of epistemic injustice rather than uneducated or adherents to demagoguery. Through this, it will be possible to understand why education, which purports 'to play a key role in creating democratic citizens' is not only 'implausible and outdated' but theoretically implausible in its current formation. As Fricker suggests, I shall conclude by exploring ways in which expressions of hermeneutical epistemic injustice might be neutralised so as to remanifest the democratic citizen.

#### DEMOPOL workshop: Impartiality of democratic education

#### David Martínez (Universidad de O'Higgins): Comprehensive or political liberalism in citizenship education?

This article focuses on the debate between political liberalism (PL) and comprehensive liberalism (CL) as the foundation of citizenship education. PL is freestanding vis a vis comprehensive doctrines and it is restricted to the basic structure. CL is not freestanding, and it is not restricted to the basic structure. According to Rawls and his followers, PL demands less of citizenship education and therefore it would be more accommodating of social diversity than CL, because the latter would embrace one comprehensive doctrine, namely, liberalism. Instead, PL would demand a core of principles of values as the foundation of citizenship education but would be open to school provision in which other comprehensive doctrines could have a central role.

Some critics contend that if we consider empirical conditions, there are no substantial differences between PL and CL concerning citizenship education, the so-called convergence thesis. For example, in school systems characterized by segregation and inequalities citizenship education should develop the more demanding comprehensive form of liberalism. Also, in a social context in which many citizens are in Rawls's terms no reasonable (i.e., extremists, authoritarians, and so on),

it is necessary to teach the more comprehensive account of liberalism. If this orientation is correct, the problem is that it seems that citizenship education would impose unequal burdens on students that endorse comprehensive doctrines different to comprehensive liberalism. Relying on recent literature on post-secularism, the article provides an account of citizenship education which is still democratic and liberal, and at the same time could reduce the burden.

Keywords: political liberalism, comprehensive liberalism, convergence thesis, Rawls.

Tarna Kannisto (University of Helsinki): The School Institution and the Principle of Non-intrusion to the Private

Susan Okin famously stated that as the family serves as the children's first "school of justice"<sup>1</sup>, it should also be internally just. However, she admitted that interfering directly within the family life, even in the name of equality and justice, would risk causing injustice to those who do not share these liberal ideals. In this article, I ask in what sense this principle of non-intrusion to the private should be extended over the school institution. If the principles of public justice and private morality came into conflict in school education, which set of principles should be given priority in relation to the school institution? Both approaches risk renewing old forms of injustice (or creating new ones), because family and school together provide the main media for the intergenerational transmission of social status, well-being, and wealth. When the distribution of social goods via education is based on morally arbitrary features such as gender or minority, racial, refugee, or socio-economic status, injustice is done to those who end up in a worse off position than they would have otherwise been (given their effort and talent). Private choices made by families thus have a strong bearing on public matters. However, it seems that from a justificatory perspective, the school is neither a purely public nor fully private institution but is something in between. In my paper, I propose that if the family as a social institution is a part of the basic structure, the school must be part of the public sphere even more strongly than the family. Thus, the principle of non-intrusion to the private protects parental choices on their children's schooling only in a limited sense.

KAHIFI: Law, equality and agency in education

Susan M. Tyrrell (University of North Texas): Separate but Unequal: An Analysis of the Downward Hurdle of Education since Passage of Israel's Nation-State Law

A quest for human rights demands the right to an education, yet some societies that promote democracy eschew the right to an equal and democratic education in the face of political polarisation. A striking example of this is my own homeland of Palestine and its controlling state of Israel. My paper shows how the most recent Basic Law, the Nation-State Law (2018), granting only Jewish Israelis the right to self-determination, affects the access and freedom of education for Palestinian children. Likewise, Israel also uses revised curriculum in Israeli schools to deposit

phrases that further the chasm, reminiscent of Freire's critiques of the banking model of education (1970). Israel's previous Basic Laws have included the phrase "Israel as a Jewish and democratic state"; the 2018 law is notably absent of the word "democratic", betraying the claim that Israel itself promotes democracy and human rights (Buettner, 2020). This is evident in Israel's claim to provide equal education for all its residents, which is not reality for Palestinians, a fact that has increased since the passage of this law. Though Abu-Saad (2004) revealed that the curriculum in Arab schools had little more intent than indoctrinating Palestinian students with Israeli nationalism, while erasing the Palestinian Nakba, it was not until Israel's Nation-State Law that extreme right-wing nationalism became a part of the official curriculum. Nasser (2022) writes that discrimination and segregation policies over the years, culminating most recently with the Nation-State law, have "intentionally marginalized the Arab education system too".

"Separate but unequal" is a term that defines education in this small area of the Middle East where settler-colonialism divides the land. Here, basic human rights, including the right to exist as a citizen and to access education are pre-determined by address, license plate colour, and religion; a majority of Palestinians are stateless. Depending on their region, some may require walking an hour to the closest school—assuming they are not stopped for questioning or detainment at random checkpoints. Identity-based political polarisation has become the norm, all but erasing the chance for a democratic education, on either side of the border. Israel is a party to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), which the UN reports as the "most rapidly and widely ratified international human rights treaty in history". Article 28 promises the right to a free and equal education. However, this right exists for only some over which Israel has control; a 2020 UN CRC report declared that Palestinian students are not receiving equal rights to education (CRC, 2020). I examine the research since the 2018 passage of the law, Palestinian and Israeli curriculum, and interview current human rights workers, including a lawyer, in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. My findings show how the ongoing politics in this land rob children of the right to a democratic education, despite public claims to the contrary.

Keywords: human rights, social inequalities, Palestine, Israel, marginalisation

Maria Rosén (Uppsala University): Democratization of education through juridification? The Swedish case of equal treatment

In Sweden, as in many modern European and international democracies, ways of governing have shifted in several ways, with profound implications for (democratic) education policy and practice (cf. Lindgren et al, 2020; Murphy, 2022). Among changes such as comprehensive marketization, juridification, as a mode of welfare regulation, is a central feature (e.g. Novak, 2018; Rosén et al., 2021). The juridification of education is visible by a shift from collective social rights to individual and legally assured rights, with a growth of legal complaint systems (e.g. Carlbaum, 2016; Novak,

2018). In Swedish education, this shift has been specifically evident regarding issues of equality and diversity.

Intertwined with a development of expansion of EU-law on discrimination and equal treatment, Sweden in 2006 introduced a legal policy forbidding discrimination, harassment<sup>1</sup> and other kinds of degrading treatment (here called “equal treatment”). This policy includes possibilities to report incidents to the Child and School Student Representative and the Equality Ombudsman who can represent students in national courts (SFS 2008:567; SFS 2010:800). Such endeavors – in the name of democracy – are difficult to question (cf. Rosén, 2023).

However, as has been discussed by Teubner (1987) and Habermas (1987), juridification as means of democratization may challenge ethical and political qualities of social spheres, such as in education (cf. Habermas, 1987; Teubner, 1987). In similar ways, Wendy Brown (2000) has pointed to the paradox inherent in rights, as both enabling and challenging emancipation and equity. These dilemmas and tensions have also been discussed in the growing body of, so far mainly Nordic, empirical research on juridification of education (cf. Karseth och Møller, 2018; Lindgren et al 2020; Murphy, 2022; Novak, 2018; Rosén et al 2021; Rosén and Arneback, 2021; Stefkovich, 2014).

Against this backdrop one can conclude that juridification as a process of democratization of education is a complex contemporary phenomenon. As such I argue there is a need for a better understanding of the consequences for democratic education. In this presentation I intend to elaborate on what juridification may enable and challenge in relation to democratic education, by the use of the Swedish policy case of equal treatment, theories on juridification and law (Habermas, 1987; Teubner, 1987; Brännström, 2009; Brown, 2000) as well as earlier research on juridification of education (Arneback, 2012; Carlbaum, 2016, 2017; Cooper, 2019; Bergh & Arneback, 2016; Murphy, 2022). As a result, I would like to discuss how we can place ourselves to think both with and against – as well as beyond – juridification of democratic education. Lastly, I would like to open up for a discussion on possible theoretical paths for further research, which may combine insights and theories from the fields of democratic education and philosophy of education, as well as research on juridification of education.

Key words: democratization, juridification, law on equal treatment, rights, democratic education

Samaneh Khalili, Anuleena Kimanen (University of Turku): To be or not to be "Finns", Human agency in democratic citizenship and education of culturally diverse youth

Due to the rise of immigrants into the European context over the last decade, new challenges in promoting inclusion, sense of belonging, integration, and social cohesion have been considered. Several European researchers have highlighted the importance of inclusive and diverse societies (Jackson 2014, 2019). In this regard, youth work is essential to Europe's long-term prospects. According to the European Union Council, youth work aims to integrate all young people into

society while also providing them with tools and opportunities to influence society as active citizens (Brussels. 16 November 2018). In this article, having taken these concerns into account, we investigate multiple dimensions of human agency in democratic citizenship and education of culturally diverse youth in Finland.

In theory, we contemplate "citizenship-as-practice" and "education as living together in plurality," with an emphasis on the political aspects of citizenship that relate to plurality and difference rather than sameness (Lawy & Biesta, 2006). In the ongoing research project, 30 young people from diverse background in urban neighbourhood aged 15 to 19 were interviewed about their civic participation and sense of belonging at the levels of family, friends, school, leisure activity and society as Finnish citizens. We employed semi-structured interviews and using partly mapping activity and life course approach. The human agency analytical framework (Khalili and et al. 2022) which comprises three major categories 1. the foundation of agency, 2. the requirements of agency, and 3. educational consequences are used to examine human agency in civic participation and sense of belonging. According to some empirical findings from our research, civic participation and sense of belonging on emotional grounds of agency are stronger among youth at the level of family and friends, while cognitive and selective grounds need to be strengthened. Furthermore, in terms of requirements of agency and educational consequences, participation at the school and leisure activity levels, which reinforce living together in plurality and provide the opportunity for citizenship as practice, is more cognitive and selective when compared to participation at the society level.

Key words: democratic citizenship, Human agency, education, youth.

KAHIFI: Työväen sivistäminen ja kansan valistaminen

Ulla Aatsinki (Tampereen yliopisto): Demokratiakasvatus ja vähemmistöt

Olen tutkinut työläislasten aatteellista kasvatusta 1920-luvun Suomessa sekä kansanedustajien näkemyksiä lapsuuden ajan yhteiskunnallisten ja/tai poliittisten kokemusten vaikutusta heidän poliittiseen uraansa II maailmansodan jälkeen. Yhdistämällä näiden tutkimusten tuloksia ja aineistoja uudesta näkökulmasta tarjoan Kesäpäiville esitelmää, jossa pohdin, miten poliittiseen vähemmistöön jäänyt vasemmistolainen työväenliike organisoii työläislasten poliittisen kasvatuksen ja mikä oli demokratian osuus tässä työssä. Suomen Työväen Järjestönuorten toimintaan lapsina osallistuneiden haastattelujen ja muistelmien avulla avaan sitä, kuinka demokratiakasvatus toteutettiin käytännössä 1920-luvulla ja tuon esille, miten lapset ymmärsivät ja sovelsivat oppimaansa yhteiskunnassa, lähinnä koulussa ja kasvuyhteisössään. Lopuksi pohdin, oliko lasten demokratiakasvatuksella vaikuttavuutta pidemmällä aikavälillä; miten poliittisen vähemmistön demokratiakasvatus poikkesi tai sulautui yhteiskunnassa vallinneeseen käsitykseen demokratiasta?



Esitelmäni aineisto koostuu pääosin Suomen Työväen Järjestönuorten ja sen paikallisten yhdistysten asiakirjoista sekä omaelämäkertoista, muistelmista ja haastatteluista (Kansan Arkisto, Eduskunnan kirjasto). Hyödynnän tapaustutkimuksellista otetta, ja syvennyn tarkemmin joko Pispalan, Rovaniemen tai Sörnaisten järjestönuorten toimintaan tai tuon niistä kaikista esiin keskeisiä tutkimusteemoja.

### Kirsi Ahonen: Vastuullisia kansalaisia, yhteiskunnallisia toimijoita, poliittista herätystä: Työväen sivistystyön piirteitä 1900-luvun alkuvuosina

Tarkastelen esityksessäni aikuisille työläisille suunnattua kansalaiskasvatusta ja poliittista valistustyötä murrosaikana, jolloin demokratia oli vasta muotoutumassa Suomessa. Vaikka äänioikeutettujen ja vaalikelpoisten määrä eduskuntavaaleissa laajeni kertarysäyksellä vuonna 1907, kansalaisia lähempänä ollut kunnallinen päätöksenteko säilyi epädemokraattisena aina vuoteen 1918 saakka. Vasta tuolloin tulot ja varallisuus lakkasivat olemasta äänioikeuden ja vaalikelpoisuuden peruste kunnallisvaaleissa.

Esimerkkeinä käytän vuonna 1899 toimintansa aloittanutta Tampereen työväenopistoa, joka oli ensimmäinen laatuaan Suomessa, sekä Tampereen työväenyhdistystä, joka poliittisen toimintansa ohessa järjesti jäsenilleen erilaista opetusta.

Työväenopisto oli kunnallinen laitos, jonka yhtenä tärkeänä tavoitteena oli vastuullisten kansalaisten kasvattaminen poliittisen puolueettomuuden hengessä. Aluksi sen toimintaa ohjasivat etupäässä sivistyneen porvariston edustajat. Työväenyhdistys puolestaan oli poliittinen toimija, jonka kiinnostus sivistystyössä kohdistui etupäässä poliittiseen valistukseen. Alun perin liberaali, sivistystyötä painottanut yhdistys oli koonnut piiriinsä työläisiä, työnantajia sekä muita työväenasiasta kiinnostuneita kaupunkilaisia. 1890-luvun lopulla se kuitenkin muuttui sosialistiseksi ja työläiset ottivat yhdistyksen johdon käsiinsä, mutta opetuksella oli edelleen sijansa sen toiminnassa.

Kahden erilaisen sivistystyön toimijan tarkastelu avaa näköalan toisistaan poikkeaviin kansalaiskasvatuksen lähtökohtiin, tavoitteisiin ja sisältöihin. Demokraattisen kehityksen edellyttämien suurten yhteiskunnallisten muutosten tavoittelu toi väistämättä esiin poliittisia erimielisyyksiä vallan ja toimijuuden jakautumisesta, ja ne heijastuivat myös sivistystyössä. Työväenopiston opetuksessa tavoitteena oli 1900-luvun alkuvuosina porvarillista yhteiskuntaa ymmärtävien ja arvostavien kansalaisten kasvattaminen. Eduskuntauudistuksen myötä mukaan tuli myös vastuullisten äänestäjien ja yhteiskunnallisten toimijoiden valmentaminen, mikä näkyi yhteiskuntaa käsittelevän opetuksen suurena osuutena. Työväenyhdistys taas pyrki oman poliittisen liikkeen vaikutusvallan kasvuun ja siinä nähtiin tärkeäksi niin omien jäsenten ja aktiivien kouluttaminen kuin työläisten laajojen piirien uinuvan poliittisen tietoisuuden herättäminen. Kuten työväenopistossa, kurssien ja poliittisen valistustyön aiheina olivat yhteiskunnalliset kysymykset

mutta painopiste oli vahvemmin ajankohtaisissa asioissa ja näkökulma oli selkeästi työläisten etujen ajamisessa.

Sekä työväenopistossa että työväenyhdistyksessä tietuopuolinen opetus ei ollut ainoa keino valmentaa opiskelijoita tai jäseniä yhteiskunnalliseen toimintaan. Työväenopistossa järjestettiin keskustelukokouksia, joissa osallistujat oppivat ilmaisemaan itseään ja perehtyivät kokouskäytäntöihin toimimalla vuorotellen puheenjohtajana ja sihteerinä. Työväenyhdistys ja sen alaisuudessa toimineet puhujaseurat ja ammattiosastot olivat jo itsessään eräänlaisia demokratian kouluja, joissa jäsenet kouliutuivat aktiivisiksi kansalaisiksi ja yhteiskunnallisiksi toimijoiksi yhdistystoimintaan kuuluneiden rutiinien myötä.

Heidi Hakkarainen (Turun yliopisto): Kansanvalistusta ennen demokratiakasvatusta: Jaakko Juteinin (1781–1855) kasvatuserittely 1800-luvun alussa kansainvälisessä kontekstissa

Tämä esitelmä käsittelee 1800-luvun alun kansanvalistusta ja kasvatuserittelyä tarkastelemalla etenkin Viipurissa 1810-luvulta saakka vaikuttaneen Jaakko Juteinin (Jacob Judénin) kasvatuserittelyä. Jaakko Juteinin kirjoitukset *Lyhyt Neuvo Lapsen Opettajalle* (1816) sekä *Puhe Lapsen Kasvatuksesta* (1817) olivat varhaisia suomeksi kirjoitettuja kasvatusta käsitteleviä tekstejä. Vaikka kirjoitukset kuuluivat hyvin varhaisiin suomeksi julkaistuihin painotuotteisiin, ne kyttyivät monin tavoin oman aikansa ajankohtaisiin kansainvälisiin kasvatusta käsitteleviin keskusteluihin. Juteinin voi nähdä kääntäneen suomen kielelle monia John Locken ja Jean-Jacques Rousseau'n kuten myös saksalaisten filantropistien teksteihin pohjautuvia ajatuksia sekä tuoneen myös Suomen oloihin kansainvälisiä kasvatukseen liittyviä tavoitteita. Hän levitti valistusaatetta Suomessa ja korosti valistuksen ulottamista myös kansan pariin kasvatuksen myötä. Ihmisen kasvu yksilönä oli myös yhteisön kehityksen edellytys.

Ihmisyyden vaalimisessa ja kehittämisessä lukutaidolla ja lukemisella oli tärkeä merkitys. Juteini kirjotti suomeksi ja julkaisi viipurilaisen Cederwallerin kustantamon kautta kirjoja vuodesta 1815 lähtien. Hänen kirjoittamastaan aapisesta *Lasten kirja* (1816) ilmestyi lukuisia painoksia. Myöhemmin Juteini toimi myös vuonna 1845 perustetussa Viipurin Suomalaisessa Kirjallisuusseurassa. Seura on julkaissut 2000-luvulla runsaasti Juteiniin liittyvää uutta tutkimusta sekä tämän kootut teokset avoimena julkaisuna vuonna 2009. Kuitenkin Juteinin kasvatukseen liittyviä kirjoituksia on käsitelty viime aikoina vähemmän. Juteinin yhteydet H.G. Porthaniin ja Turun Akatemiaan ja toisaalta hänen kytköksensä Viipuriin ja etenkin saksalaiseen kulttuuripiiriin tekivät hänestä merkittävän kulttuurivaikuttajan, jonka ajatukset muokkasivat myös myöhempää kasvatuserittelyä autonomian ajan Suomessa. Tarkastelemalla Juteinin 1800-luvun alun kasvatuserittelyä ja käsityksiä kansanvalistuksesta tämä esitelmä myös lähestyy vuoden 2023 Kasvatuksen historian ja filosofian Kesäpäivien teemaa ”Demokratia ja kasvatuserittelyssä” historiallisesta näkökulmasta.

Esitelmä pohjautuu käynnissä olevaan tutkimukseeni Viipurin alueen varhaisista suomenkielisistä lastenkirjoista. Samalla se myös esittelee uutta vuonna 2023 alkavaa tutkimushanketta ”Lukemalla kansalaiseksi? Lastenkirjat ja kasvatuksellinen kirjallisuus Suomessa 1790–1850” (Koneen Säätiö).

Keynote talk: Democracy and Conceptual Conditions of Educational Authority

Speaker: Associate Prof. Christopher Martin, Okanagan School of Education, University of British Columbia

In *The Right to Higher Education: A Political Theory* (2022) I argue that liberal democratic citizens have an individual entitlement to post-compulsory provision. I base the argument, in part, on the view that the social institutions of a democracy (including educational institutions) should support the equal freedom of all. However, recent critics have argued that this conception of educational institutions downplays their role in generating inequality. Others have argued that this conception overstates the value of personal autonomy in a pluralistic society. In this talk, I will provide a brief overview of my justification of a right to higher education. I will then show how this justification appeals to a distinctly different view of political authority in a democracy. I then depart from the debate over higher education in order to focus on the broader implications of this view for how we can understand the roles and responsibilities of educational institutions in promoting democracy. In particular, I'm interested in what it might tell us about the relationship between educational authority and civic trust, especially in increasingly divided political cultures.