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Welcome to the annual Newsletter of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain (PESGB).

The Society was formed in 1964 to promote the study, teaching and application of the philosophy of education. The Society holds an annual three-day national residential conference, other regional conferences and local branch meetings. The Society’s primary publication, the internationally renowned Journal of Philosophy of Education, is published four times each year.
From the Chair

Last year was a memorable year in so many ways.

The most obvious marker of our 50th anniversary was the outstandingly well-organised annual meeting and conference, which I think all who attended found stimulating and enjoyable in equal measure.

While a large number of members of the Executive (and indeed members beyond that), led by Richard Smith, contributed enormously to the success of the conference and the many other highly successful events, our heartfelt gratitude in particular goes to the peerless Carrie Winstanley. As colleagues will know all too well, Carrie has, over the years, worked tirelessly to ensure that the conference has been gracious, enjoyable and smoothly efficient. In her last year as conference organiser she surpassed even her own extraordinarily high standards. At the same time as we thank Carrie, we welcome and wish well her successor, David Aldridge.

Of course, the core of our conference remained, as it always has been, the programme, and Morwenna Griffiths and the Review team ensured that we were graced with outstanding keynotes and paper presentations. The Journal, under Bob Davis’ considered editorship, has continued to flourish, and editorial work with Patricia White and Morwenna will offer further evidence of the vitality of these efforts.

The list of people who deserve our thanks goes on and on, with Mary Richardson, Ruth Heilbronn and Naomi Hodgson doing wonders for our online presence and visibility, Michael Hand reinvigorating Impact, and many others chairing and taking up memberships on working groups and committees. They stand in a long line of colleagues over the last 50 years (in and beyond the UK) who have made the Society what it is today – a vibrant intellectual and social community, where disputation fosters clarity and amity rather than fractiousness and malcontent.

We are enormously grateful to all our active members for maintaining our collective health.

So now that we have passed our 50-year mark, what about the next 50 years? Given that a week is a long time in politics (and even longer, it would appear, in education in England), it would be foolish to speculate too far ahead.

What is clear is that the need for clarity as to the purposes of education has never been more pressing. As the UK’s education systems appear, prima facie, to inexorably drift further and further apart, with respect to normative claims and educational goals, we need to consider whether this is a surface phenomenon or something more normatively charged. It would appear that the more fissiparous operations of the English education system evidence the emphasis on the individual and small collective, whereas Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales all appear to sustain a desire for something like social solidarity across quite disparate sub-communities. For those on the political Left, the maintenance of such solidarity is paramount as a means of securing the flourishing of the whole community. For those on the political Right, social and economic sclerosis is the issue of overbearing étatiste control. As is often the case, both sides may have some case to answer.

The discourses and practices of teacher education would benefit from some sustained reflection in these regards. One way of framing the quite different energies and consequent challenges in English and Scottish teacher education is through the lens of entropy and negentropy. When disruptive energies are injected into established social practices, the consequences can be less predictable than the protagonists imagine. In England, the legislative disruption of the historic relationships between universities, local government and schools in the domain of teacher education has witnessed an entropic explosion of opportunity and possibility. Much of this has been incredibly productive and energising; equally much of it has been chaotic, disappearing down black holes of mediocrity and resource dissipation.
England’s system is sufficiently large and variegated to offer both the hazards and the rewards of an entropic system. In Scotland, Graham Donaldson’s review of teacher education, ‘Teaching Scotland’s Future’, was also intended to disrupt and re-energise a somewhat complacent system but has been hampered by the negentropic impulses of a small system. Here, every ‘actor’ positions themselves to secure their own structural advantage and the system is closely bounded and constrained by the others’ expectations. In a small system, each ‘actor’ manages to cancel out or negate the impulses of the others so that, despite robust rhetoric, change collapses in on itself. Northern Ireland is a yet more closely bounded system and the negentropic impulses so robust that, despite its palpable and ongoing failure to meaningfully address the most economically marginalised and culturally impoverished communities, not much changes.

Despite its bad press in recent years, Wales may offer our best hope for a system that can negotiate the choppy waters between Scylla and Charybdis. Here politicians and civil servants, head teachers and teacher educationalists are attempting, under the guidance of John Furlong, to forge a new and productive partnership that will serve the educational needs and aspirations of all. This engagement is grounded in a serious attempt to engage with, and reflect on, the competing normative claims and attachments of the various parties as well as a complex range of sometimes contesting practices that envelop the teacher. Much work remains to be done by philosophers on how to understand teaching as a profession and a practice.

The shifting landscape of higher education (HE) is also ripe for renewed consideration of purposes. With increasing numbers of global firms eschewing the traditional milk round (of what are deemed to be global research universities) in search of talent, and others no longer using possession of a degree as a shortlisting filter, universities may not provide the clear professional access, assumed in the claims of the OECD and domestic politicians, to economic advantage. Of course, in such matters, historical amnesia may be considered a virtue. Probably only colleagues of a certain age may faintly recall that possession of a university-based HE qualification was not a sine qua non of access to many of the ‘higher’ professions. It was perfectly possible to become a banker, lawyer, accountant, engineer, surveyor, nurse... via an articulated/work-based route.

Ironically, alongside medicine, teaching was one of the few professions that did require some higher qualification – presumably on the grounds that the nineteenth-century tutorial system was not an unqualified success! This opening-up/reopening of alternative professional access invokes some very interesting questions about the purposes and timbre of HE. It also flies in the face of some of the self-serving rhetoric of the OECD’s obsession with the knowledge economy.

Questions around the knowledge economy also surface in further education. Here the drift has been towards service-driven technical skills, largely on the grounds that traditional technologies and their material outputs will rely increasingly on the algorithm. Of course, it may be that there isn’t an algorithm for an automated hairdresser or barber – there certainly isn’t for the one who cuts my hair! But many of those activities that we currently assume will need human intervention may not always do so. Indeed, if one were to take seriously John Gray’s largely dystopian meditation on free will and the rise of the algorithm (which I don’t), in The soul of the marionette, humanity itself could become obsolete.

At that stage, I don’t suppose having one’s hair cut will be much of an issue. Yet, in all this, there is something circular about how human beings need to keep reinventing themselves and their educational aspirations in the face of their own inventions.

One could continue to add to this list of interesting issues, questions of securitisation and education, race and ethnicity, gender and equity, the reclaiming of the epistemic in the face of the obsession with the affective – the list goes on. What all of this illustrates is that the need for philosophers of education to engage with communities, professionals, policy makers and administrators goes on unabated. Moreover, it suggests that every site of education may be rewarded by considered philosophical reflection and that much remains for us to ponder.

I very much hope that the next 50 years of the Society will be as rich and stimulating as the last 50, and that those who have forged our field continue to be revisited as reminders that the challenges of, and need for, thoughtful discernment are not new but in constant need of renewal.

With kind regards to all.
From the Newsletter Editor

It will not have escaped the notice of some that the Newsletter has come out rather later than usual. There are good reasons for this which I won’t bore you with here – anyone doing an actor-network analysis of newsletter production where “actors” include viruses is welcome to contact me.

Luckily for the Society, there are so many people willing to help produce publications like this, and I extend my warmest thanks to everyone who contributed to it. This Newsletter will be my last as editor and I wish the new news editor (the role has been somewhat expanded) the best of luck.

Given the historical importance to the Society of the year gone by, it is fitting that the first article in this year’s Newsletter should take us back to the beginning. Phil Snelders (see page 8) transports us to the 1960s and the excitement surrounding the emergence of the Society and its Annual Conference. Given that Phil more or less invented the Saturday night party, can I suggest that next year we sing ‘Foggy, foggy dew’ in his honour? His article is followed by a letter from Michael Oakshott, kindly sent in by Kevin Williams.

In his article on page 12, Darren Chetty reports on the recent launch of the new Race, Ethnicity and Philosophy of Education sub-committee. Darren sets out the aims of the committee. He then goes on to alert readers to the fact that the PESGB is now a subscriber to the British Philosophical Association Society for Women in Philosophy Good Practice Scheme. Darren gives us a sense of what that scheme involves by outlining the Seminar Chairing Policy Suggestions that are included in it.

If one should feel despair at the current state of the university, then Ron Barnett’s article on page 14 may offer some possibility of re-enchantment. Ron argues that the university exists as an assemblage of three planes. This assemblage presents a task for the imagination that may be realised in a poetic project.

In her article, Andrea English (see page 17) celebrates the centenary of John Dewey’s Democracy and Education. Andrea reminds us of this book’s extraordinary influence and alerts readers to the publications and forthcoming events that will mark the anniversary of its publication.

Reporting back on their work on philosophy and teacher education, Janet Orchard and Ruth Heilbronn give details (on page 19) of recent publications emerging from the 2011–13 seminar series. They also discuss challenges and opportunities facing philosophers of education when working with teachers and teacher educators on the ethical dimensions of teaching.

Thanks to all those mentioned above and also to Jonathan Fletcher, Imran Arif, Ido Gideon, Naziya O’Reilly, Alexis Gibbs, Diana Murdoch, Sue Chapman and Claudia Schumann for their thoughtful and evocative conference reports. Thanks to David Bakhurst, Amanda Fulford and David Lewin, whose reports on large grants demonstrate that the Society is getting something good for its money. I’d also like to thank Ben Kotzee and Mary Richardson for their notices and Naomi Hodgson for help in collating reports. Thanks to all those who sent pictures and publication lists.

Finally, thanks so much to the excellent publishers of the Newsletter, particularly Kevin Ashill, who have displayed considerable patience over the last few years.
Secretaries’s notices

PESGB Officers and Executive Committee

The Society’s affairs are managed by an Executive Committee of President, Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary, Treasurer, Conference Programme Chair, Conference Organiser, Editor of the Journal of Philosophy of Education, six elected members and up to six co-opted members.

Jim Conroy (Chair)
School of Education
University of Glasgow
St Andrew’s Building
11 Eldon Street
Glasgow G3 6NH
j.conroy@educ.gla.ac.uk

Richard Smith (Vice-Chair)
School of Education
University of Durham
Leazes Road
Durham DH1 1TA
r.d.smith@durham.ac.uk

Morwenna Griffiths (Conference Chair)
Charteris Land 3.09
Moray House School of Education
University of Edinburgh
Edinburgh EH8 8AQ
morwenna.griffiths@ed.ac.uk

Ben Kotzee (Secretary)
School of Education
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston
Birmingham B15 2TT
h.b.kotzee@bham.ac.uk

Richard Davies (Treasurer)
School of Education and Lifelong Learning
University of Aberystwyth
Penbryn 5
Penglais Campus
Aberystwyth
Ceredigion SY23 3UX
r.davies@aber.ac.uk

Bob Davis (Journal Editor)
School of Education
University of Glasgow
St Andrew’s Building
11 Eldon Street
Glasgow G3 6NH
r.davis@educ.gla.ac.uk

David Aldridge (Conference Organiser)
School of Education
Oxford Brookes University
Harcourt Hill Campus
Oxford
OX2 9AT
daldrige@brookes.ac.uk

PESGB Annual General Meeting 2016

The 2016 Annual General Meeting was held at 9pm on Saturday, 2 April 2016 at the Society’s Annual Conference at New College, Oxford.

Branch Secretaries

The Society currently has 21 regional branches. The list of branches and secretaries is as follows:

Bath and Bristol
Darren Garside
d.garside@bathspa.ac.uk

Bedford
Neil Hopkins
neil.hopkins@beds.ac.uk

Birmingham
Michael Hand
m.hand@bham.ac.uk

Cambridge
Christine Doddington
cd236@cam.ac.uk

Devon and Cornwall
Melanie Parker
m.c.parker@plymouth.ac.uk

Dundee
Lorraine Anderson
l.l.anderson@dundee.ac.uk

continued on page 6
If you live in an area without an active branch, please consider starting one. The Society has money available to help set up and run branches. Contact the Secretary, Ben Kotzee (h.b.kotzee@bham.ac.uk), for advice.

How to contribute to the next PESGB Newsletter, including items for the Members’ publications section

Items for the Members’ publications section should follow precisely the style of the examples below, including order, format and punctuation.

**Book**


**Book chapter**


**Article**


Please email your contribution to pesgb@sasevents.co.uk

The deadline for the next issue of the Newsletter is 31 August 2016.

---

**Durham**
Andrew Davis
andrew.davis24@btopenworld.com

**Edinburgh**
Andrea English
Andrea.English@ed.ac.uk

**London**
Judith Suissa
j.suissa@ioe.ac.uk

**Netherlands and Flanders**
Anders Schinkel
a.schinkel@vu.nl

**North-West**
David Lundy
lundyd@hope.ac.uk

**Nottingham**
Lindsay Davies
lindsay.davies@ntu.ac.uk

Andrew Fisher
andrew.fisher@nottingham.ac.uk

**Oxford**
Alis Oancea
alis.oancea@education.ox.ac.uk

**Roehampton**
Suzy Harris
s.harris@roehampton.ac.uk

**Sheffield**
Ansgar Allen
a.allen@sheffield.ac.uk

**South Wales**
Mike McNamee
m.j.mcnamee@swansea.ac.uk

**Stirling**
Ian Munday
ian.munday@stir.ac.uk

**Strathclyde**
David Lewin
david.lewin@strath.ac.uk

**Warwick**
Matthew Clayton
m.g.clayton@warwick.ac.uk

**West Yorkshire**
Amanda Fulford
a.fulford@leedstrinity.ac.uk

**Winchester**
Emile Bojesen
emile.bojesen@winchester.ac.uk
Large and small grants

Over many years, the Society has been pleased to support members doing high-quality work in philosophy of education. In recent years, the increase in our income has led to a review by the Executive of our grants scheme. We now have a number of categories of grants available.

All members of the PESGB who have held membership for at least one year at the date of submitting the application are eligible to apply.

Small Grants Scheme
The Society’s Small Grants Scheme allows members to apply for relatively modest sums (up to £750). These can be used to support your work in philosophy of education. You can apply for a small grant at any time during the year, and we seek to respond promptly to requests.

Large Grants Scheme
1. Research Project Grants (up to £100,000)
   Support for collaborative or interdisciplinary educational research projects with a substantial philosophical component and with relevance for educational practice or policy.

2. Research Fellowships (up to £20,000)
   Support for individuals, who are current employees of (normally) a UK higher education institution, to further philosophical research and write an original and substantial piece of work in the philosophy of education, or work that incorporates philosophy of education to a substantial extent.

3. Seminar Series (up to £10,000)
   Support for the organisation of seminar series in the philosophy of education.

4. Doctoral Studentships (up to £4,000 for up to three years)
   Tuition fee support for full-time and part-time students pursuing doctorates in philosophy of education or doctorates in education which involve a substantial amount of work in the philosophy of education, normally at UK universities.

5. Miscellaneous Grants (up to £3,000)
   Support for initiatives not covered by the other categories but aimed at the sharing, application and/or further development of scholarly work in the philosophy of education.

The closing date for applications is normally 1 December. Please see the PESGB website for future closing dates.

Full details can be found at: www.philosophy-of-education.org/resources/grants
At the conference in the New Year of 1970, Paul Hirst took me to one side and asked me if I would be willing to join that category of persons willing to become the new Conference Organiser (CO). What he did not tell me was that that category was a category of one.

So I took over from Ieuan Lloyd, who had been CO for two years, having taken over from Miss Higginbotham, Head of Education at Stockwell College where he worked, and who had been CO since the foundation of the Society. Since that date, 46 years ago, conferences came and went in a blur, with only a few memorable moments standing out for me. If only I had kept a diary, or an account of how each conference went, but I did not.

It was long after that first conference that ‘the Annual Conference’ became a regular item on the agenda of the Executive Committee, and that usually consisted of arrangements for the next conference, and how far the Vice-President had got with recruiting paper readers. Nevertheless, I remember my time in the post with great affection and pleasure.

Starting philosophy

I should describe how I came to be at that conference in 1970. In 1964, I was a two-year-trained teacher, teaching in my second secondary modern school in Chelmsford, Essex. In the same school was Tony Gibbons, teaching science. We independently cast around, and came across the London Institute’s Academic Diplomas in Education. Once accepted onto the course, because we were not graduates we were compelled to do Theory of Education. This meant travelling to the university two nights a week during term-time for two years. Term started on the Monday, and on the Tuesday evening we sat in a crowded room and waited for the first lecture from the newly appointed Professor Richard Peters. It was an event that I remember well, though much else is blurred. The lecture was on the nature of philosophy of education.

Lectures unfolded week by week, and we were not to know that that winter was to be one of the coldest on record. Twice a week after our journey we both went waddling stiff legged along the corridors, taking off layer after layer, and then sitting through material that made our minds ache. We could not lose face in front of one another, so we persisted. Then came the time when, in a tutorial in Richard Peters’ room, he said at the end, “Now you’ve started doing Philosophy”. We came out of there grinning like Cheshire cats, and threw ourselves into reading and writing, and dashing across the road to try out an idea or two on each other.

In the New Year of 1964 we went on a conference by coach from the Institute to The Hallams, a country house. I remember little of the conference, except that Chris Ormell read a paper on an aspect of mathematics; and in a paper on an aspect of religion, someone queried whether Jesus was an historical figure, and Peters from the chair said firmly that there was no doubt, given the historical and archaeological evidence. For those who attended that conference, the circumstances made it quite unforgettable.

The first annual conference of the Society

At the end of that term, Richard Peters called together the members of all the courses, as well as others with an interest in the subject, and announced his intention to form the Philosophy of Education Society, and that there would be an annual conference in the New Year.
We celebrated our 25th anniversary there, but that was not without its problems. First, there was the question of whether it really was our 25th anniversary. Sometime during the course of the conferences, the date had changed from the New Year to Easter, and the counting up was problematical. Second, we normally had the place to ourselves. This time, however, we had to share it with the Mastermind of Britain Society. They too were having a celebratory meeting, and insisted that their dinner was to be in the dining room as usual, which was to be specially decorated. I pointed out that we had been there since about 1970, and for that reason alone should have the choice of venues for the celebratory dinner. It was to no avail, and we had ours in a gymnasium, though the staff did their best to decorate it as if to disguise the surroundings. It was a very successful dinner, and the kitchen staff was to be congratulated. There were speeches afterwards by Professor Ruth Jonathan, the President, and Professor Paul Hirst. Afterwards we went to the bar and mingled with the Masterminders – a curious lot compared with us – and of course the great Magnus Magnusson.

The conference party

I suppose that the origins of the conference party were held in my room. A gang of us, suitably armed with drinks, would assemble, and I recall vividly the proceedings being conducted by Victor Quinn, sitting on my bedside cabinet. My particular contribution was the singing of ‘Foggy, foggy dew’. Later it spilled out from there into the conference room.

Later in our stay at Froebel, a temporary bar was erected in one corner, level with the conference speakers, and at the due time the secretary of the college would creep in, disappear behind it, and the remainder of the questions and answers would continue to the chink of glasses and bottles.

Outstanding papers

Of other conferences I remember instances and individual papers.

I remember the visit of Gilbert Ryle, who was going to do battle with John White on intelligence. He came at teatime, after which there was a paper, then dinner, then the paper on intelligence. He came into the paper before dinner, and at one stage he rose to his considerable height, folded his arms, closed his eyes, and spoke in the most beautiful English about some aspect of the paper without hesitation for about five minutes – something I’ve always wished I could do.

continued on page 10
I remember a paper read by a professor, from Denmark I think, which was the first paper read at conference by someone whose native language was not English. I did not make a note of the year, the name of the professor, nor the title of the paper. I remember thinking what a feat that was.

I remember the visit of Mary Warnock, who read a paper on ‘Teaching’, based, I suppose, on her experiences in a private girls’ school, without having read anything that our members had written about it.

I remember that at the end of another paper, the first contribution from the floor was by Mike Degenhardt, who rose, said, “So what?” and sat down. On being pressed to say something more by Peters, he added that he thought a paper in philosophy of education should have some bearing on our dealings with children and their educational development.

Organisational challenges
I also remember something hidden from most members: an occasion on which my wife thought that she would spend the weekend with a friend in London, so came down with me. She dropped me off at Froebel, and it was not until I saw the car disappearing down the drive that I realised that all the conference material – labels, lists, notices, etc. – were in the boot. No mobile phones in those days, so I had to cadge a lift off an early arrival and go to the other side of London to collect it all.

Of course, the greatest change in running conferences has been the introduction of the computer. I had filing cards, and handwrote letters in the early days. The papers were photocopied, bound in light blue, and the spine in dark blue, produced by the duplicating department of the Leicester College of Education, and later by Leicester Polytechnic. I was the BEd Tutor in most of those years, with more than a hundred students in each year, each studying two main subjects and education, and I worked out the weighting of each year, and the results, with a pocket calculator. If only I had had spreadsheets available – only I would not have even known what the word ‘spreadsheet’ meant. I discovered that in the ‘children’s room’ at college there was a typewriter with a large font, on which I produced the lapel labels. I paid my children to stuff envelopes. It was all very much a hit-and-miss and homely affair compared with the seeming polished ease with which conferences are now run.

Courtesy, kindness and good times
Above all, I remember the courtesy and kindness of the conference members, and particularly of the officers of the Society. They did not berate me when VAT was introduced, and I accepted Froebel’s estimate, assuming it contained the VAT, but it didn’t. We were a hundred or so pounds down that year, but overall we made a small profit each year.

I particularly remember the occasion at the end of the celebration conference when Richard Peters came diagonally across the room, and, ill as he was, thanked me for the work I had done for the Society. That is a very special memory. As was a letter I have from him which he starts in his small, neat handwriting by, “I do wish you’d stop calling me Professor”.

Now at the age of 80, the only lecturing I do is to WI groups about my village (see South Croxton: The village on the hill, available through Amazon). I taught on half a day a week in a small village school up to a few years ago, to which my two grandchildren went, thus earning me some Brownie points. I just miss children and schools, but not the system. I am a great-grandfather and enjoy family life, with both friends and family coming for dinner parties. I have celebrated my 50th year in teaching, and went two years ago to the golden celebrations of a school where I taught when it opened, and from where I took the Academic Diploma.

I look forward to getting the PESGB Newsletter, and learning about what some of my former colleagues are getting up to. Me – well, there’s life after lecturing and teaching, and part of its richness comes in the memories stored about good friends and good times.
This was letter kindly sent in by Kevin Williams.
As you are probably aware, the PESGB is committed to supporting and promoting philosophy of education in a climate of inclusion, tolerance and respect for diversity.

Race and ethnicity sub-committee
The PESGB Executive Committee recently decided to launch a Race, Ethnicity and Philosophy of Education Committee, to run for the next five years.

It is a sub-committee of the Executive Committee of the Society and will consist of at least one member who is a trustee of the Society and up to nine further members from the broader community of PESGB members.

Aims
The aims of the Race, Ethnicity and Philosophy of Education Committee are:

- to promote and support the study of philosophy of education addressed to questions of race and ethnicity;
- to recruit new members from racial and ethnic groups currently under-represented in the Society; and
- to create a network for people with an interest in philosophy of education relating to race and ethnicity.

The committee will:

- encourage, as necessary, suitable members of the Society to help to facilitate projects initiated by the Race, Ethnicity and Philosophy of Education Committee;
- liaise with other sub-committees of the Society, in particular with the Development Committee, over projects in support of the above aims; and
- make recommendations to the Executive Committee for financial support of activities in the above areas.

Committee members
The Race, Ethnicity and Philosophy of Education Committee members are currently:

- Zara Bain
- Jack Bicker
- Darren Chetty (Co-Chair)
- Michael Merry
- Naziya O’Reilly
- Paul Standish
- Judith Suissa (Co-Chair).

The sub-committee held a well-attended meeting at this year’s Oxford conference. The committee is open to anyone who is interested in supporting its aims. Please look out for further details.

Runnymede Trust survey
The Society is currently conducting research in conjunction with the Runnymede Trust to survey the views of members on issues of race and diversity, both within the Society and in the field of philosophy of education more broadly. Members have been sent a link to the survey.
**BPA/SWIP good practice scheme**

As a further indication of its commitment to equality and diversity, the PESGB is now a subscriber to the Good Practice Scheme of the British Philosophical Association (BPA) and the Society for Women in Philosophy (SWIP). More information about the scheme can be found at: [http://bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice](http://bpa.ac.uk/resources/women-in-philosophy/good-practice)

One element of the scheme relates to discussions following presentations. The following extract is a section from *Seminar Chairing Policy Suggestions*, which can be found at the link above.

**Seminar chairing policy suggestions**

1. **Take a short (e.g. 3-5 minute) break between the talk and the questions**
   
   This allows those who aren’t confident about their question (e.g. postgraduates) to think it through and/or discuss with colleagues. The introduction of a break has been reported to have greatly increased PhD students’ participation in the question session at Sheffield.

2. **Don’t necessarily operate on a first-come-first-served basis**
   
   Consider allowing the chair to exercise discretion in the order in which they call on people to ask questions, e.g. by prioritising people who don’t normally speak/postgraduates. (First-come-first-served prioritises the most confident, who will often be the same people in every session. Indeed, in many departments the slightest hesitation in raising one’s hand will mean no chance to speak.) Also, when writing down a list at the start of the question period, try starting at the back of the room rather than the front.

3. **Adopt (and enforce) the hand/finger distinction**
   
   A hand represents a new question, and a finger represents a follow-up question or request for clarification that is highly relevant to the question/answer just given. This gives people who tend not to speak the opportunity to ask smaller, ‘safer’ questions. However, the distinction is open to abuse, and the chair should feel comfortable with noting such abuse and acting accordingly (e.g. by stopping the ‘finger’ question if it is clearly irrelevant and recategorising it as a ‘hand’ question, to go on the bottom of the list of questions).

4. **One question per question (or similar)**
   
   Sometimes a ‘question’ will consist of several distinct questions. This often results in one or two high-status (or simply more talkative) individuals monopolising the discussion. The result of this is that fewer voices are heard and existing hierarchies are reinforced. It also makes life difficult for the speaker, who has to keep track of them. Questioners should be told to select one question only to ask, and that they can be added onto the bottom of the queue for future questions.

5. **Don’t necessarily grant the questioner a follow-up question**
   
   Sometimes a questioner just doesn’t know when to let it lie. You might adopt a ‘no follow-ups’ rule as an extension of the ‘one question per question’ rule, or – more modestly – make it clear that permission (which may or may not be granted) must be sought from the chair to ask a follow-up question, and that failure to do this may result in the questioner being cut off mid-flow.”

These suggestions have already been implemented at London Branch meetings of the PESGB and at other branches. A number of presenters and attendees have commented favourably on how these suggestions have enriched discussions.

**Further information**

For more information, or to discuss how you might become involved with the committee’s activities, please contact Darren Chetty (dchetty01@ioe.ac.uk) or Judith Suissa (j.suissa@ioe.ac.uk).
Understanding the university: planes and possibilities (and even poetry)

There has been, in the Western world, a 200-year history of work on the modern idea of the university.

That lineage, which amounts to a great tradition on the idea of the university, was begun in Germany in the early nineteenth century, with Kant (The conflict of the faculties) and others such as Schleiermacher and Schelling. It was followed in England and through into the twentieth century, both in the USA and in continental Europe. Several books have indeed borne the title ‘The Idea of the University’ or something very similar to it (for example, books by Newman, Ortega y Gasset, Jaspers, Leavis and Minoque). Collectively, this tradition could be said to amount to a conception of the university of reason.

Recently, however, this great tradition could be said to have reached a double cul-de-sac, in that the university of reason has been challenged on both sides. On the one hand, we have witnessed the rise not only of the fragmenting ‘multiversity’ (Kerr), with nothing it appears in the way of a unifying theme, but also of the ‘entrepreneurial university’ (Clark). On the other hand, we have witnessed substantial critiques of the university from philosophers and others, of whom Lyotard and Readings perhaps stand out. On Lyotard’s view, the large concepts on which the Western university had rested – knowledge, truth, reason, and so on – were ‘meta-narratives’ towards which, in a postmodern age, only ‘incredulity’ was due. On Readings’ view, the university had indeed abandoned its Germanic heritage in reason and culture, and was now ‘in ruins’, the only way forward being that of ‘dissensus’ within the ruins.

If the university is now ineradicably on the path to becoming ‘entrepreneurial’, or if it is ‘in ruins’, it appears that there is little remaining space for philosophical work. That, however, would be a premature judgement.

Three planes

A proper understanding of the university should observe that the university now moves on three planes.

First, the university moves on a plane the ends of which are the university qua institution and the university qua idea. These are not two planes but are ends of the one plane, with the university as institution and the university as idea interacting with each other. Ideas of the university may buttress the university qua institution, or may open the way for alternative kinds of institution. Alternatively, the university qua institution may provoke new imaginaries (Taylor) of itself and even oppositional thinking about the university.

The second plane on which the university moves is that of a single university in its own time and space and in its (own) possibilities. Its possibilities are not merely projections of its here-and-now, but are brought into view through imaginings. Its possibilities constitute not only ‘lines of flight’ (Deleuze and Guattari) but also lines of positive movement-towards, and of movements-onwards. Each university will have its own time and space and, depending on its resources, will have its own range of possibilities continually opening before it.

The third plane on which the university moves is that of a relationship between the particulars of the university as an institution – its events, its activities, its persons, its happenings (which are infinite) – and the general ideas or universals through which the university may be understood. Especially in Lyotard’s wake (but in the wake of postmodernism more generally), one might be forgiven for thinking that the universals with which the university is associated have dissolved. To the contrary: the university is increasingly awash with universals. This is not to contend that there is agreement either about the universals that should be associated with the university or that there is even agreement as to the substance of any one universal. Across the world, there is...
disagreement, say, over whether ‘employability’ or ‘impact’ or ‘academic freedom’ or ‘critical inquiry’ should form part of the range of universals that might be legitimately associated with the university. And there is disagreement as to what might constitute, say, ‘academic freedom’ or ‘impact’. The universals of the university provide spaces within which discursive conflict can take place (Butler, Laclau and Zizek).

These three planes – (1) the university as institution and as idea; (2) a university in its own time and space and in its (own) possibilities; (3) the university as a set of particulars and as the embodiment of universals – constitute the beginnings of a new understanding of the university (see Figure 1).

We may grasp what it is to understand the university by acknowledging that the university is not just as it may appear before us as in, say, a sociological analysis. Nor is it to be understood primarily through a range of concepts that we might find of interest. Rather, it is to be understood as an assemblage (De Landa) of structures and ideas, of forces and possibilities, of the past and of the future, and of underlying mechanisms and of imagined options.

Implications

There are a number of implications of such a schema.

First, this approach acknowledges an ontological layering that constitutes the university. This ontological layering incorporates the structuring ‘generative mechanisms’ (following Bhaskar’s critical realism) that underlie the university – that is to say, such massive forces constituted by the global knowledge economy, neoliberalism and marketisation, the digital age, and quality audits including world rankings.

Second, the university moves simultaneously on different planes and both the poles of each plane are in tension with each other and the planes interconnect with each other. For example, globalisation (evident on plane 1) is giving rise to projects of internationalisation (on plane 2); and ideas of internationalisation are themselves undergoing developmental changes in response to the widening panoply of universals (on plane 3).

Third, as the social epistemology of the university widens and an ever larger array of large ideas and concepts come into view through which the university might be understood (‘wisdom’, ‘the public university’, ‘wellbeing’, ‘ecology’), so there is always a ‘remainder’ (Adorno), an unfulfilled potential. The university always falls short of the horizons that the new universals are imparting.

Fourth, the university is subject to distortions and even to ‘negative dialectics’ (Adorno) as the poles of each plane are in tension with each other. There may be a falling back, as the university recedes from the hopes invested in concepts of reason, fairness and openness. And the university may come to undermine itself. For example, far from forming a unity (as on earlier conceptions of the university), teaching and research may be seen to be in conflict.

Fifth, amidst the instability brought about by the university now moving on multiple and unstable planes, and against an array of widening and competing universals, there are spaces for agency. The agency here is not only that of persons in the university.
but also of the university itself becoming a ‘corporate agent’ (List and Pettit). There are spaces for new self-understandings – pedagogic, civic, ecological, public – on the part of the university (and into which some universities worldwide are seeking to move).

**Possibilities and utopias (and poetry)**

It follows that we understand the matter of understanding the university partly as an imaginative project. However, the imagination here is not entirely free but is obliged to search for new concepts of the university that do justice to its three planes. Concepts will need to heed and pay due deference to the structuring mechanisms at work and to the possibilities that might plausibly open for the university. Such concepts have a right to be utopian, but here they would be required to have a degree of empirical warrant. They would be utopias of the university that could be brought off in the best of all possible worlds. They would amount to **feasible** utopias.

It is not enough, therefore, to have new ideas of the university: what is needed are **better** ideas. **Criteria of adequacy** can be identified, against which putative utopian ideas can be put to the test. These would include those of range, globality, wellbeing, feasibility, duration and emergence.

Such a set of tasks for the imagination amounts to a scholarly programme that could resuscitate the long tradition of the idea of the university. It would involve work of multiple kinds, at once conceptual, philosophical, theoretical, empirical, imaginary and practical. It would be a demanding project as each new era, and each set of local and global circumstances, brings into view new possibilities for the university as a corporate agent.

The university is not condemned to live in its ruins, but rather has the possibility of espying and creating new buildings alongside the old. It would be a project without end. It might even involve new vocabularies and so be, in part, a poetic project.

**Ronald Barnett** is Emeritus Professor of Higher Education, UCL Institute of Education. He has recently completed a trilogy of books (all published by Routledge): *Being a University* (2011); *Imagining the University* (2013); and *Understanding the University* (December 2015). This article is a précis of that trilogy.
The year 2016 marks the centenary of John Dewey’s *Democracy and Education*. The text has had worldwide influence and is regarded as a classic in philosophy of education.

There are several publications planned to celebrate this classic text, including journal special issues in *Educational Theory*, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *Education and Culture* and the *European Journal of American Pragmatism*.

There are also several centennial events sponsored by societies internationally, including the American Educational Research Association, the John Dewey Society, the Philosophy of Education Society, the History of Education Society and the PESGB.

The sheer number of international publications and events that are planned for 2016 to celebrate this work indicate its profound relevance within the field of philosophy of education and beyond.

**What is it about this book that so many are drawn to?**

The book was designed as a textbook on philosophy of education and it is still assigned in many education courses today. In my own experience as a teacher educator, most pre-service teachers have not heard of Dewey. However, as soon as they read a few passages of *Democracy and Education*, they start to discuss how the ideas apply to the classrooms they’ve experienced, either as students during their own schooling or as teachers. In particular, they are drawn to Dewey’s criticism of the separation of mind and body that happens in schools. When I remind them that Dewey was writing a century ago, I see the looks on their faces which I can only describe as a mix of “Oh right… I forgot” and disappointment about the fact that not much about schooling seems to have changed. But this realisation also seems to inspire their deep consideration of what, in fact, has changed – and what work still needs to be done.

Perhaps so many are drawn to this book because it covers a wide range of themes and issues relating to education, including teaching, learning, educational environments, subject matter, values, and the nature of work and play. Dewey discusses various aspects of these issues and how they relate to underlying philosophical positions on the mind, knowledge and morality.

As the title indicates, the text offers a way of looking at the relationship between democracy and education. Dewey writes in the preface that he will not only discuss “the constructive aims and methods of public education”, but will also provide “a critical estimate of the theories of knowing and moral development which… still operate, in societies nominally democratic, to hamper the adequate realization of the democratic ideal”.

For educators, the book offers insight into the importance of their work. It makes clear that educating is not an isolated task, something that has influence on just the one person being ‘educated’ in one particular moment. Rather, the work of the educator is embedded in the web of relationships – political, social, moral, etc. – that make up our groups, communities and societies, and can, in turn, influence those relationships.

In discussing the anniversary of this text with others, I have heard from several Dewey scholars that a particular chapter in the book speaks to them, a different one for each, and that they have returned to this chapter time and time again throughout their careers.

*continued on page 18*
This is true of my own experience with the book as well. My first encounter with Dewey was Chapter 11 of *Democracy and Education* on ‘Experience and thinking’, which I read during the first year of my graduate studies in Germany. Since then I have probably read the chapter more than a hundred times, incorporating it into my teaching and writing. Over time, it has continued to lead me to new insights.

One reason why philosophers of education admire this book is the contribution it makes to establishing philosophy of education as indispensable to the education of teachers. As is seen in many of his other texts, Dewey regarded teaching as a profession that entails thinking and reflection. On this point, he was in agreement with other thinkers from different traditions, such as J.F. Herbart and R.S. Peters. *Democracy and Education* illuminates how philosophy is intimately intertwined with education. This is seen in how the book sets out to define what education is, and culminates with a definition of philosophy as ‘a general theory of education’. Sidney Hook wrote of *Democracy and Education* that it is “the one book that no student concerned with philosophy of education today should leave unread”.

**Will this book still be relevant in 100 years?**

Of course that is hard to say, but it seems that this book speaks to so many people even today because it offers us a way to discuss and debate problems that face humanity. Whether we agree or disagree with Dewey’s approach or conclusions, one thing that the book does is make us think about these problems. Perhaps that is why it has lasted through the ages, and I suspect it will still inspire discussion in decades to come.

Andrea R. English is Chancellor’s Fellow in Philosophy of Education, University of Edinburgh.
The Society has continued to support engagement between philosophers of education, teachers and teacher educators throughout 2014–15.

The successful seminar series ‘Philosophical Perspectives on the Future of Teacher Education’ (2011–13) has borne fruit in the form of an edited book of contributions from the series, published in April 2015. We hope that you will look out for Philosophical Perspectives on Teacher Education (Wiley-Blackwell – editors Ruth Heilbronn and Lorraine Foreman-Peck) and encourage libraries near you to order it. It aims to make expert philosophical reflection accessible to teacher educators who may not have a background in our discipline.

Recently published, too, is What Training do Teachers Need? Why teachers need theory (IMPACT 22), written by Janet Orchard and Chris Winch (October 2015). The pamphlet argues for a conception of teachers as professionals who require a deep understanding of the conceptual, empirical and normative dimensions of educational practice. Teachers need educational theory to understand what they are doing and why they are doing it, and to enable them to think intelligently about how to do it better.

We have continued to develop our work on the ethical dimensions of teacher education. Unfortunately, we have found little time on formal courses of teacher education to enable sustained reflection on this critical aspect of the role.

A recent review of teacher education in England (Carter, 2015) has picked out for specific attention the “tremendous sense of moral purpose” associated with teaching, citing it as “a distinguishing characteristic” of a “noble profession”. Yet there is still currently no formal requirement for teacher educators on higher education courses in England to teach ethics to teachers, leaving it unclear where the development of that sense of moral purpose is to come from. In earlier times, undergraduate routes into teaching might have included provision of this kind. More recently, though, these courses have been lost, as degrees have been streamlined. There is no established tradition of them at all in England on the 36-week Post Graduate Certificate in Education programmes, the main route into teaching.

Teacher education in England is not alone in this respect. A recent international survey (Maxwell et al., 2014) aimed to establish how commonly different jurisdictions have included ethics and values curricula in their pre-service teacher education. The survey explored the extent to which teacher educators believe ethics and values represent an important aspect of a pre-service teacher education curriculum, and looked at any obstacles that might prevent their inclusion. Results for England suggest that, while in principle teacher educators agree about the importance of ethics in pre-service teacher education, in practice they have little time to engage with ethical issues other than those that arise in the course of dealing with pedagogical matters. Further, they receive little, if any, professional development themselves to support this aspect of teacher education provision.

This problem is compounded in England by the findings from a new data set released as part of the 2013 Teacher and Learning International Survey (TALIS) of 34 countries, carried out by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. This review of continuing professional development found that teachers in England report higher participation rates than average across TALIS
countries for courses and workshops (75%) and in-service training with outside organisations (22%). However, the review reported lower than average participation among teachers in England in more in-depth activities, such as those involving research or formal qualifications. We might infer from this that “courses and workshops (often short-term) and external in-service training are shallower, less effective and bring less lasting impact than research-based or accredited professional development courses” (Burstow, 2014).

This presents a challenge and an opportunity to further the work we do with teachers and teacher educators on the ethical dimensions of teaching. Following on from the P4T workshops that we organised in 2013–14, we took some teachers and teacher educators to the PESGB @ 50 Edinburgh Branch Conference (‘Ethics, Education and Teaching: Perspectives on the teacher in contemporary society’) in October 2015. We have learned that attendance has opened some avenues for work in schools, directly arising from the participants’ experience. (For more on the P4T initiative, please see last year’s Newsletter and an article by Janet Orchard, Ruth Heilbronn and Carrie Winstanley in the forthcoming special issue of Ethics and Education on ethics in professional education.)

Finally, the PESGB’s website now has a ‘Resources’ section of teaching and study material in philosophy of education – see www.philosophy-of-education.org/resources/index.html. If you have any resources to share, please send them to Ruth Heilbronn (r.heilbronn@ioe.ac.uk). We will make sure that they are fully attributed and edited to your satisfaction before posting.

If anyone has ideas to add to our plans, or would like further information on our work in teacher education, please contact Janet Orchard (janet.orchard@bristol.ac.uk).
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A view from Africa

Jonathan Fletcher

The 2015 Conference of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain (PESGB) was held from Thursday 26 March to Sunday 29 March at New College, Oxford. I was sponsored by the PESGB to attend the conference as a representative of the Philosophy of Education Network in Ghana, having had my paper accepted by the organisers of the conference. The PESGB paid the conference fee as well as my travel expenses to and from Ghana.

First of all, I would like to thank the PESGB for giving me the opportunity to attend the conference. It was a very interesting event, which gave me the privilege to discuss many issues regarding philosophy of education and its role in teaching and learning. The conference was attended by researchers, lecturers, students, practitioners, teachers, principals, policy makers, advisors, managers and consultants from all over the world. Conference delegates were able to attend sessions highlighting the latest research and practices in philosophy of education around the conference themes, with many sessions allowing time and space for questions and discussion. All the sessions I attended were valuable, as they explored ideas from different perspectives, therefore collectively giving a holistic view of learners and their needs, strengths and uniqueness.

As a teacher educator, the conference provided a very enriching experience for me, not only because it was well attended by teacher educators from many parts of the world, but also because the sessions on the philosophies underpinning teacher education were awesome! Indeed, these sessions reminded me of why I was doing the things I had been doing all along, and also allowed me to step out of the ‘box’ and think differently.

I really enjoyed the keynote presentations in the Holywell Music Room. Specifically, the ‘Ends of education’ presented by Catherine Elgin, ‘Education and the outdoors’ presented by Bob Davis and the ‘Uncoercive rearrangements of desire’ by Gayatri Spivak were mesmerising. The respondents at these presentations were also great, as they clarified issues that appeared somewhat unclear in the main presentations.

Furthermore, gaining access to the full papers before the conference was a huge plus. This made it possible to have insights into the various authors’ perspectives on the issues they raised in their respective presentations.

Since I have returned from the conference, my PhD students have benefited immensely from the discussions that some of these papers have generated. Also, the conference provided opportunity for conversation and networking throughout the day during the meal breaks. The delegates I had the chance to interact with participated with such infectious enthusiasm, and this undoubtedly contributed to making the PESGB @ 50 Conference an excellent forum.

On the whole, I found the conference relevant as, in addition to influencing my perspective on the impact of philosophy of education on teacher education, it provided an invaluable starting point for the future development of the Philosophy of Education Network in Ghana.

My first visit

Imran Arif

I cannot write this report on my experience of attending the PESGB annual conference at New College, Oxford, without giving a context to what brought me there.

I wanted to attend as part of my own education about the philosophy of education as I was, at the time, researching and writing my MA dissertation in this area. I had been accepted to present a workshop paper; my first, in fact. This undoubtedly heightened the experience of nerves, though, fortunately, I was
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scheduled to speak on the first evening. My worries about presenting were, to some extent, relieved by my dear old friend Mike Peters, who said: “Well, it must have been good enough to have been accepted, so just enjoy the experience”.

Well, I felt I had perhaps fallen in favour with the Gods and, following such twists and turns of fate, off to Oxford I went. Mike would join me at the end of the conference and we planned to stay on another night, so he could take me on a walk down memory lane.

The conference was definitely a new experience. I think it was incredibly well organised and planned. Real thought had been put into how the works being presented connected with each other, and sessions were themed in such a way as to make connections central to the experience.

I was honoured to share a platform with the organiser of the conference, Carrie Winstanley, when we presented our respective workshop papers in the same session. Carrie’s paper, along with many others (I especially enjoyed the keynotes), contributed to the positive experience of engaging with complex and profound ideas in philosophy of education. As such, I felt inspired and exhilarated to be a part of the PESGB annual conference at Oxford in 2015 as we celebrated its 50th anniversary.

My experience of Oxford ended, as planned, with an extra day spent walking down memory lane with Mike. This was in addition to the walking tour I had already taken, which was scheduled as part of the conference. Mike and I took the open-top bus tour, which I highly recommend for anyone who wants to know about the history of the University and its many colleges.

Although this was my first ever experience of Oxford, it was sadly Mike’s last. He passed away a few months later. He lectured in sociology and in the social sciences at what is now Leeds Beckett University. I am one of the many students he stayed in touch with beyond the duration of our studies. He always spoke fondly of his time at Oxford, and was proud of my humble contribution and involvement in the PESGB conference at New College. I feel blessed to have known Mike as one of his students and as one of his friends. He provided so much encouragement as both teacher and mentor.

---

**PESGB Pre-conference 2015**

New College, Oxford

26 March 2015

**Pre-conference graduate workshops as initiation**

**Ido Gideon**

One of the great things about the PESGB Annual Conference is a sense of shared concern for philosophy of education as an area of study. For students like me this shared concern is a way into the history of philosophy of education, manifested by the main questions and figures that created its narrative. It is quite fitting, then, that the pre-conference graduate workshop preceding PESGB’s 50th anniversary conference was dedicated to reflection on the history and future(s) of our field, and its significance in educational theory and practice.

Patricia White’s talk on ‘Fifty years of philosophy of education: hot topics and neglected topics’ was a fascinating and engaging session, in which we reflected on the history of our field by examining how the questions that drive philosophers of education have evolved over the years. Patricia treated us to a real historical nugget in the form of a syllabus to an MA seminar entitled ‘Forms of knowledge and the curriculum’ from 1964. Reading the syllabus, which was developed on R.S. Peters’ and Paul Hirst’s conception of philosophy of education, led us to consider the topics that we as philosophers see as under-represented in research. The future of teaching philosophy of education also raised the question of what texts should be included to train new philosophers.

The significance of philosophy of education in teacher training and education studies was also at the centre of Stefaan Cuypers’ presentation about different conceptions of philosophy of education. We were sent three ‘impossible’ questions to ponder in advance:

- What role does, could or should philosophy of education play in relation to educational theory and practice?
- Which conception of educational philosophy does/could/should play such a role?
- Could there be and is there one paradigmatic conception of educational philosophy?
Stefaan argued for a tolerance between different conceptions of philosophy of education, while reserving the ‘analytic’ paradigm a primary role. According to Stefaan, while ‘all other conceptions of philosophy of education depend on the analytic one, the latter does not depend on any of the others’. Personally, this statement made me quiver at a dystopian future in which continental philosophers will have to confine themselves to paragraphing long sentences.

The fact that the Sir Christopher Cox Room at New College was fully packed with graduate participants – as well as the lively conversation during the two presentations – is sufficient proof that as long as we argue, there is a future for philosophy of education. In the end, the workshop was abuzz with discussion about whether any of us will find a job.

In his paper, Jeff Stickney looked at the policy significance of Wittgenstein’s rule-following argument. Stickney drew upon his experiences as both a high school teacher and a professor of educational philosophy and policy, to bring attention to what he calls “rule entanglement” in education.

Mikel Burley drew on Wittgenstein-inspired modes of investigation to advocate an interdisciplinary approach to the study of religion. Burley gave us a taste of what such study might look like when it is not preoccupied with a fixation on propositional beliefs and truth claims.

In his paper, Alexis Gibbs urged us to think of film “as” education rather than simply an instrument for serving educational ends. To achieve this, Gibbs questioned a number of assumptions about film and interpretation. Drawing on the work of Wittgenstein, Merleau-Ponty and Cavell, Gibbs argued that such assumptions can block the potential for films to unsettle us and, in the process, educate.

For me, the most inspiring and thought-provoking ideas on the language of ‘education’ came courtesy of Naoko Saito’s paper, ‘The twilight of American philosophy’. Saito drew on the American transcendentalism of Emerson and Thoreau to revitalise the question: ‘What is useful knowledge for human beings?’ This question needs revitalising as, in educational circles, it is usually framed in relation to narrow concerns around economic growth.

Emerging in a space that extends beyond the limits of Deweyan pragmatism, Saito’s “beautiful knowledge” is one that is useful to us in a higher sense. Saito’s illustrative use of different light forms, visualised by the glorious
technicolour of a Helsinki sunset, emerges in both Thoreau’s Walden and ‘Walking’. Saito encouraged her audience to understand how standing in the full glare of sunlight, or likewise in complete darkness, obscures our vision of such knowledge. Instead, it is in the twilight, a borderland ‘between’ where the gleam of knowledge can be most aptly discerned, that we must walk in order to find our way. Her clever argument prompted a reconsideration of the ‘ungraspable’, that is to say, how the drive towards secure ground, or indeed the call for pragmatic usage, deprives us of the ability to think critically about the possibilities for human transformation.

Above all, it is not the transcendence of light that gives us what can be acquired by reading in a high sense but the ordinary grounding of the earth. As we found ourselves wading through muddy patches, beating back the overgrown nettles and bracken in a walk through the rain-drenched Gregynog woodland, I thought of these lines from Mrs Darwell’s poem Written on Walking in the Woods of Gregynog: ‘Lower, down their fertile sides/ The patient hind his plough share guides’.

Our company, with expert guidance from one conference veteran, allowed us to find our way through the undergrowth. As Cavell shows us, finding our way is to depend upon the acquisition of a father-tongue, a re-education that requires a continual transforming of the self. The educative implications of our stay, of our own hoeing and ploughing, orient us towards a responsibility to determine what might be achieved as a result of this rethinking. Sojourns to and from Gregynog provide us with the opportunity for rebirth and for rethinking the relationship between philosophy and life.

European Conference on Educational Research 2015
Budapest
7–11 September 2015

Alexis Gibbs

As 50,000 Syrian refugees poured into Hungary in August 2015, some 3,000 educationalists prepared to do the same for the European Conference on Educational Research (ECER), casting the conference into fragile perspective. The customary panics about under-rehearsed PowerPoints and paucity of handouts paled in the light of a looming humanitarian crisis just outside the classrooms of Budapest’s Corvinus University.

But if European politicians were floundering in the face of this emergency, Europe’s philosophers of education took action, by presenting research that aimed to enhance educational futures despite disaster, not as a consequence of it. It was apposite, then, that the long papers were kicked off by Morwenna Griffiths’ positing of a post-human perspective on social justice, given the hot potato of humanity being tossed around in Brussels and on the continent’s borders.

Network 13 (the philosophy network) continued to justify its adoption of the long paper format with contributions that provided both greater depth and potential for discussion, frequently as rich as goulash and sometimes as spicy. James MacAllister’s meditations on whether there might be a Scottish philosophy of education particularly fired the bellies of those working in British institutions, but the broader political implications were evident: could we be having similar conversations about a Catalanian philosophy of education in Dublin?

We had a dynamic lesson in art history, courtesy of Joris Vlieghe and Thomas Storme, who were reviving Klaus Mollenhauer via Piero della Francesca. Paul Standish invited the audience to ‘see connections’ in the language of education, challenging our aspect-blindness with duck-rabbits and pumpkins, and introducing the important terms of “lumping” and “splitting” into the educational vernacular.

Among the shorter presentations, philosophical inspiration was still drawn from a predominantly European pool: Rancière, Sloterdijk, Arendt, Castoriadis, Buber, Nancy, Foucault and Merleau-Ponty all made appearances.
It was a strange experience to find myself, one afternoon, behind a table in the foyer at Moray House School of Education, Edinburgh University, greeting people whose faces I had seen from the covers of books and whose words I had read and reflected on so much. “Welcome! Welcome! A badge, a programme, apologies for the building works, refreshments are just around the corner…”

The large lecture hall soon began to fill with the 75 delegates. Many had travelled considerable distances from other areas of the United Kingdom and from as far afield as Russia. Old friends and new acquaintances met up and snatches of discussions were to be heard: voices from many lands, knowledgeable voices and new, younger tentative voices, as undergraduates, postgraduates and staff mixed with the visitors.

Sharon Todd represented Network 13 at conference level with a keynote on facing uncertainty that took as its principal conceit the ‘Eurovisionism’ of education that was sadly less to do with high camp than with tough competition. Along with Paul Smeyers, Ian Munday and Gonzalo Jover, Sharon also contributed some stoical session-chairing throughout.

Where Paul Smeyers presided over Corvinus’ classrooms, Carl-Anders Säfstrom took over as master of ceremonies for the network dinner, a chance for those with hair to let it down, and those without to live it up.

Budapest might have been beset with problems that anticipate new educational dilemmas on the horizon, but it also provided a hospitable environment in which to make anticipation an urgent educational matter.

Hungarian philosophers were not so conspicuous, but then Budapest-born intellectual Georg Lukács was deeply sceptical of philosophy as a task that seeks to compensate for having no home by making a home everywhere, and in doing so separates the ideal self from the real world. Fortunately, educational utopias were not in evidence at the 2015 ECER, and research seemed very much to be led by ‘real’ issues: zero tolerance policies, PISA, co-operative schooling, solitude, and the obsolescence of the classroom all featured as critical fodder. On the other hand, Lukács’ notion of a “transcendental homelessness” resonated throughout the presentations, and is one that seems remarkably pertinent when thinking about educational futures for a Europe in transition.

Penny Enslin challenged our complacency on the ethics of charity. It was particularly timely, as thoughts turned to refugees and migrants, not so very far away, at the gates of Europe. She talked of the difficult balance we, as teachers, must find. We encourage the next generation, not to make them ‘feel great’ about giving, but to understand our responsibilities to others. It proved to be a theme that would resonate...
through all the talks: the complexity of our relationship with the ‘other’. Morwenna opened the floor for questions, and lively discussion followed, as people responded to the issues. Sue and I weaved our way around the room, roving microphones in hand, as the debate ebbed and flowed.

As an Edinburgh-based doctoral student, it was interesting for me to attend a conference here at Moray House School of Education. Walking past the same buildings every day, I wonder if I rather take for granted the beauty of this historic city. Built at the turn of the twentieth century, Paterson’s Land, our home for two days, was the result of the transfer of responsibility for the education of Scottish teachers from the Church to Provincial Committees. The buildings that had been passed over with this transfer were not deemed sufficient to cope with the increased demands of the new era. The building has thus played a key role in the education of Scotland’s new teachers over a period of many years; how fitting, then, for our conference on the teacher in contemporary societies to be held here.

Sue’s report from the wings: day two

As the second day of the conference dawned, Diana and I resumed our places behind our registration desk and we were able to put the final few faces to the names on our badges.

Andrea English introduced our much-awaited international keynote speaker, Nel Noddings. Outlining the argument posited in her new book *A Richer, Brighter Vision for American High Schools*, Nel began by talking about the purposes of education. She argued in favour of a “unifying” purpose of education, to produce better adults, and drew upon John Dewey’s work to explore the possibility for a richer vocational education. Within a discussion of care ethics, and seeing education as crucial to the cultivation of caring, Nel suggested that every teacher is a moral educator. Reiterating that teaching is not just about instruction, she discussed the distinction between “caring about” and “caring for”, suggesting that “caring for” must be attentive and receptive and must be in communication with the “cared for”. Nel discussed the problems involved with the kind of policy-making that takes into consideration only assumed needs rather than expressed needs. There were many questions and comments following this keynote and I suspect the debate could have continued for much longer.

After lunch, Paul Standish took the stage for the second keynote of the day: ‘Teaching exposed’. Beginning with the dangers of our current assessment-focused educational culture, Paul argued that we are losing the rich relation between teacher, content and student. He suggested that the teacher is “exposed”, not only in bodily form at the front of the classroom, but also in laying open his/her vulnerability, which Paul proposes is an essential part of teaching. Teachers must consider that what they are teaching is “worthy of attention” and begin with the assumption that learners are “capable of a response”, alongside the notion that what is taught is “worthy of a response”. Teaching to the test, as teachers are often expected to do, is a “denial of humanity”, and fails to allow learners the belief that they are capable of a response. Teachers must be ready to be challenged by this response.

The final keynote of the day came from Tom Hamilton, in which he outlined the role and function of the General Teaching Council for Scotland, highlighting the nature of the organisation as a professional, regulatory, independent body. Tom stressed the view of the GTCS that teachers are not just deliverers of content. He talked about integrity in relation to the Professional Standards and suggested a need for openness and humanity.

Before the day drew to a close, our panellists – Gillian Robinson, Holly Linklater, Natasa Pantic and Morwenna Griffiths – invited questions. The panellists took their turn to comment on the day’s proceedings, making connections to teacher education, and answering questions posed by the audience. Again, much interesting discussion ensued, with a huge variety of perspectives being expressed and explored.

This was not just a celebration of 50 years of the PESGB, but also a celebration of the power of conversation between diverse members of a wide community.
requires an interval between acts, as it were, in which risk and excess threaten to disrupt the identity being constituted" (Butler, 1991, 28).

In a way, travelling to the same place with a similar group of people and in a similar organisational structure makes the differences between the yearly events all the more visible. This year I did not even first and foremost come to Tilos for the conference itself, but for taking advantage of the long, quiet afternoon breaks to write a handbook chapter together with my colleague Rebecca Adami, and in order to talk through our work with the many established scholars present.

One of the pleasant constants of the Tilos conference is that for a rather small group of presenters (20 to 25 per year), there is an exceptional variety among the attending scholars regarding the stage in their academic career, their national backgrounds as well as the theoretical traditions they place themselves in.

Being in this small place together for a whole week means literally bumping into each other on the small beach promenade, sometimes passing by on your way to somewhere else, sometimes taking a seat with someone you have never spoken to before. This allows for multiple informal discussions over lunch, dinner and coffee. It sometimes opens up encounters and conversations between people who would not usually approach, interact with, or even have access to each other during larger conferences and events.

Philosophy as lived experience is practised in time and space. Tilos as a place is not just special for being a small and beautiful island; it is also special for providing so many places whose history and set-up seem to be created just for the purpose of philosophical exchange. Talks take place in a variety of locations: besides the hotel conference room, delegates present in the Livadia beach café, in an old amphitheatre up in the mountains and at an old monastery high up on rocks. Rumour has it that next year there will be presentations on a boat.

It is not only the amount of time that this small but diverse group of philosophers of education spends together in a restricted space that is important; the shifting between organised and focused hours for presentations and the spare time in the long afternoon allows for multiple loose associations and self-determined activities. The very structure of the conference gives time – time for writing, time for thought and time for conversation.

I maintain that the distinctive character of human psychological powers lies in our responsiveness to reasons, which emerges as children are initiated into traditions of thinking and reasoning. In this process, children gradually become rational agents in self-conscious control of their thoughts and actions. It follows, I argue, that the cultivation of autonomy is a primary educational end.

My new venture begins with further exploration of responsiveness to reasons. I shall defend my position from the objection that it is too intellectualistic, a complaint that relies on too sharp a distinction between reason and passion, and on the mistaken idea that someone is responsive to reasons only when she engages in articulate reasoning, deliberation or argument. In my view, affective and appetitive states, and engaged coping and spontaneous skilled activity, all exhibit responsiveness to reasons. I hope the resulting view will combine the best elements of the robust individualism of the critical thinking tradition with insights from recent work on reasoning as a social activity, a mode of conversation in which disputants seek to establish a meeting of minds.

I then propose to develop the idea of the meeting of minds, understood as a deep intellectual affinity or accord between persons. To this end, we must overcome all vestiges of Cartesianism and argue that direct, non-inferential knowledge of other minds is sometimes possible and that human beings can share thoughts and feelings in a substantive sense. Such like-mindedness is possible, not only with respect to particular beliefs, but it can also apply to intelligent activity and to the ethos or spirit that informs our thought and action. I hope thereby to understand the phenomenology of satisfying educational encounters, where teacher and student find themselves enjoying a special rapport that enhances the educational experience. As such, the idea of a meeting of minds enables us to characterise something to which authentic pedagogy should aspire.

I shall build on this idea by deploying a model of pedagogy that celebrates conversation – especially face-to-face interaction. To this end I will explore the dialogical and dialectical character of teaching and learning, arguing that conversation facilitates students’ engagement with ideas, not only because it affords them opportunity to speak, but also because it enables them to experience ideas in movement as they and their interlocutors think on their feet. I hope the model will provide insight into the scope and limits of new learning technologies. While it does not undermine judicious use of web-based instruction, I expect it to challenge some leading assumptions in the burgeoning literature on NLT.

There are many other themes I wish to address. I hope to incorporate insights from recent work in the epistemology of disagreement to counter the objection that my view betrays an uncritical confidence in education as fostering like-mindedness. I also hope to examine the light cast by my position on moral education and, if this does not prove too ambitious, on the scope and limits of philosophical inquiry itself.

I am extremely grateful to the PESGB for granting me the fellowship and look forward to discussing the project’s themes with PESGB members at seminars and conferences as my work develops over the coming months.
Large Grant reports

Amanda Fulford

Disruptive pedagogies: unsettling satisfaction, expectation and engagement in higher education

As I write this, I know it’s nearly the beginning of a new academic year: the football season has started (groan), the shops are full of ‘back to school’ clothes, and there’s just the slightest hint of approaching autumn in the Yorkshire morning air.

Usually, at this time of year, I’m thinking about (or sometimes dreading) the challenges of a new university semester – battling room bookings; the eternal problem of photocopier jams, and of ever shortening marking deadlines. This time, however, is a little different. Earlier in the year, I was glancing through my unread emails when one caught my eye. The first line, displayed in my inbox, read: “I am pleased to let you know that an award is to be made...” Sensing that this could not be news of an imminent dame-hood, I was very pleased to find out that this was an award of a Research Fellowship Grant from the Society.

The idea for the research that the grant application is supporting comes from my work in higher education. I have worked in post-1992 universities since 2002, and my experience suggests that these contemporary UK universities share a number of characteristics. These relate to the particular emphasis placed on measures such as student satisfaction, student engagement and meeting students’ expectations. It is not that I think that these are necessarily the wrong things to which universities should give attention. It is rather that the importance placed on such measures gives me a strong sense of unease. In thinking why this is the case, I have come to the view that it is because the focus on these aspects of the overall student experience tends to drive universities towards particular pedagogical approaches, ways of talking with, and relating to, students. Research into the question of whether the discourses of satisfaction, engagement and expectation are now dictating the tutor–student relationship, and our ways of talking and being with each other, is, I think, both timely and relevant.

My plans are to use the generous award from the Society to read, write and publish philosophical research on the changing nature of higher education in the contemporary university. I plan to develop my current research, by exploring what is at stake in particular iterations of ‘student expectation’, ‘student engagement’ and ‘student satisfaction’. My aim is to unsettle the way that some of these terms have come to be understood – hence the title of the project: ‘Disruptive pedagogies: unsettling satisfaction, expectation and engagement in higher education’.

My aim is also to explore a more positive purpose in seeing the possibilities of these terms, and in fleshing out the pedagogical implications of understanding them in a richer way. Through drawing on Gabriel Marcel’s writings on freedom, participation and presence, I will consider issues of engagement and expectation in the tutor–student relationship. In rethinking dominant notions of satisfaction in higher education, I draw on the work of Stanley Cavell, and his readings of Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau to consider what might be gained by ‘unsettling’ thinking and learning. What I am attempting is a reversal of the dominant discourses of satisfaction, engagement and expectation. This means considering what is at stake in the idea of the unexpected in a university education; it entails exploring the etymology of ‘engagement’ and asking what it means for a student not to be engaged, and it asks whether an unsettling education is ultimately a more satisfying one.

In trying to work through these ideas, and in suggesting ways of working with students who are sympathetic to such ideas, I would be happy to talk with colleagues at conferences, and I look forward to seeing you there.
David Lewin

Educational philosophy for a postsecular age

I have always wondered about the proper place of religion in an age in which science, technology, postmodernity, pluralism and secularism have made traditional religious life seem inauthentic, even impossible.

Back in 1948, the theologian Rudolf Bultmann proposed a programme of demythologisation of the (Christian) tradition: “It is impossible to use electric light and the wireless [radio] and to avail ourselves of modern medical and surgical discoveries, and at the same time to believe in the New Testament world of demons and spirits” (Bultmann et al., 1961: 5).

The twentieth century saw theologians and philosophers explore a range of responses to the modern age, with the Catholic Church famously undertaking the Second Vatican Council. The grip of secularism seems to have loosened since its apex at the close of the twentieth century. Does the new language proposed a programme of demythologisation of the modern age? Is the postsecular a return to traditional forms of religious life?

In this monograph I explore the significance of the postsecular for educational philosophy. The grant covers a period of writing up for manuscript submission in spring 2016 (Routledge International Studies in the Philosophy of Education). This book seeks to undercut. Whatever we take ‘postsecular’ to mean, it cannot be simply a return, as though the secular age has been discredited and faith can be restored rather than denies, the secularisation thesis.

This research considers two assumptions within much educational theory. The first assumption is the identification of religion with the propositional. Many tensions around autonomy and criticality versus religious upbringing take for granted a propositional view of religious life, in which the assumed commitment to particular beliefs or truth claims defines the problem (Strhan, 2010). This propositional view of religion plays into a view that ‘critical thinking’ must challenge religious views. Is secularism to be identified with being critical? For Talal Asad, Saba Mahmood and others, this identification haunts the current political and cultural tensions that play out between the ‘Christian West’ and the ‘Islamic World’ (Asad et al., 2009). It becomes rather too easy to identify a secular education system, with a system that privileges Western, neo-liberal values (which itself can be said to privilege Christian narratives).

The second assumption I hope to explore is the progressivist view of history. There are many elements to this, from Fukuyama’s discredited thesis that history comes to an end with liberal democracy (Fukuyama, 1992), to a general ‘developmental’ view of human nature and history with Hegelian and messianic Christian roots. Conceptions of linear time do appear strongly ‘Western’ in character, but interestingly would include the Islamic and Jewish conceptions of temporality. But more significantly, this conception of linear time conveys ideas of progress, development and autonomy (reflecting our Western (post)Christian imperialism), which also underpin our ways of thinking about education.

These ideas have a particular way of framing debates within educational theory, which this book seeks to undercut. Whatever we take ‘postsecular’ to mean, it cannot be simply a return, as though the secular age has been discredited and faith can be restored in traditional religion. I am grateful to the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain for its support of this project.


Website and online developments

It is a year since the PESGB launched its new website, complete with a new logo and a twenty-first-century ‘brand’ for philosophy of education.

Getting the site up and running was exciting, difficult and continues to be a challenging endeavour as we get to grips with managing the new technologies and the different systems that affect how our members access journals, online information and events.

We plan to conduct a short survey of our membership sometime this year in order to gauge how and when people use the website and, in particular, what you all think of this new environment in which to share ideas, to work and to promote the Society in its 50th year and beyond. Feedback is essential in helping us to keep improving the website and also in developing new strands to our online presence.

Most notable in the past year has been a significant increase in traffic relating to social media from our Twitter and Facebook accounts. A digest of these is linked through the website so that we can share information as widely as possible, and this has been very successful. Indeed, it has been so successful that we are now working with a professional branding agency to decide on a formal social media strategy. We are also setting up a separate volunteer group (from our membership), who will take responsibility for the use of social media for the Society. We have tried to manage both the website and social media together, but it has overwhelmed our Steering Group team of three – mainly due to the fact that we are all working researchers/academics with little time to spare! This aspect of the Society’s online work is very much a work in progress, so more to follow.

Traffic through the new site is constantly increasing and that demonstrates (we hope) better access, more interest in what we do and a more navigable place to explore philosophy of education. Plans for the coming months include:

- adding more visual content (films and photographs);
- continued excellent content of author interviews and book reviews; and
- an excellent range of resources for teachers and students.

As ever, the overall editor gains the kudos but does just a small part of the work. My thanks go to Naomi Hodgson and Ruth Heilbronn for their commitment, fantastic support and great sense of humour throughout all the tribulations and challenges of this great task. And many thanks to Steph and SAS for all their help – we are so glad that they are now taking a larger role in content uploading/editing to keep our site interesting and up to date.

There is still more to do, but I’m very proud of how the website has evolved and how it reflects what we told Wiley-Blackwell when we first started talking about an update. PESGB is the home of philosophy of education.

Distinguished Service Award

Donald Kerr

In spring 2014, the Canadian Philosophy of Education Society, at its annual meetings in Ottawa, recognised a member of the PESGB, Dr Walter Okshevsky, with its Distinguished Service Award, for his long-standing contributions to the Canadian Society and to philosophy of education.

The Canadian Philosophy of Education Society received several strong letters of support from members across the country, and at various stages of their career, for Walter’s nomination, recognising:

- the growing influence of Walter’s scholarship on Habermas;
- his care and dedication in nurturing future and current scholars in philosophy of education; and
- his hard work and commitment to the Canadian Philosophy of Education Society over many years, including an unprecedented two terms as its President.

Walter is viewed with warmth and affection by his colleagues. For many of us, Walter has been a pillar of the Canadian Philosophy of Education Society for many years, and his recognition through this Award was truly deserved.

Mary Richardson

Distinguished Service Award
Members’ publications
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